



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 145

The situation in Grenada

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In connection with agenda item 145, the Assembly has before it a draft resolution in document A/38/L.8, an amendment to that draft resolution in document A/38/L.9, and a further draft resolution in document A/38/L.10.

2. I call on the representative of Seychelles on a point of order.

3. Ms. GONTHIER (Seychelles): It seems to me that human life gets lost in the tide of political events. It has been the customary procedure here in the General Assembly to respect a dead leader with a minute of silence. I therefore request you, Mr. President, to invite us to maintain that tradition and to give the late Prime Minister of Grenada, Mr. Maurice Bishop, a minute of silence before we begin these deliberations.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly decides to observe a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Maurice Bishop, the late Prime Minister of Grenada.

The members observed a minute of silence.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before I call on the first speaker in the debate, I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed at the end of this afternoon's meeting.

6. I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen on a point of order.

7. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): The question before us is both urgent and important. Last week the Security Council held a number of meetings to discuss the invasion of Grenada. Sixty-five representatives spoke in the Security Council, after which a draft resolution was presented¹ and in the end was vetoed by a permanent member of the Security Council.

8. The invasion of Grenada is still going on, and the question remains urgent and critical. Therefore, my delegation deems it necessary that no time be wasted before the General Assembly pronounces on developments in Grenada. Therefore, whilst apologizing to all representatives who have put their names on the list of speakers, I move, under rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that we close the debate and start voting on draft resolution A/38/L.8.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Democratic Yemen has proposed the closure of debate on the item before us. Under rule 75 of our rules of procedure,

"A representative may at any time move the closure of the debate . . . Permission to speak on the closure of the debate shall be accorded only to two speakers

opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

I call on the representative of Antigua and Barbuda.

10. Mr. JACOBS (Antigua and Barbuda): The matter before the Assembly, the situation in Grenada, concerns my region, the Caribbean, and my country, Antigua and Barbuda. My Government has asked me to make a statement on the matter before us. There is additional information which needs to be brought to the attention of representatives in the Assembly. I notice that once again a foreigner far removed from the Caribbean region is trying to stifle debate on this important subject for his own purposes.

11. I oppose the closure motion.

12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Saint Lucia.

13. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): My delegation also opposes the motion of the representative of Democratic Yemen.

14. The events in Grenada, which began on the morning of 25 October, when a pre-emptive defensive force made up of troops from some Caribbean States, and with logistical and personnel support from Barbados, Jamaica and the United States of America, landed on Grenada to protect civilian lives, restore domestic order and nullify a major security threat to the islands of the Caribbean region, were inaugurated well within the international legal constraints of the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States and, more specifically, within the purview of the 1981 Treaty establishing the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, to which Grenada is a party. Therefore, Saint Lucia rejects all allegations designed to portray this pre-emptive action as either *ultra vires* or contrary to the principles of international law.

15. The actions called for and co-ordinated by the Defence and Security Committee of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States [OECS] are consistent with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and, as we all know, the Organization of American States [OAS] takes cognizance of Article 51.

16. Saint Lucia is a non-aligned State, both in the formal sense of being a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and in the practical sense of maintaining a non-aligned foreign policy. Consistent with this, we belong to no military bloc, nor do we take any actions to exacerbate great-Power rivalry in the international theatre.

17. In that context, Saint Lucia has not in the past engaged in international adventurism or displayed a propensity to intervene in what is expressly within the internal affairs of any State, so long as that State does not threaten Saint Lucia's security concerns. It does not at present do so, and it has no future plans to do so.

18. Saint Lucia had closely monitored events on Grenada since the overthrow of its constitutional Government on 13 March 1979. While we expressed no value judgments on the merits of the 1979 *coup d'état*, we were filled

with consternation by the fact that the leadership of the New Jewel Movement failed to hold free and fair elections within a reasonable time. We became more and more alarmed as events in Grenada continued to demonstrate the flouting of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of the charter of the Organization of American States and of the Treaty establishing the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States. We grew increasingly alarmed as the régime in Grenada tightened its grip, muzzled the press and imposed an authoritarian *modus vivendi* upon the citizens of Grenada.

19. In the past four years Grenada had built up its armed forces, with the assistance of both regional and non-regional totalitarian States, to a level unmatched by any other country in the Eastern Caribbean. History has shown, and our own intelligence reports have confirmed—

20. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Mozambique on a point of order.

21. Mr. dos SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, I wish to apologize to you personally, to the Assembly and to the representative who was making a statement, but I want this meeting to take place under the most serene conditions. I feel that we are straying from the question under discussion. A motion has been presented and, as you rightly said, Sir, two speakers may speak against it. I am not sure, however, whether in these circumstances speakers can be allowed to make the statements they had already prepared. Hence I seek your assistance, so that we may keep to what we are discussing now.

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have taken note of the remarks just made by the representative of Mozambique on a point of order. I now ask the representative of Saint Lucia to continue his statement.

23. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): In the past four years Grenada has built up its armed forces, with the assistance of both regional and non-regional totalitarian States, to a level unmatched by any other country in the Eastern Caribbean. History has shown, and our intelligence reports have confirmed, that the microcosmic territory of Grenada was becoming far too small to contain both its revolutionary zeal and the mounting tons of military hardware.

24. The brutal coup in Grenada only a few days ago, when over 100 Grenadians were killed, including the Prime Minister, Maurice Bishop, and several Cabinet members, made it abundantly clear—

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I invite the representative of Saint Lucia to try to refer only to the reasons for which he opposes the motion for the closure of the debate. I have not put any time-limit on those statements, even though that is allowed under the rules of procedure, because we are considering a motion for the closure of the debate. But I appeal to the representative of Saint Lucia to express his thoughts as briefly as possible.

26. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): In deference to your request, Sir, I shall certainly cut my statement short. However, as the representative of Mozambique rightly pointed out, we came here prepared, because we have witnessed the constellation of forces here which attempt to muzzle those countries which are most directly interested in this affair. The representative of Mozambique, who, it will be recalled, voted against the draft resolution condemning the invasion of Afghanistan, has, surprisingly enough, denounced this invasion. We see where the objections from the floor are coming from.

27. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Mozambique on a point of order.

28. Mr. dos SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, I am really very sorry to come back to my point, but you have noticed that the speaker is really straying too far away from what he is supposed to be referring to. Now he is speaking about Mozambique. I want to assure my friend that Mozambique has not been invaded by foreign forces.

29. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again I ask the representative of Saint Lucia to conclude his statement and to refer to the proposal that has been made on closure of the debate—of course with any reservations he may wish to make and maintaining the right to reply, if he so wishes, at the end of the afternoon. He may continue.

30. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): Mr. President, I have no further comments.

31. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote the motion for closure of the debate moved by the representative of Democratic Yemen. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Malawi, Mauritius, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, United Republic of Cameroon, Yemen, Zaire.

The motion was adopted by 60 votes to 54, with 24 abstentions.

32. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before we proceed to the voting on the draft resolution, I call on the representative of Belgium, who has submitted an amendment to the draft resolution and has asked to speak.

33. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to recall that we have submitted an amendment [A/38/L.9] to the draft resolution on which it is now

proposed that a vote be taken. I have not had the opportunity of introducing that amendment; I do not know if I should do that from my seat or if I should come to the rostrum. In any event, I wish a vote to be taken on that amendment before the voting on the draft resolution.

34. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I invite the representative of Belgium to come to the rostrum to introduce the amendment.

35. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief; I think that everyone has seen our amendment. It would insert a new paragraph between paragraphs 4 and 5 of the present draft resolution in document A/38/L.8.

36. Why have we introduced this amendment? We think that it would improve the text of the draft resolution because it relates to the future development of the situation in Grenada. The text of the draft resolution relates to the present situation. It is our desire, as has already been indicated in official statements of our Government, that the normal state of affairs be restored as soon as possible for the people of Grenada, and we think that the best way of doing that would be to hold, as quickly as possible, free elections that would give the Grenadian people the possibility of choosing the Government they wish to have.

37. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution in document A/38/L.8 and on the amendment introduced by the representative of Belgium and contained in document A/38/L.9. First, however, I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen.

38. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Thank you for calling on me a second time, Mr. President. On this occasion I should like formally to move that no action be taken on the amendment just introduced by the representative of Belgium. I ask you to be good enough to put this motion to the vote immediately. It is made under rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure and is in consonance with a precedent established only two weeks ago.

39. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly has heard the proposal just made by the representative of Democratic Yemen that a vote not be taken on the amendment in document A/38/L.9, introduced by the representative of Belgium.

40. Rule 74 of the rules of procedure reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

I have set a five-minute time-limit on each statement.

41. Mr. de LA BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): I shall limit myself to saying that everybody has the right to submit an amendment to the text of a draft resolution. It is all the easier for me to say this since everyone is aware of the position taken by my country during the discussions in the Security Council. Hence, I think that there is no reason not to have a vote on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Belgium. In our view, that amendment would be a very fortunate addition to the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Nicaragua and Zimbabwe.

42. Indeed, we believe that it is necessary for free elections to take place as rapidly as possible, in order to

enable the people of Grenada to choose their representatives and their Government freely. That is why, so far as we are concerned, we shall vote in favour of the amendment.

43. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation supports the motion made by the representative of Democratic Yemen concerning the rejection of the amendment proposed by the representative of Belgium.

44. I believe that this proposed addition is not logical and not acceptable. It is not logical because it calls for elections to be held during the occupation. Who is going, practically speaking, to organize such elections? The occupation forces, which have eliminated the legitimate régime there and have imprisoned its leaders? The amendment is not acceptable because it relates to the internal affairs of an independent country, a Member of our international Organization.

45. Therefore, my country supports the rejection of this amendment, and I state again our support for the motion made by the representative of Democratic Yemen.

46. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): I had been trying to catch your eye, Mr. President, even before you called on the representative of Democratic Yemen. However, I am not going to make an issue of that.

47. I have asked to speak not, certainly, to contest the right of any delegation present in this Assembly to introduce an amendment to any draft resolution before us. In fact, with specific regard to the amendment proposed by the delegation of Belgium, my delegation would like to state categorically that we find the amendment to be an interesting, thoughtful one. I would express my delegation's appreciation to the delegation of Belgium for the interest taken in the draft resolution, which was sponsored by Guyana also at the level of the Security Council—an interest which led the delegation of Belgium to consider ways in which it could improve the text now before us for consideration. However, my delegation finds the motion presented by the delegation of Democratic Yemen irresistible, and I shall state why.

48. My colleagues will notice that draft resolution A/38/L.8 is almost identical with that which was presented by three delegations to the Security Council last week. The draft resolution that was presented to the Council was not adopted, for reasons which are no secret to anyone here. It means that the international community has not so far had an opportunity to pronounce itself on the events that took place in Grenada last week. In view of the fact that the Security Council was so prevented last week, it was the wish and the intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution now before us that the General Assembly should be given just such an opportunity to pronounce itself on those events taking place in Grenada. Therefore, with the draft resolution that we are now considering, the sponsors are simply seeking to have the Assembly pronounce itself on what has happened, on the events of last week.

49. It seems to my delegation that draft resolution A/38/L.10 has a different thrust, a different emphasis. Draft resolution A/38/L.10, presented by Trinidad and Tobago, looks to the future. It looks forward. One of the elements in draft resolution A/38/L.10 is precisely that of elections, to which the delegation of Belgium has so thoughtfully referred in its proposed amendment [A/38/L.9]. Therefore I should like to suggest that the amendment of Belgium could properly be considered by this Assembly when we are dealing with the draft resolution presented

by Trinidad and Tobago, which looks to the way forward. The focus of draft resolution A/38/L.8 is on what happened last week, the events of last week.

50. I know that the proposal by Belgium is made with the best of intentions and in all sincerity, but I should like to suggest very humbly that its consideration would be more relevant when we are taking up draft resolution A/38/L.10, presented by Trinidad and Tobago. It is for this reason, and no other, that I say that I find it hard to resist the motion by Democratic Yemen.

51. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): It is particularly sad, if symbolically appropriate, that the action on this issue concerning Grenada in this body should be accompanied by attempts to stifle free discussion of the issues and to reject an amendment which calls for free elections. It is particularly appropriate that those efforts should be made by a country which calls itself "Democratic Yemen". It is particularly appropriate that questions should be raised by the representative of Libya concerning how the persons now in Grenada—the Governor-General, presumably, and the representatives of OECS—would be able to organize free elections, since the Government of Libya is singularly unqualified on that subject.

52. The motion by Democratic Yemen has been described as "irresistible". If indeed this body finds irresistible a proposal, first, that debate be stifled and prevented and, secondly, that an amendment proposing free elections for a liberated people be rejected, then we have arrived at a moment of truth.

53. Has it come to this, that the Organization, founded in the wake of a great war against tyrants, comprising from the moment of its birth nations liberated by force from the troops and quisling Governments of tyrants, should be asked to deplore the rescue of the people of Grenada from the grip of a small band of murderous men whose clear intention was to secure the permanent subjugation of Grenada and its people, putting this small but strategically located island at the disposal of foreign tyrants? If yesterday's victims of yesterday's tyrants and tomorrow's victims of tomorrow's tyrants should join in deploping the liberation of today's victims from today's tyrants, and should do so in an organization founded precisely to ensure that there be no more victims and no more tyrants, then surely we would have arrived at the end of the dreams and the hopes of the founding generation.

54. Free discussion, free elections, rule of law and due process of law are precisely the questions at issue in Grenada and precisely the questions at issue in this body today. Maurice Bishop and his Cabinet were murdered without a trial, without a right to defend themselves, without a court, without a judge. They were murdered in cold blood. If this body today attempts to stifle discussion of the issues involved in the establishment of democracy in Grenada after a terrible experience with lawlessness and tyranny, then the majority here is an accomplice to the death of the dreams which we all bring to this great Assembly.

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote the motion by the representative of Democratic Yemen, submitted under rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no decision be taken on the amendment submitted by the representative of Belgium [A/38/L.9]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia,

Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Niger, Oman, Panama, Qatar, Rwanda, Seychelles, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda.

The motion was rejected by 63 votes to 43, with 34 abstentions.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The motion by the representative of Democratic Yemen has not been adopted. We shall therefore proceed in accordance with the rules of procedure to vote first on the amendment contained in document A/38/L.9.

57. I call on the representative of Vanuatu on a point of order. I should like to recall that the representative of Vanuatu may refer only to a point of order regarding the conduct of the voting. If it is on any other point, he would have to wait until the end of the voting process.

58. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): I apologize for the interruption, but I was trying to get the President's attention before the voting began in order to propose a sub-amendment to the Belgian amendment.

59. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the representative of Vanuatu that we very much regret that his action concerning a sub-amendment had not been communicated before the beginning of the voting process on the Belgian amendment. Since we have begun the voting process, we cannot accept his sub-amendment. However, after the voting process is over, we shall hear any proposal that he may wish to make.

60. I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order with regard to the voting process.

61. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): It is my understanding that the Assembly has not sufficiently debated the amendment made by the representative of Belgium. I have a lot to say about it. I have not had a chance to speak on it. My understanding was that we were in the voting process only with respect to the motion by Democratic Yemen. I understood that the amendment was not included in that voting process, and I have a sub-amendment to submit to it. I have it written out in front of me and I have not had an opportunity to submit it. Has the voting process with respect to the

motion by Democratic Yemen been transferred to this amendment? I think the Belgian amendment is not in the position of being voted upon.

62. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling on those representatives who wish to raise a point of order, I wish to refer to the point of order raised by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Delegations should bear in mind that so far we have held two votes and are in the process of a third. The first vote was held on the closure of the debate under rule 75 of the rules of procedure and closure of the debate was agreed to with respect to the item under discussion. Then we held another vote on the motion by the representative of Democratic Yemen, namely, that the Belgian amendment should not be put to the vote. That motion by Democratic Yemen was not adopted. Therefore, closure of the debate on the item was upheld. Rule 75 states that after adopting the closure of the debate on the item "the motion shall be immediately put to the vote." The motion, in this case, is the draft resolution with the Belgian amendment.

63. Under the rules of procedure, we must first vote on the amendment and then on the draft resolution as a whole. That is the situation as it stands and I would ask the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to understand that that is the logical way in which to proceed and I apologize if there has been any confusion in the voting process.

64. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to request clarification whether my understanding is correct. May I still submit an amendment to the Belgian amendment, but without making a statement?

65. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall reply to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, with all due respect, by stating that under the rules of procedure it is no longer possible to introduce a sub-amendment to the Belgian amendment. After the voting has taken place, if any delegation wishes to make a proposal, I do not think that we could deny it that right.

66. Mr. QUIÑONES-AMÉZQUITA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have asked to speak simply to request that the vote on the Belgian amendment be a recorded vote. We wish to know who is in favour of the holding of elections in Grenada.

67. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): A recorded vote has been requested on the amendment submitted by Belgium in document A/38/L.9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Seychelles, Sudan, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

The amendment was adopted by 71 votes to 23, with 41 abstentions.

68. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

69. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): We wish to request a vote on the resolution paragraph by paragraph.

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the United States has asked for a separate vote on each of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution. Rule 89 of the rules of procedure states:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon . . . If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are approved shall then be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

Are there any objections to the request made by the representative of the United States for a separate vote on each of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution?

71. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): I do not wish to be heard on the proposal of the representative of the United States. I asked to speak prior to the vote on the Belgian amendment in order to propose a sub-amendment which my delegation feels is relevant and germane and I would like to proceed, since you promised, Mr. President, that we would be heard immediately after the vote was taken on the amendment.

72. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The request of the representative of Vanuatu has been considered. The process of voting on the draft resolution has begun, and I would like to ask him if he wishes to invoke any of the rules of procedure in support of his proposal.

73. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): With all due respect, I believe that a point of order is appropriate to submit a sub-amendment, even though the amendment has just been adopted.

74. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would remind the representative of Vanuatu that rule 88 of the rules of procedure states: "After the President has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting." Therefore, under the rules of procedure, I cannot now accept a new amendment but must continue the voting process.

75. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): I do not mean to labour the point, but the fact is that I tried desperately to catch your attention, Sir, before the voting commenced.

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I must say to the representative of Vanuatu that I deeply regret what has happened. The President always tries to notice when a representative wishes to speak and hopes to be assisted in this by members of the Secretariat. I beg delegations to see to it that, whenever such a need arises, a member of the delegation approaches the President or draws our attention by any means. Unfortunately, we cannot go back on the voting process. If I hear no objections, we shall proceed to vote on the draft resolution, with a separate vote on each operative paragraph.

77. I call on the representative of Italy on a point of order connected with the voting process.

78. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation and perhaps others have asked to be able to speak in explanation of vote before the vote. Of course, I cannot ask for the voting procedure to be halted now, but I think that before we proceed to the vote, even if we are to vote on each paragraph separately, time should be given to delegations to make their views known. The vote has already been forced through and we have been prevented from speaking in the debate; at least we should be given the opportunity to explain our positions before the vote.

79. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the representative of Italy, as I did the representative of Vanuatu, that the voting procedure is under way. Under rule 88 the voting may not be interrupted. In connection with explanations of vote, rule 75 states that if the General Assembly is in favour of the closure of the debate, the debate is closed, and this is what the Assembly has done. The representative of Italy and the other representatives who wish to explain their vote will be given the opportunity to do so after we have concluded the voting.

80. I call on the representative of Cuba on a point of order in connection with the voting.

81. Mr. VIERA LINARES (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish simply to request that this should be a recorded vote, so that it may be clear who supported armed intervention in Grenada and who condemned it.

82. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the representative of Cuba that all the votes will be recorded.

83. I now call on the representative of Israel on a point of order in connection with the voting.

84. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In connection with the point of order just raised by the representative of Italy, I should like, with all due respect, to draw your attention, Sir, to rule 88 of the rules of procedure, which makes it very clear that explanations of vote are part of the voting process.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank the representative of Israel, but I wish, at the same time, to bring to his attention the fact that rule 88 is a general provision and rule 75 is a specific one. Therefore the President continues to operate under this rule.

86. We shall now vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/38/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea,

Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, El Salvador, Israel, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 106 votes to 8, with 25 abstentions.

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/38/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Barbados, Dominica, Jamaica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of,² Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Solomon Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 126 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/38/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,³ Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Jamaica.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 142 votes to none, with one abstention.

89. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, El Salvador, Israel, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Chad, Chile, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 108 votes to 9, with 21 abstentions.

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

91. Mr. BUFFUM (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs): May I draw the attention of all delegations to the fact that, in adopting the amendment submitted by Belgium, the Assembly has already approved the inclusion of a new paragraph 5. Therefore, paragraph 5 in the text of draft resolution A/38/L.8 will now become paragraph 6.

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the explanation given by the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, we shall now vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/38/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Turkey.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 122 votes to 2, with 14 abstentions.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.8, as amended, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia,⁴ Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, El Salvador, Israel, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

Draft resolution A/38/L.8, as amended, as a whole, was adopted by 108 votes to 9, with 27 abstentions (resolution 38/7).

94. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have to inform delegations that we are still in the process of voting and those wishing to explain their vote will be able to do so at the end of the voting.

95. I now call on the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, who will introduce draft resolution A/38/L.10.

96. Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to speak—

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I apologize to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

98. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): It is our understanding that once the process of voting has begun it cannot be interrupted for any other business, and that explanations of vote are part of the process of voting. In that case, would it not be correct that explanations of vote should precede any other business?

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the United States has raised a point of order which is logical, since we have closed the debate on the item. In consultation with the Secretariat as to the usual practice in these matters, however, we have decided to give the opportunity to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.10. We shall then proceed to vote on that draft resolution, and

immediately following that we shall hear explanations of vote. I thank the representative of the United States for her comments, but that is the procedure which the President must follow, according to the consultations we have had.

100. I call on the representative of Mozambique on a point of order.

101. Mr. dos SANTOS (Mozambique): With all due respect, Mr. President, many delegations asked to speak to explain their votes and you promised them that they would be able to do so after the voting. At the end of the voting we thought that we had at last reached the promised land, but unfortunately, in your wisdom, you have decided to follow a different procedure. I do not want to hold up the proceedings of the Assembly, but I think that the representative of the United States is correct on this point.

102. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am fully aware of the difficulties which arise in a process like this, but I have held consultations and I understand that the practice which should be followed, and which has been followed by the Assembly in the past, is to finish voting on the various proposals or draft resolutions and after that hear explanations of vote on each of those draft resolutions and proposals.

103. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

104. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I understand clearly what you have just said, Mr. President, and that you base yourself on consultations that have taken place, but I should like to put forward two points for your consideration. First, it might be convenient for the Assembly, as regards its future proceedings, to know which rule your ruling is based upon. Secondly, perhaps some account should be taken of the point of order made earlier by the representative of Guyana, in which he was making, if I understood him correctly, a strong point about the different types of draft resolution contained in documents A/38/L.8 and A/38/L.10 respectively. They are not, as he put it, in the same ballpark.

105. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would ask the representative of the United Kingdom kindly to co-operate, so that the representative of Trinidad and Tobago may make his statement. Immediately after that statement the Assembly will deal with the matter raised by the representative of the United Kingdom.

106. Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.10, sponsored by Trinidad and Tobago. I wish to tell my colleagues how sorry I am that there appears to be a slight disagreement on the procedures we should follow and that there has had to be some discussion of this. I shall not take too much of the Assembly's time in introducing the draft resolution. I wish also to thank the representative of Guyana for the kind statement he made with regard to our draft resolution.

107. There is no conflict at all between our draft resolution and either draft resolution A/38/L.8 or the amendment contained in document A/38/L.9. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.8 in its entirety. If we had made any comment on that draft resolution, we might have suggested that the language of one or two paragraphs could have been a little different. But we think that the purpose and the slant of the draft resolution were correct. We were not satisfied, however, that it went as far as it should have in terms of what is good for Grenada, and it is for that reason that we are introducing to the Assembly draft resolution A/38/L.10, which looks to the future and, we hope, will result in the Assembly

endorsing certain provisions which would allow the people of Grenada to live a life of normalcy and to pursue their economic development when the chaos into which they have been thrown has come to an end.

108. I do not propose to go into all the provisions of our draft resolution; I shall only go into its substantive part.

109. We regret—as, I am sure, all other delegations do—the use of force and its consequences in an island as small as Grenada, as indicated in paragraph 1.

110. In paragraph 2, we call upon all States to show the strictest respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Grenada. That is one of the standing principles of our Organization and, if we recall rightly, when the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago addressed the Assembly during the general debate [18th meeting], he pointed to the fact that it is one of the duties of these institutions of ours to observe what we call the international public interest. In our view, the danger for our times lies in our international institutions divorcing themselves from the international public interest. If our actions are not in line with those principles, we are actually undermining the very basis of those institutions and of the nations that form them.

111. That is why, in paragraph 3, we join with the sponsors of draft resolution A/38/L.8 in urging the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces. In that connection, I wish to make a revision to that paragraph. It should read as follows: “Urges the immediate withdrawal of foreign forces from Grenada”.

112. We believe that the people of Grenada must be given a chance to resolve their problems in a context, not of fear or trepidation, but one in which they themselves will be able to see to their own affairs. They will not be able to do so if there are foreign armies on their soil.

113. In its paragraph 4, the draft resolution also urges an early solution to the situation in Grenada and puts forward certain proposals. In paragraph 4 (a), we urge the immediate establishment of a broad-based civilian interim administration, its primary function being to see to elections.

114. For that reason, we could not oppose the Belgian amendment in document A/38/L.9. Of course, we tried to persuade the Belgian delegation to join with us in sponsoring draft resolution A/38/L.10 rather than proposing an amendment to the other draft resolution, so that we could have arrived at an integrated resolution. We think that it would be good for the Assembly to adopt a resolution with that kind of international flavour. There is nothing new about that: it was done with regard to Zimbabwe, to Uganda, and in other connections. I think that the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth secretariat would be quite prepared to assist in such an operation, and I wonder whether the Assembly might not appeal to him in connection with the implementation of resolutions on this subject.

115. I wish also to make a revision to paragraph 4 (b). The word “immediate” should be inserted before the word “deployment”. Our purpose in this subparagraph is to ensure that there will be no vacuum left when the foreign forces leave. I am sure that no delegation would want there to be any vacuum in Grenada. When the foreign forces leave, there should be an almost immediate deployment of what is being called a “security presence”. We could have used the term “security force”, but that has certain connotations which I am sure delegations would prefer we did not introduce into this draft resolution.

116. We also think that, for the benefit of the Assembly, there should be a fact-finding mission comprising persons who know the area and know Grenada very well but who will also, because they are not necessarily living in Grenada, have an objective view. We are not insisting on nationals of States members of the Commonwealth, and thus leaving out other members of the Assembly; we simply think that certain members would be able to make a most valuable contribution and report back to the Secretary-General.

117. We should also like you, Mr. President, to use your good offices to ask Member States and specialized agencies and other bodies in the United Nations system to assist, as appropriate, in the rehabilitation of Grenada, with the continuation of its programme of social and economic development. I do not believe I need argue this point or make it any stronger, as so many representatives are aware of this need and of the contribution that United Nations agencies and Member States themselves can make. Therefore, I need do no more than to draw representatives' attention to paragraph 6, which “Requests Member States to co-operate in giving effect to the measures outlined above”. However, I add the plea that no one should take any steps or do anything that would be against the kind of action that we all believe to be necessary—that is, permitting Grenada to return to normality.

118. I also ask that the Secretary-General be requested to use his good offices to secure the implementation of these measures as a matter of urgency and that he report back to the Assembly as soon as possible.

119. I wish to make only one further point. Our draft resolution was introduced only a few hours ago. A number of representatives with whom I have discussed it have told me that they have great sympathy with it and would like to support it. However, a number of them have not been able to refer the text to their headquarters in their various countries. In the light of rule 78 of the rules of procedure, Mr. President, would it not be wise for us to allow 24 hours for representatives to consult their Governments? If you and the Assembly agree, we shall not vote upon the draft resolution this afternoon but shall postpone the vote for 24 hours.

120. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I said earlier that I would reply to the representative of the United Kingdom on the two points that he put forward for my consideration. I shall reply to the second point first.

121. The representative of the United Kingdom, referring to what the representative of Guyana had said, said that the resolutions were of different types. He first asked what rule in the rules of procedure could be used as a basis for the practice that the Assembly has followed in such cases. The relevant provisions appear in rule 75, which deals with the Assembly's decision on closure of debate. It states: “A representative may at any time move the closure of the debate on the item under discussion”. Therefore, the debate is closed not on one draft resolution or another but on the item under discussion, which in this case is “The situation in Grenada”. I give this explanation so that it may be clear what logic we have been following.

122. Of course, this relates to the explanations of vote, which in this case take place immediately after the vote on all draft resolutions. However—and this may help allay the fears of delegations which wish to follow this matter more thoroughly—the representative of Trinidad and Tobago has notified me that he would like to have the 24-hour rule applied. His draft resolution was distributed a short time ago, and rule 78 says: “As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote

at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting." In the circumstances, I propose that we postpone this meeting until tomorrow in order to comply with the request of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. The explanations of vote will then of course have to be given tomorrow, after we conclude voting on draft resolution A/38/L.10. Therefore, consideration of the item "The situation in Grenada" will continue at tomorrow afternoon's meeting, since at tomorrow morning's meeting we shall continue consideration of the item relating to the Iraqi nuclear installations. Unless I hear any objection, I shall adjourn the meeting.

123. I call on the representative of Italy on a point of order.

124. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I took the liberty of interrupting you during the voting on the draft resolution submitted by Nicaragua because I thought it important, the debate having been closed prematurely, in our opinion, that delegations which, like my own delegation, wished to explain their position more clearly should be able to do so before the vote. You saw fit not to call on me and, of course, I accepted your decision out of respect for the presidency.

125. You said that those delegations that wished to explain their votes could do so after the voting. Without getting into a discussion of procedure—in which I recognize your absolute authority—I should like to point out that my delegation believes it to be quite important that, since this forms part of the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Nicaragua—of which, in any case, we voted in favour—the Italian delegation and other delegations should be allowed to explain their votes now without waiting for a subsequent meeting of the General Assembly, which, of course, will be taking up the same item but a different draft resolution on which the position of the Italian delegation, and that of other delegations, could be different.

126. It is a question not of a statement in the debate on the situation in Grenada but of an explanation of vote on a given draft resolution.

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

128. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I think it is evident that rule 75 of the rules of procedure applies merely to the closure of the debate proper. It is equally clear, from rule 88, that explanations of vote, both before and after the voting, are not part of the debate. I fail to follow the logic distinguishing between explanations of vote before the vote and after the vote, given the fact that in rule 88 it is stated explicitly that "The President may permit members to explain their votes, either before or after the voting".

129. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be only proper to permit those representatives who wish to make explanations of vote before the voting to do so, because this situation is clearly not covered by rule 75 but, rather, by rule 88.

130. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to reflect upon the comments just made by the representatives of Italy and Israel. With the Assembly's permission, I propose, therefore, to suspend the meeting for 5 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 6.05 p.m. and resumed at 6.15 p.m.

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): During the suspension of the meeting, I have had an

opportunity of holding further consultations and I have been able to ascertain that, when several draft resolutions have been submitted on an item, the practice followed in the General Assembly has been to complete the voting on all the draft resolutions before giving delegations an opportunity to explain their votes.

132. Delegations are well aware of special cases in which up to 15 draft resolutions have been submitted on an item. In such cases separate explanations of vote on each draft resolution would mean an extremely lengthy procedure and would affect the smooth order of the Assembly's consideration of the items on its agenda.

133. However, the rules of procedure, and in particular rule 88 on explanations of vote, give the President discretionary power. I would not wish the decision I am now going to make to be regarded as a precedent. I have taken into consideration the fact that we are in a rather special situation today because a motion was made for the closure of the debate on the item. That meant that a large number of delegations were unable to express their views. For that reason—a very special and unusual reason—I shall exercise my discretionary power and give those delegations that wish to explain their votes this afternoon on the draft resolution that has been adopted—that is, the draft resolution in document A/38/L.8—an opportunity to do so.

134. I would inform the Assembly that there is a list of delegations that have expressed their desire to explain their votes. There are also delegations wishing to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

135. If the Assembly agrees, we shall follow the procedure I have set forth. In that way, I intend to keep the promise I made when I assumed the presidency that I would act as impartially as possible and in keeping with the rules of procedure and the Charter of the United Nations.

136. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

137. Mr. SUAREZ (Philippines): My delegation wishes to explain its votes on draft resolution A/38/L.8.

138. The Philippines deeply regrets the military action undertaken jointly in Grenada by the United States and Caribbean countries, because it runs counter to the Charter of the United Nations and does violence to the basic principles of our Organization. The Philippines would have wished that other means, political and diplomatic, had been exhausted.

139. Having said that, we cannot ignore the circumstances and the sequence of events which led to that armed intervention, namely, the murder of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and senior members of his Cabinet, which in effect abolished the legally constituted Government of Grenada. The imposition by force of a régime determined to suppress the rights and liberties of the people of Grenada, the prior and unexplained presence of foreign armed forces in that country and the numerous caches of arms, munitions and military equipment clearly in excess of Grenada's legitimate defence requirements—all this produced consequences inimical to the security and stability of Grenada and of the Caribbean region.

140. Therefore we understand the joint action of the United States and the six Caribbean countries. In the light of the stated objectives, my delegation does not impute ignoble motives for their action. Their objective is to create appropriate conditions for the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of Grenada and the restoration of democratic processes in that country. We agree with those objectives.

141. In examining draft resolution A/38/L.8, however, we were distressed by its evident lack of balance. Mention of other parties which provoked the United States response, and whose actions, therefore, deserve to be deplored, is conspicuous by its absence from the draft resolution. An important dimension of the grave crisis has been completely ignored, and consequently this has erased the total context needed for impartial judgement.

142. My delegation wishes to make it clear that, on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, it does not condone the joint action of the United States and the Caribbean countries. My delegation wishes to make it equally clear that it does not condone the actions of other foreign parties which, by their subversive deeds in the Caribbean and in other Latin American countries, give everyone great cause for alarm.

143. On these grounds, my delegation voted in favour of the Belgian amendment [A/38/L.9] but abstained on draft resolution A/38/L.8.

144. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.8, despite its reservations. However, in view of the amendment that was submitted, on which we cast a negative vote, and the attempts to deprive this vote of its serious nature, we feel that we should explain our vote.

145. The occupation of Grenada, a small independent country, is one more defiant challenge to all peace-loving countries of the world and to the United Nations and it demonstrates that nothing deters United States imperialism when it wishes to carry out its policy of aggression and expansion, when it wishes to impose its dictates on other countries. With this act of imperialism the United States has once again shown its true face—the face of aggression and barbarism. It has shown that it has no respect for international law and has trampled under foot the Charter of the United Nations.

146. The United States invaded Grenada under the pretext of protecting United States citizens living there, establishing law and order and putting an end to the chaos in that country. According to such logic, United States imperialism could intervene in any Latin American country where there are United States citizens, experts or advisers. It is not the first time that the United States imperialists have used pretexts of that kind. They used a similar pretext when they intervened in the Dominican Republic. However, United States citizens are to be found also in Lebanon, El Salvador, Nicaragua and many other countries. Does this give Washington the right, on the pretext of "looking after its citizens", to carry out invasions or aggressions of the sort perpetrated in Grenada? The United States imperialists wish not only to bring that small country under their armed yoke but also to threaten the Latin American countries whose policies do not suit the United States.

147. At present in the Caribbean region and in Central America a situation of tension and insecurity has been created as a result of the aggression and overt military intervention against the peace-loving Nicaraguan and other peoples and of the aggression against Grenada. The many military manoeuvres undertaken by the United States in the Caribbean and the gunboat policy of the Pentagon are merely a prelude to barbarous aggressions.

148. The United States aggression against Grenada is just like the occupation of Viet Nam and the intervention in Lebanon by United States imperialism and the occupation of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan by the Soviet social imperialists. The peoples of the world should not

be misled by the crocodile tears of the United States imperialists and the Soviet social imperialists when they condemn and accuse each other regarding their respective acts of aggression against peoples of the world. This is a form of rivalry between the super-Powers for domination and hegemony over the peoples which are victims of the imperialist intrigues and wars instigated or undertaken for their own ends. It is a well-known fact that when the United States imperialists and the Soviet social imperialists reach an agreement it is for both to commit crimes against the peoples, but when one wishes to act on its own account the other acts "in opposition" or "in defence" of the peoples. This is what occurred recently in Chad, in Africa. This is what is occurring in Grenada, in Central America.

149. The delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania energetically condemns the fascist invasion of Grenada by the United States imperialists and demands that it end immediately, that they withdraw their occupation troops and that Grenada be allowed to remain an independent sovereign State.

150. In view of what I said earlier, my delegation expressed its position by not taking part in the voting on the draft resolution.

151. Mr. JACOBS (Antigua and Barbuda): It is regrettable that the Assembly should discard the right to free debate and rush with ungodly speed to vote on a draft resolution brought before us by those who know nothing about the events in Grenada which led to the rescue operation.

152. There was an intervention to rescue our black brothers and sisters from chaos and tyranny—the tyranny of foreign forces, the tyranny of guns. Men are born free, and everywhere they are in chains. This is a statement of fact.

153. No one, no party, no ruling military junta has the right to speak for the people, whether they be black or white, rich or poor, until they have faced the electorate. The people should never be the servants of the State; the State should always serve the people.

154. We deliberate this afternoon against the background of an increasingly troubled world. It is a world in which the quality of human life is severely impaired and human life itself is greatly endangered. In addition, a large mass of humanity exists on the very margin of survival. There are those who are born into a cycle of suffering and for whom death has become a welcome escape from pain, in a world where a large section of humanity suffers unendurable hardship due to economic deprivation. It is an assault upon the conscience of all mankind when a handful of men, backed and supported by foreign forces, add to the burden of human suffering by denying basic human rights, by committing mass murder and by terrorizing an entire nation.

155. Unfortunately the Caribbean, my region, has recently experienced such a disgraceful episode. It is an episode which we would have preferred never to witness, for we are universally known for the poetry of Aimé Césaire, of Derek Walcott and of Martin Carter. We are known for the literature of V. S. Naipaul and the economic brilliance of Nobel prize winner Sir Arthur Lewis. We are known for the beauty of our beaches and the warmth and hospitality of our peace-loving people. We have no history of violence. We seek no quarrels. We seek no guns. We prefer our battles on the cricket grounds where the ability of our players as world champions is beyond question.

156. Last week, a gang of men held an entire nation under house arrest at the point of guns. Before they had

imposed their brutal campaign of captivity, they shot down the head of the Government and several of his Cabinet ministers. Mr. Whiteman was one of those who was brutally murdered. Despite his philosophy, despite his leanings, he was an acquaintance. He spoke at the 32nd meeting of the General Assembly, in October. Jacqueline Craft was also gunned down. She is well known to many members here. What was her crime? What was Mr. Bishop's crime? Mr. Bishop spoke before the Latin American regional group this year. He was a dynamic individual. Men say that Bishop's only crime was his love for his people, that he sought to restore constitutional rule to his State.

157. When Unison Whiteman and a large crowd of Grenadians—our black brothers and sisters who were born and who live in Grenada—converged on Bishop's residence and freed him from house detention, shells and bullets dispersed the triumphant gathering and the slaughter of innocent Grenadians began. The United States was not in Grenada at that time. The Caribbean Community and Common Market forces were not in Grenada at that time. There were foreign troops there, and they are responsible.

158. This is a question that must be answered. Who is responsible for the murder of Mr. Bishop and his Cabinet? Who is responsible for the slaughter which claimed the lives of so many of the Grenadian leaders? There are those who are responsible. The answer must come. The international community must be told in clear terms.

159. Since the last world war, 28 countries have fallen beneath the armed might of naked aggression. From Poland to Afghanistan, the situation is the same. Men are held captive, crushed beneath the armed might of foreign forces or made slaves to a way of life foreign to their own life-style.

160. My country, Antigua and Barbuda, together with six other States in the Eastern Caribbean, form OECS, under which we enjoy an economic community, a common currency, joint diplomatic representation and responsibility for our common defence and security.

161. But even before that organization came into being, the Eastern Caribbean countries had been partners in an interlocking relationship. We are the same people. Transported from Africa as slaves 300 years ago, our struggle for freedom and our eventual emancipation, 150 years ago this year, were achieved after the same struggle. For many long years, up to 1958, Grenada and the countries of the Windward Islands of the Eastern Caribbean were one country with a single decision-making body.

162. From 1958 to 1962, the Eastern Caribbean, including Grenada, along with Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, was one country under the West Indies Federation. From 1962 to 1967 the countries of the Eastern Caribbean pursued a joint and collective path leading to independence. But even independence did not divide us. Instead, each of us pooled his individual sovereignty in a joint relationship under OECS.

163. We are a homogeneous society with strong links that bind us together. For instance, the Queen's representative as head of State of my country was born in Grenada. So was his wife. The Director of Public Prosecution of my country was born in Grenada. So, too, was the former Minister of Legal Affairs in my Government. Those ties among our States cannot be dismissed or discarded. There is a cross-transfer of people in the Caribbean which strengthens the bonds binding us.

164. The savagery and butchery of Grenadian nationals by madmen represent an ugly face, a face which none can detest more than those of us who are brothers and

sisters of Grenadians. When this occurred there were foreigners in Grenada under the guise of assistance. Beware of the Greeks, especially when they come bearing gifts.

165. In our efforts to respond to Sir Paul Scoon's invitation for help, we sought assistance from our large neighbours in the Caribbean. Two of them, Jamaica and Barbados, which also share a common history and several common institutions with Grenada, agreed to join us.

166. It is a sad commentary on the state of mankind that deep suspicion and fear occasioned an unwelcome buildup of sophisticated armaments on Grenada in recent years. Peace-loving nations as we are, many of us have no armies, and such armies as do exist could not collectively match the military strength of that régime which had so effectively terrorized the Grenadian people in a short time. Therefore we turned to other friendly Powers and invited them to assist us in protecting our people at home and in Grenada from further threat by a tyrannical régime.

167. The United States will withdraw from Grenada as soon as the island is fully secured—not before. There never was, and there still is not, any intention that United States troops would remain in Grenada for longer than is absolutely necessary.

168. Our own men will be out of Grenada in a matter of weeks, turning the country over to a broad-based civilian Government, which will immediately prepare for general elections. Grenada will have democracy restored and the will of the people shall prevail, free from tyranny, free from despotism.

169. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy): I should like first, Mr. President, to thank you for your very wise ruling and to express to you our deep appreciation for calling on us at this time.

170. The Italian delegation voted in favour of all the paragraphs of the draft resolution sponsored by Nicaragua [A/38/L.8] and for the resolution in its entirety out of respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, which should not be set aside for any reason, the application of which we have consistently favoured at all times in the past and to which Italy intends to reaffirm its full and determined adherence. As a friend of the United States and as a member of the same free alliance with the United States, we feel at liberty to dissent whenever necessary from its decisions, without that having to imply any stress on our relations which are the basis of this free alliance and of the principles which inspire it.

171. In the same spirit of frankness, one cannot forget the reality of the situation which arose in the island of Grenada as a result of the tragic events which led to the killing of Prime Minister Bishop and of other eminent representatives and leaders of that country, and the concern that such a situation might have arisen in neighbouring countries. We therefore approve the reference made to those tragic events in the preamble of the resolution just adopted.

172. I think we should look at the future now; it is above all important that everyone work constructively for the prompt re-establishment of the principles of international law, and to bring Grenada fully back to normal. To this end, it seems to us essential that the people of Grenada be put in a position to express itself freely and to choose, in full sovereignty and autonomy, through free elections, its own system of government and its own destiny.

173. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States did not oppose the inscription of the

item on the situation in Grenada under rule 15 as an additional item for consideration by the General Assembly during the current session. The United States does not object to debate of this issue. To the contrary, we welcomed a full judicious discussion of all the facts pertaining to the situation in Grenada, convinced that an understanding of the situation will support the action of OECS and its associates, including the Government of the United States.

174. The United States, therefore, particularly and most especially regrets the decision to terminate debate before it had ever begun, to deny the Assembly the right either to discuss or to review the facts before it made its decisions. The United States very deeply hopes that the Assembly will not repeat this decision in dealing with other important matters concerning international peace and security.

175. The United States is convinced that the facts, and understanding of the facts, will support our actions. We believe that the use of force by the task force was lawful under international law and the Charter of the United Nations, because it was undertaken to protect American nationals from a clear and present danger, because it was a legitimate exercise of regional collective security, because it was carried out with due concern for lawful procedures and in the service of values of the Charter, including the restoration of the rule of law, self-determination, sovereignty, democracy and respect for the human rights of the people of Grenada.

176. The United States did object to giving special priority to the consideration of this item, not because we do not think it important—obviously we think it very important—but because the situation that now prevails in Grenada is not more urgent than other matters still to be considered by the Assembly, matters that also involve the basic values of the Charter and even more human lives, matters such as the situation in Lebanon and the Middle East, southern Africa, Central America, Afghanistan, the war between Iran and Iraq and other issues that will not come before the Assembly at all, such as the aggression against Chad, or the repression of the Polish people, or the persecution of Andrei Sakharov, Anatoly Sharansky, José Pujol, Ricardo Bofill, Eloy Gutiérrez Menoya, and other beleaguered defenders of human rights now held prisoner in some country which not only votes to deny debate in the Assembly but practises repression of dissent at home.

177. Moreover, the United States deemed it hypocritical and politically tendentious to turn the Assembly's urgent attention to the situation in Grenada only after the real emergency in that country had passed, which is to say only after Grenada had been rescued from the murderous elements that had taken over the country, threatening the people of that country and the neighbouring States as well. But the issue was brought before us without debate. It was forced to a vote without debate, and so we are left to consider only retrospectively the issues raised in the resolution.

178. First, it is necessary to consider the situation that prevailed in Grenada before the intervention of 25 October to decide whether that situation was such as to warrant the use of force in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. Examination of those facts permits us to decide whether the principle of self-determination was violated or whether it was upheld; whether the sovereignty of Grenada was destroyed or whether it is being restored; whether the people of Grenada were victimized or whether they were in fact and quite truly liberated; whether the cause of peace was damaged or was served. These only appear to be difficult

questions. The difficulties disappear when the questions are addressed not in the abstract but in the context of the concrete circumstances that led the small peaceful democratic island States of the Caribbean not merely to sanction the intervention but to request it and to participate in it.

179. The test of law lies not in the assertion of abstract principles but in the application of universal norms to specific situations.

180. A court that cannot distinguish between lawful and criminal use of force, between force used to protect the innocent and force used to victimize the innocent, is not worthy to sit in judgement on anyone. The failure to preserve such distinction does not preserve law as an instrument of justice and peace but erodes the moral and legal foundations of civilized existence.

181. There was, of course, first, the question of force, the question of violence. There was, as I have already mentioned, the murder of Maurice Bishop, his deputies, his Cabinet ministers, people who were randomly chosen from the crowds in and around Bishop. There was no court, no trial, no judgement, only murder. The full facts concerning these murders will become clear and will be presented to the world in due time.

182. In expressing horror at these brutal and vicious murders, Prime Minister Tom Adams of Barbados said that the division in the Caribbean now goes far beyond ideological pluralism and is the difference between barbarians and human beings.

183. The United States, in the course of its participation in the collective regional security action in Grenada, has, along with its colleagues in that action, come into possession of hundreds, indeed thousands, of documents captured on Grenada, and these documents are currently in the process of analysis. Among these documents are five very interesting secret military assistance agreements between Grenada, the Soviet Union, Cuba and North Korea, executed between 1980 and 1982, which provide for the training of Grenadian soldiers in Cuba and the Soviet Union and the assignment of Cuban and Soviet advisers and trainers in Grenada.

184. Among these documents are agreements for the delivery, free of charge, of millions and millions and millions of dollars' worth of military supplies: 20,000 uniforms, 4,500 rifles and sub-machine-guns, 58 armoured vehicles and 7,000 mines.

185. The United States will be presenting photographs of the weapons actually found in the seven warehouses in Grenada, in those yet to be discovered and in the adjoining island.

186. The United States believes that there is, as some nations have suggested, a parallel that can in fact be drawn between the action in Grenada and the Soviet action in Afghanistan—a very meaningful parallel. Just as Maurice Bishop was murdered in Grenada because he tried to free himself from the Soviet stranglehold, so too was Mohammad Daoud murdered in Afghanistan and, after him, Hafizullah Amin was murdered in Afghanistan. They too discovered that the only thing more dangerous than embracing the Soviet bear is trying to break loose from its deathly grip. They too learned that the price of trying to reverse the course of history, the inexorable course of history in the Soviet view, is violent death. This, and this alone, is a parallel between Grenada and Afghanistan. The difference is that the people of Grenada have now been spared the cruel fate of the people of Afghanistan.

187. The United States is proud to have participated, with its Eastern Caribbean friends, in the liberation of

the people of Grenada, in the restoration of their sovereignty, their right to self-determination, their human rights, their rights to democratic government, and is proud to have voted for that reason, today, against a resolution that deplored this positive and constructive event.

188. Mr. VIERA LINARES (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The resolution that has just been adopted constitutes a decisive and impressive rejection of the illegal and cowardly action undertaken by the United States Government in carrying out military aggression and occupation of the small, heroic island of Grenada. We, the peoples of the Caribbean and Latin America, well know the brutal interventions of the United States Marines, which began at the beginning of the last century and of which the attack on Grenada constitutes the latest example. Usually the most cynical and scanty explanations have been adduced to justify such intervention, but it is necessary to point out that in this case they have resorted shamelessly and unabashedly to lies to hide from the people of the United States and of the world the true reasons for this act of aggression, its bloody and painful immediate consequences, and the serious and threatening precedent this constitutes.

189. I state here in this Hall that the President of the United States lied when he stated that the American citizens in Grenada were threatened. I state that he lies when he attempts to present the decision to invade Grenada to us as the result of the request of a group of countries which have received little, if ever any, respect from the Washington Government. He lies when he tells us that hundreds of Cuban military personnel were present on the island and that a military airport was being built. By not telling the American people about the content of the Cuban communications that he received 72 hours before the invasion and during the conflict, he is withholding necessary and enlightening information.

190. Shocking though it is to see how the very standards of peaceful coexistence are being despised, how lives are being sacrificed in justification of a policy of force and subjection, it is even more shocking to see Mr. Reagan and his lackeys in the Caribbean shed hypocritical tears over the tragic fate of Maurice Bishop, an unforgettable revolutionary leader of the people of Grenada and of the Caribbean, whose wise and prudent leadership of the revolutionary process in his country constantly came up against opposition of all types, including subversion and coercive economic action by the United States. Suffice it to recall that only a few weeks ago the occupant of the White House refused with haughty disdain to receive Mr. Bishop when he visited Washington. It is important to emphasize here that the military intervention of the United States constitutes an act that runs counter to the principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations; that the countries of OECS violated the letter and spirit of the very Treaty that they invoked in order to justify the intervention of the United States and that they had no right to do so; that the sole legal authorities in Grenada are those members of the Government of Mr. Bishop who are still alive and for whose physical security we fear; that the United States military occupation of Grenada is illegal and should cease immediately and all foreign forces should be withdrawn from the island; and that any authority set up by the occupying forces is therefore neither legitimate nor constitutional, nor does it reflect the free will of the people of Grenada, and should therefore be rejected.

191. The Government of Cuba has declared that the number of Cubans in the island was under 800; only 43 were military staff, 636 were construction workers, 18 were diplomats, including their families, and the rest

were technical experts, doctors or teachers who were co-operating in the building of a new Grenada—all in all, 784 Cubans, of whom 44 were women.

192. For almost four years, Cuba, together with other countries, including Western allies of the United States, has co-operated in the building of the Point Salines airport. This was necessary for the promotion of the development of Grenada and the building of that airport was recommended even before the revolution. It could have been built by any other country inspired by the necessary desire to co-operate. The building of the airport and the presence of Cuban construction workers does not constitute any secret. Officials and journalists from various countries, including the United States, visited the construction site. The fact is that Grenada kept its doors open until the so-called champions of freedom disembarked and now censorship and restrictions typical of a fascist type of aggression prevail, including the type of censorship that has been imposed on the press of the United States.

193. Why is it necessary to hide the facts? Who can trust the information given by the occupying forces? Why is the number of imprisoned Cuban workers not given? Why is the number of Cuban dead and wounded not disclosed? Why are the figures not given us of the dead and imprisoned Grenadians, who defended their country? And why has the number of occupying forces been increased by several thousand? Are new military ventures being planned in the area?

194. In this context I must state that the Government of Cuba appreciates and places its trust in the initiatives undertaken by President Belisario Betancur of Colombia and Prime Minister Felipe González of Spain to mediate in the repatriation of the Cuban workers and to ensure the transfer to Cuba of those Grenadians whose security demands it. We hope that the United States Government will make an appropriate response to this mediation and that the international community will ensure that it is respected. However, the United States has so far refused to hand over the Cuban prisoners and it has not told us of the number of dead or the total number of wounded. The American commanding officer on the island, the real occupying authority, of whom the so-called Governor-General Scoon is no more than a repugnant puppet, has gone so far as to surround the Cuban diplomatic mission with troops, thus threatening its safety. The Cuban diplomatic staff will not leave Grenada until the very last Cuban prisoner has been evacuated by the United States troops. The United States is responsible for the safety of our fellow-countrymen.

195. In their desire to divert attention from the real facts, or perhaps stunned by international reaction or in order to prepare public opinion for new ventures, State Department sources have claimed that they intercepted messages to the effect that Cuba was organizing terrorist acts and assassinations against United States representatives in Latin America. It is indeed strange that this information should coincide with the very moment when the military forces of the United States were surrounding the Cuban Embassy in Grenada. The Government of Cuba acts in a responsible manner and denies totally such allegations. The terrorists of this hemisphere are in Washington. They ordered the bombing of the civilian hospital of Saint George.

196. In his statement of 27 October, the President of the United States stated that Cuba was informed before the Marines landed. Mr. Reagan lied. The note to which he referred was handed to the Cuban authorities three hours after the invasion was initiated and when the Cuban

workers had already been under attack for more than an hour and a half.

197. The Government of the United States is misleading public opinion in that country to hide the fact that they illegally and immorally used the unfortunate events that occurred in Grenada in order to carry out a further act of force against a small country of the third world for the purpose of colonizing it again and of converting it into a forward base for operations against the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean. No consideration of human rights or preservation of the lives of United States citizens, or of those whom they were attacking, was in the minds of those who ordered the invasion.

198. Grenada is today an occupied country. Its independence has been flouted and lives solely in the hearts of its sons and fighters, in those who have inherited the tradition of struggle from Maurice Bishop. Neither honour nor victory has been obtained by the United States in this ignominious battle. Washington has tried through this military adventure to obtain votes for the re-election of its present Government and will try to set this as a precedent for new aggression and interventions in Central America and the Caribbean. In the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency they are in fact beating the drums of war against Nicaragua and El Salvador.

199. Today's vote in the Assembly may help to stop such acts. If it does not, then, in the words of a communiqué from the Revolutionary Government of Cuba:

"We hope that the heroic resistance of the Cubans and the Grenadians to the treacherous surprise attack will have taught them that their adventures throughout the world can no longer be taken as military promenades, that the peoples of the world are no longer frightened of them and that, determined to fight, the people are now invincible."

200. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.8, as amended.

201. This is a matter of principle for us. The Government of Finland has followed with concern the developments in Grenada which have led to the use of force and to outside interference in the internal affairs of that country. International disputes should be settled by peaceful means, through negotiations, without resorting to force which is prohibited in the Charter of the United Nations. The situation should be normalized as soon as possible by withdrawing the foreign forces and re-establishing the right to self-determination of the people of Grenada.

Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Vice-President, took the Chair.

202. The debate in the Security Council has clearly demonstrated that there is a broad consensus on these principles. We regret the fact that the implementation of these principles in relation to the situation in Grenada has become subject to controversy, in particular between the great Powers. We wish to stay outside these controversies, in accordance with our policy of neutrality.

203. The Government of Finland has repeatedly voiced its concern over the increasing number of developments endangering peace among nations. We have emphasized the responsibility of the United Nations and especially of the permanent members of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security.

204. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka voted in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.8, including the amendment in document A/38/L.9, which has just been adopted by the Assembly, in order to reaffirm our commitment to two vital principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Those principles are the non-use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, and the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. When the violation of those principles takes the form of an armed intervention, our concern is not only for a vindication of principle but also for a reassurance of the only defence available to the great majority of Member States of the Organization.

205. We have been consistent and unequivocal whenever there has been a breach of those principles. In 1979 we spoke out when those principles were violated in Kampuchea, and in 1980 when they were similarly violated in Afghanistan. In the Assembly, we may not have been the most vocal in this regard but, by the vote we cast every year when the resolutions on Kampuchea and Afghanistan come up, we have sought to demonstrate that there can be no compromise when those principles are involved. To remain silent or to be equivocal now, when there has been a no less open violation of those principles in Grenada, would for us be a wholly indefensible position.

206. Above all, as I stated earlier, like the majority of States whose representatives have spoken in this Assembly, we do so because both respect for and observance of those principles are an act of self-defence or, one might say, our last resort.

207. Just as we have done in regard to the resolutions on Kampuchea and Afghanistan, the resolution on Grenada which we have just adopted calls for an end to the armed intervention and for the withdrawal of foreign troops. We can only hope that in the case of Grenada there will be a more prompt compliance with that call from the Assembly, so that even if there has been a breach of the principles, that compliance will at least be some recompense.

208. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): The situation in the Caribbean and Central America has long been fraught with danger, danger to the well-being of the countries and peoples concerned, and danger to the regional peace and stability with a dangerous impact on world peace and international security.

209. It cannot be denied that, with the prolongation of economic and social problems in many parts of the area, non-hemispheric forces have tried to exploit the situation to the benefit, not so much of the peoples of the region themselves, but rather of a global strategy alien to this region.

210. Neither can it be denied that a certain Power within the region has engaged itself in exporting revolution to neighbouring countries with the assistance of a non-hemispheric Power. Indeed, hardly a single country in this hemisphere has felt unconcerned about these nefarious activities.

211. It also cannot be denied that the region is rich in resources, human and natural, and is vested with a tremendous responsibility to preserve and enhance peace and stability partly because of its strategic location, with the vital sea lanes as well as the canal linking the two great oceans.

212. Nor can it be denied that the events prior to the recent armed intervention in Grenada had horrified the entire world. The murders of the late and lamented Prime Minister and other leaders had dealt a blow to organized government in that island paradise, and instilled many doubts and fears in neighbouring countries. Indeed, uncertainties arose regarding the safety of foreign nationals in Grenada, and even the general population at large.

213. Nor can it be denied that not all the facts have become known about those and succeeding events in Grenada. It was obvious, however, that the transformation of the peaceful island into, relatively speaking, an armed camp with strategic potentials has long been a cause of deep concern among its weaker neighbours.

214. Despite those concerns, however legitimate they may be in the circumstances, the armed intervention in Grenada violates the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law. My delegation deeply regrets the loss of life suffered as a result of the military actions, but at the same time feels relieved to learn of the safety of the foreign nationals, which was one of the major concerns that led to the armed intervention. This should presage a rapid return to normalcy and the restoration to the people of Grenada of their right to self-determination, free from all forms of external interference and coercion.

215. My delegation is further encouraged by pronouncements from various quarters to the effect that the nations which participated in the intervention will withdraw their forces as soon as possible from the island. In this connection, my delegation welcomes the initiatives being taken by the Commonwealth countries which may assist in peace-keeping in Grenada, also a member of the Commonwealth.

216. In the light of the foregoing, my delegation carefully examined the text of draft resolution A/38/L.8, which begins by reaffirming the principles to which Thailand has consistently adhered, the sovereign and inalienable rights of Grenada, a Member State of the United Nations, in particular the right to self-determination, and then the principle enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations which, together with the other principles and rights cited earlier, must be applicable to all States regardless of geographical location.

217. My delegation is also conscious of the need for all States to show consistent respect for the aforementioned rights and principles, wherever such rights and principles are being trampled under foot or threatened. That is why Thailand consistently supports the right to self-determination and the principle of non-intervention, as well as the right of countries which are subjected to foreign occupation in other parts of the world to be free and independent. While we remain hopeful that these rights will soon be restored to the people of Grenada, the same cannot be said with regard to the aforementioned situations. The question is therefore posed before the Assembly whether we can be equally hopeful for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the occupied territories in those areas of the world, or whether we can be equally insistent and consistent in demanding the restoration to those other peoples of their right to self-determination, free from outside intervention, interference, subversion, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever.

218. All I can say is that the delegation of Thailand will be consistent. The test will soon come with the consideration of the situation in Afghanistan. My delegation looks forward to a similar display of consistency on the part of those delegations which have shied away from being consistent on the Kampuchean issue and now profess to be fully consistent and to remain consistent.

219. The operative part of the resolution just adopted is also difficult to argue with, as it is consistent with the above-mentioned principles and practice of the Organization.

220. While the right of individual and collective self-defence cannot be denied, the provisions of the Charter provide for it only if an armed attack occurs, and not

merely a threat either real or perceived of such an attack. Although the Charter provides for regional action for the maintenance of international peace and security, such actions must be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and no enforcement action is permitted under regional arrangements without the authorization of the Security Council.

221. It cannot be denied that Thailand enjoys the most cordial relations with the countries which have participated in the multinational force which is now present in Grenada. We noted with appreciation their sense of fair play in not opposing the inclusion of this item on our agenda or the waiver of the seven-day delay in its consideration. It cannot be denied also that the erstwhile peaceful island State of Grenada, with which Thailand recently established diplomatic relations, has suffered a series of misfortunes arousing the concern of its neighbours near and far. The situation in Grenada must therefore be restored to normalcy, with all the rights of the people intact and reaffirmed, especially their right to self-determination.

222. In conclusion, one should take the long view of the situation in Grenada, in terms of both looking back in time and looking ahead beyond the present situation. Events leading to the recent armed intervention cannot be isolated from subsequent developments. They reflected some unhealthy trends which set Grenada on a collision course with its neighbours. Whether we like it or not, and whether that course was one democratically chosen by the people or not, it was an internal matter for Grenada. If and when peace and self-determination return to Grenada and its people, in the near future, the Assembly will be more than ever justified in its demand for similar conditions, particularly in Kampuchea and Afghanistan. If this Assembly acts consistently, then my delegation will find renewed encouragement in the willingness and ability of the United Nations to remain constant to its noble aims and ideals. Then in the long run the world Organization will be that much stronger in its endeavour to serve the legitimate interests of its Member States and all mankind.

223. For the foregoing reasons my delegation was able to vote for draft resolution A/38/L.8, and its amendment in document A/38/L.9, now adopted by the General Assembly.

224. Mr. ZAINAL ABIDIN (Malaysia): First of all, my delegation regrets having been prevented from making a formal statement on this serious question today. It is true that as many as 80 countries participated in the debate in the Security Council but many others did not and certainly my delegation was looking forward to expressing its view formally. I hope the Assembly will bear with me if I present what I have to say in the form of an explanation of my delegation's vote.

225. The Malaysian Government views with grave concern the events taking place in Grenada, which began on 25 October 1983. The act of interference and invasion of this small island State is a clear violation of international norms and constitutes a glaring breach of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, which urges Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other State. Many of the existing international conflicts, such as those in Afghanistan, Kampuchea, southern Africa and the Middle East, emanate from the failure of Member States to adhere strictly to and uphold these sacrosanct principles. Malaysia has therefore consistently called upon the international community to observe these principles scrupulously in order to guarantee the maintenance of a stable world order.

226. My delegation listened with great attention to the various statements made in the Security Council, as well as those made in the plenary meeting today. In our view, the situation confronting us in Grenada could be briefly summarized as follows: first, there were fear and anxiety with regard to the country's future course; secondly, there was a breakdown of law and order in that country; thirdly, the fear and anxiety compounded by the breakdown of law and order brought about intervention by foreign military forces; fourthly, it is imperative for these foreign forces to be withdrawn; and, finally, there is an urgent need for a return to normalcy to ensure that Grenadians can choose their own future, free from outside interference and coercion.

227. In our view, the events that took place in Grenada were really the result of the interplay of power and ideological politics which have indeed pervaded the Caribbean area for some time. We fear that if this phenomenon persists not only Grenada but the whole of the Caribbean will be embroiled in an intense power struggle, in which the losers would ultimately be the small countries themselves.

228. The situation is indeed volatile. We strongly believe that countries in the region, whatever their ideological orientation, must scrupulously respect the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and must seek at the same time a permanent and viable framework of co-operation, to ensure their collective future and destiny. No State must threaten or feel threatened by any other. In calling for an immediate cessation of the armed intervention and for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Grenada, it is our hope that the people of Grenada will be able to determine their own political, economic and social system free from outside interference and coercion. It is our further hope that Grenada and other Caribbean States will be able to determine in concert the path of political, economic and social development and co-operation that will guarantee their common security and well-being.

229. I wish to emphasize that Malaysia remains committed to the fundamental principles of international relations enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, upon which our survival as a sovereign and independent nation—and, I am sure, that of many other States too—depends. This commitment leaves us with no alternative but to express our serious concern at the events which have taken place and are taking place in Grenada and to call for the immediate restoration to the people of Grenada of the right to the full exercise of its national sovereignty. For this reason, Malaysia supported draft resolution A/38/L.8, as amended by Belgium in document A/38/L.9.

230. Mr. ANDINO-SALAZAR (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): El Salvador voted against draft resolution A/38/L.8 for the following reasons. The roots of the problem of Grenada lie in the intervention in that country of Cuba in pursuit of expansionist aims of an ideological nature. The internal power struggle within the ruling clique of Grenada gave rise to chaos and anarchy, which led to a general disrespect for human life that culminated in the death of the Prime Minister and other Government officials.

231. The intervention in Grenada was reflected in a régime which was at the beck and call of the Soviet Union, and was contrary to the interests of the Grenadian people. That régime would have converted Grenada into a base for expansionist action in the Caribbean region and in Central America, with the collaboration in the latter area of the present régime in Nicaragua.

232. We should point out that international organizations have taken a passive stance in the face of destabilizing interventionist actions against other States stemming from alien ideological and strategic interests. This is what happened with regard to Grenada and is now happening with regard to Central America in the face of intervention by Cuba and Nicaragua, particularly in El Salvador, where they are supporting and sponsoring armed groups which are carrying out acts of terrorism. Such interventionism, which is manifested in political, logistic and military support for the various Central American guerrilla groups, has helped to convert our region into a hotbed of international tension which could very easily pose a threat to the peace and security of the hemisphere.

233. It is from that perspective that El Salvador analyses the case of Grenada and the collective action taken by OECS.

234. We cannot fail to deplore the fact that, among other things, draft resolution A/38/L.8 supports the conversion of a small, peaceful State with scarce resources and other limitations into an important depot for the supply of weapons and logistic support for those destabilizing, expansionist interests. It was for this that Grenada lost its autonomy and compromised its sovereignty.

235. The presence in Grenada of hundreds of Cuban advisers disguised as workers and technicians constitutes a typical act of intervention against the sovereign rights of the Grenadian people. In the Central American region we have seen a dramatic example of that sort of interventionist presence in Nicaragua, which now serves as a springboard for Soviet and Cuban intervention in El Salvador and throughout Central America.

236. The Government of El Salvador considers it necessary for the future of Grenada that in the short term the peace and tranquillity of the Grenadian people be guaranteed, so that a democratic régime truly representative of the interests of that country may be established. The international community should guarantee the self-determination of Grenada and prevent any future action against duly constituted Governments.

237. It is from a Central American and a national viewpoint, and in the context of destabilizing acts inspired from outside, that my country approaches the whole range of problems in Grenada. We must emphasize, however, that we deplore the events in Grenada before, during and after the intervention of the forces which are in that country as the result of collective action within the constitutional framework of OECS, and that we support the principles of non-interference and the self-determination of peoples.

238. We regret that those principles have been trampled under foot in various parts of the world and that no decisive action has been taken to ensure that they are applied and universally respected.

239. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the Belgian amendment [A/38/L.9] to draft resolution A/38/L.8.

240. My delegation does not consider that it was appropriate to adopt that amendment at the present stage—not because the Congo has ever opposed the general principle of elections anywhere, but because we consider Grenada to be under military occupation at the present time. It is ironical to put the cart before the horse and talk about elections at a time when Grenada is the object of an act of aggression and of military occupation which my country has strongly condemned. We believe that would tend to legitimize that occupation, endorse its

consequences and indicate that the Assembly considered it to be necessary for the organization of free elections. That is why we felt that the amendment was inappropriate, or at least inopportune.

241. My delegation did not wish to endorse aggression. We could in no way give our approval to foreign occupation and intervention—which the Belgian amendment seemed to suggest, in a veiled manner perhaps, but in a manner clear enough for my delegation.

242. It was for this reason that my country voted against the amendment.

243. Mr. FERM (Sweden): Sweden voted for the resolution, as an expression of our consistent support for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. We consider the invasion of Grenada a violation of very important principles of international law, notably the principles in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which states:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

From the very outset this has been, and it continues to be, the position of the Swedish Government. This also implies that we expect withdrawal of the foreign troops without delay.

244. The Swedish Government regards the question before us with deep concern. We deplore the suffering and destruction caused by the invasion, in particular the bombing of a mental hospital. We also deplore the events leading up to the invasion, including the killing of the Prime Minister of Grenada and other prominent Grenadians. Those events, however, cannot serve as an excuse for the invasion.

245. Mr. BLANCO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Uruguay voted for the draft resolution, in keeping with its consistent adherence to international law and in particular to the principles of non-intervention and the non-use of force in international relations. Those principles constitute the corner-stone of the legal system embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and of international and inter-American instruments. Uruguay took an active part in drawing up those instruments and has always called on all countries to respect them fully, on a basis of complete impartiality. The unswerving defence of those principles guarantees the equality before the law of all States regardless of how powerful they are.

246. Although it reaffirms the fundamental principles that my country supports, the resolution just adopted does not fully take into account the very complex situation which has evolved in Grenada over the past few weeks, characterized by the participation of forces of various kinds, and erupting in a violent and bloody change in the existing order. Such events as those in Grenada require us to ponder, however briefly, on the defects that we see in the functioning of the United Nations. My delegation has already pointed out here that the Organization should be strengthened to make it more effective in its primary aim of ensuring peace throughout the world, in order to prevent the occurrence of such critical situations as those we are concerned with today.

247. We must accordingly point out that the United Nations responsibility extends into the future. In that respect, it is appropriate to take into account, and encourage the implementation of, the commitment of the States involved to withdraw as soon as possible and to respect the legitimate right to self-determination of the people of Grenada. It would therefore have been advisable for

the text adopted to take account of those ideas, in order to deal with all aspects of that delicate situation.

248. The delegation of Uruguay repeats that its position is based on the principles that I have outlined, and reflects our firm and established views with regard to international law and policy.

249. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation supported the resolution adopted on the armed aggression of the United States against Grenada, a peaceful Member State of our Organization. At this meeting the General Assembly has condemned with unambiguous clarity the American armed intervention against Grenada, describing it as a flagrant violation of international law and of the independence and sovereignty of that State. The international Organization has addressed a demand to the United States to halt its armed intervention immediately and to withdraw all foreign troops from the island immediately.

250. The United States and its henchmen have been fully exposed as having committed aggression against a small, non-aligned country, in gross violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, posing a serious threat to international peace and security.

251. As is well known, taking part in the seizure of the island were detachments of Marines and airborne forces of the United States, vastly outnumbering the defending forces. Dozens of warships and about a hundred military aircraft were thrown in against a peace-loving State which threatened no one.

252. The fate that the occupiers are preparing for the people of Grenada can already be judged from certain published photographs which have found their way past the censorship: the barbed wire in a concentration camp; a hospital bombed into ruins; men and women forced at gunpoint to face a wall. One of those women is the wife of a member of the Government, standing with her hands twisted behind her back. Such is the “democracy” that the occupiers are implanting in Grenada and threatening to establish in other countries.

253. The scenario is familiar, particularly to European peoples, who became familiar with this kind of “new order” through their tragic experiences in the Second World War.

254. Official Washington does not try to conceal that what is happening is an attempt by force of arms to bring to power a régime subservient to the United States, to suppress the will of Grenadians and to deprive them of the right to determine their own fate. The present United States Administration is trying to cover up its gross act of international terrorism, raised to the level of State policy. The American representative in the Security Council attempted to prove that the United States practically had a legitimate right to launch aggressive wars against sovereign States whose internal or external policy for one reason or another does not suit the White House.

255. Flouting the clear provisions of the Charter, which forbid aggression, the United States has attempted to give itself freedom of action to intervene in other countries. In essence, its representative went so far as to say that the United Nations itself had become outmoded. Obviously, the Charter is an obstacle to adopting a course of terrorism in international affairs. That is why extremely dangerous ideas are being put forward to the effect that the principles enshrined in the Charter on the non-use of force and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States can be observed according to “the context”, as it was put, depending essentially on the arbitrary will of

the State which advocates such a concept, according to which the United States arrogates to itself the right to intervene in any country where in its view "there does not exist a responsible Government", or where events are occurring which, so it is alleged, affect the security of American citizens or affect what have become known as the vital interests of the United States.

256. In order to justify its crimes, Washington is heaping up lies and hastily fabricating fallacious arguments, but they all disintegrate when they come into contact with reality. The argument of the aggressor that Marines were landed on the island allegedly to defend American interests was completely destroyed. The deputy director of the medical school on the island, Mr. Bourne, made it quite clear that there was no need to rescue the students. The necessary conditions existed in the island for the evacuation of foreigners, and an aircraft chartered by Canada for this purpose could not land in Grenada simply because it was not allowed to take off from the airport in Barbados. The thesis was put forward by the American side that the airport being built in Grenada was of strategic significance and represented a threat to other States in the area. However, a representative of the British firm the Plessey Company, which is carrying out the construction of the airport, rejected American assertions that it was designed to serve as a military base for the Cubans or for anyone. He stated that the airport was being built in accordance with purely civilian specifications and was designed for the promotion of tourism.

257. The total failure of the attempts of Washington to justify somehow or other the landing of American troops in Grenada is convincingly confirmed by the fact that what we have here is naked aggression aimed at overthrowing the existing system and social order in Grenada and ensuring the establishment in that country of a régime subservient to the interests of the United States.

258. Behind the current actions of the United States stands a direct threat to the security and sovereignty of the countries of Central America, Latin America as a whole, the Middle East and other States throughout the world.

259. Mr. Andropov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, has described the present policy of the Administration of the United States as militaristic and representing a serious threat to peace. He said, "They go so far in order to attain their imperialist goals, that one cannot help doubting whether any brakes or curbs exist in Washington to prevent the crossing of a line at which any sober-minded man would stop."

260. The adventurist policy of Washington, whose aim it is to transform the world according to its own dictates, has aroused the legitimate concern and alarm of all countries. The present American Administration is playing with fire, and we see the sharply etched outlines of the dangerous course—a course of attempts to achieve military supremacy and dominance in the world—which is being followed by those in leading circles in the United States. It is in this context that we should view also the plans for the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe. These dangerous designs must be halted. Any attempts by Washington to change the military strategic balance in its own favour will be firmly and decisively rebuffed.

261. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia): I must say that it is difficult to speak immediately after a delegation that represents a country which has itself invaded and subjugated the independent State of Afghanistan for the past four years and which, unlike the United States in relation

to Grenada, has never given any believable assurances of intention to withdraw. Nevertheless, I should like to explain Australia's vote on the Grenada resolution.

262. The Australian Government has followed closely the serious situation in Grenada and the issues addressed in the resolution which has now been adopted. My country has been concerned at the erosion in recent years of the effectiveness of the Organization, to which we remain dedicated. Any action that undermines the basic principles of non-intervention and the non-use of force to settle a dispute is a matter of concern and regret to my Government.

263. Australia has expressed its regret at the loss of life and the injuries which occurred on the island following the overthrow of Prime Minister Bishop and his Government, as well as during the recent military operations. The Australian Government has also noted the continuing international controversy about the causes and effects of the military action in Grenada. Australia wishes to see the current military operations ended as soon as possible and the withdrawal of the intervening forces. We have noted the statement by the United States Government that it is looking to withdrawing its forces at the earliest opportunity. The Australian Government welcomes these assurances.

264. Australia is aware of the concern of the United States and the regional countries concerned regarding developments in Grenada and elsewhere in the Caribbean. We would also note that the situation as it developed in Grenada could be seen to pose risks to the safety of foreign citizens in the island. Nevertheless the Australian Government finds it hard to justify the use of force—certainly before all other possible courses of action had been exhausted.

265. My country was not consulted or advised in advance of the intervention. Had we been so consulted, we would have counselled against intervention.

266. In all the circumstances, Australia voted for the resolution as a whole. On the other hand, the formulation of paragraph 1 does not, in our view, cover fully the context in which the intervention took place. For that reason, my delegation abstained on the vote taken on paragraph 1.

267. So much for the past; we must of course look to the future. Clearly there is an urgent need to provide the people of Grenada with the earliest opportunity to determine their own future free of pressures and constraints of any kind. It was for this reason that we welcomed and supported the inclusion of the amendment proposed by Belgium [A/38/L.9]. There are indeed constitutional processes that can be followed. In the present circumstances efforts to restore constitutional government in Grenada appear to be the best available course of action in the search for stability, harmony and peace on the island. We wish these efforts well.

268. Mr. VERMA (India): My delegation affirms its conviction that the people of Grenada should be enabled to determine their own future free of all foreign intervention. As a democratic country committed to free elections, India cannot but support the right of the people of Grenada to choose their Government democratically through free elections.

269. We were in the fullest sympathy with the spirit and the purpose of the amendment proposed by Belgium. However, it is self-evident that no free elections can possibly take place in Grenada until the foreign troops have withdrawn from the territory of Grenada and all foreign intervention has ceased. We regret that this was

not explicitly stated in the amendment, despite a suggestion we made in this regard to the delegation of Belgium.

270. My delegation was constrained to vote in favour of the motion not to consider the amendment and to abstain subsequently on the amendment itself because we were persuaded that the process of free elections leading to the choosing of a Government democratically would more appropriately be the subject of a recommendation by the General Assembly after the present military intervention had been brought to an end.

271. May I add that my delegation supported the motion for closure of the debate under rule 75 of the rules of procedure not out of any desire to stifle free and full debate but only in view of the urgency of the situation. The draft resolution presented by Nicaragua [A/38/L.8] sought an urgent assessment of the situation by the Secretary-General and his report back to the Assembly within 72 hours; it would have been inappropriate, in view of that provision in the draft resolution, for the Assembly to spend more time on a long debate, instead of taking urgent and decisive action.

272. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados): With the liquidation or disappearance of the Prime Minister and other ministerial elements of the Grenadian Government, the only remaining element of constitutional power rested with the Governor-General, Sir Paul Scoon. In this capacity he issued an invitation to friendly countries to enter Grenada and restore order. Barbados was one of those that accepted the invitation. Therefore, the Government of Barbados does not consider its participation in that operation to be an act of armed intervention or aggression, or a violation of international or any other kind of law. It was a response to the sole remnant of legal authority in an otherwise chaotic and rapidly deteriorating situation.

273. It was for that reason that my delegation voted against draft resolution A/38/L.8, and in particular against those paragraphs that made reference to armed intervention.

274. Barbados respects and will continue to respect the sovereignty of Grenada. Nothing but the complete collapse of law and order, the rapid and horrific introduction of a reign of terror and the serious threat it posed to the thousands inside Grenada and in the neighbouring islands could have induced Barbados even to contemplate setting foot on the soil of Grenada, as we were eventually driven to do.

275. The pros and cons of the actions of the Caribbean Governments will long be debated. We believe that history will agree with the verdict of public opinion in the Eastern Caribbean. There has seldom in these islands been such unanimous support in the media and at the political and popular level for an action so potentially divisive. West Indians have shown that we have a view of our future that is democratic, peace-loving and devoted to constitutional and not arbitrary government. We have shown that we can cut through the artificial controversies sometimes generated and go right to the heart of things: what is best for our people.

276. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The Government of Belgium has for some time now been following the development of the situation in Central America and in the Caribbean region.

277. The most recent developments in Grenada led to the recent *coup d'état* which left many victims, including Prime Minister Bishop and a number of his Ministers. These events seriously increased the climate of uncertainty and the tension in the country and throughout the region.

278. OECS, particularly, reacted to this situation which also had as a consequence international action that,

according to assurances offered us, is limited in time and has very strictly defined objectives.

279. Generally speaking, Belgium wishes to reaffirm here its unswerving attachment to the fundamental rules that should govern international relations, rules laid down in the Charter of the United Nations—particularly the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the non-use of force. It is in that spirit that we are ready to support any efforts in the Organization designed to bring calm and normal living conditions back to the island as soon as possible, in conformity with the principles of the Charter. From that standpoint, we believe that the withdrawal of foreign troops should also take place very soon. In this regard, the Belgian Government noted with satisfaction the clearly expressed will of the parties directly involved in this conflict to withdraw their troops as quickly as possible.

280. We have had frequent occasion to stress the importance we attach to the role of regional organizations. In this case too, the Belgian Government very much hopes that the regional organizations, in particular OAS and OECS, which have a specific peace mission in that region, will succeed in establishing a democratic process in Grenada as soon as possible.

281. My Government wishes to stress that the people of the island must soon be in a position to decide on their own fate and to choose the Government they wish. That is why we introduced an amendment calling for the holding of free elections as rapidly as possible. We wish to thank the countries that supported that amendment.

282. The fact that the debate on the draft resolution was arbitrarily eliminated, thus preventing us from setting forth our views before the voting, was obviously one of the factors that helped to influence our vote.

283. Mr. PELLETIER (Canada): The General Assembly has been confronted today with a series of events that strikes at the very heart of the Charter of the United Nations. We in Canada are particularly concerned over what has happened in Grenada because, like Grenada, we are a part of the western hemisphere and, like it, we belong to the Commonwealth. We are also bound by common interests, similar institutions and shared values to those countries that sent troops to Grenada on 25 October. The United States is a neighbour with which we have a close friendship and with which we share global commitments to peace and security.

284. We deeply regret the loss of life that has occurred on all sides. A significant number of Canadians were put at risk, but we are relieved that at least there were no casualties among them.

285. We understand the concerns of our Caribbean friends over what was seen as developments in Grenada threatening the stability of the region. We understand too the concerns of the United States over the welfare and safety of its citizens, in the light of events leading to 25 October. This is a proper, indeed obligatory, concern of every Government.

286. We have examined the principles and practices of international law as they bear on this regrettable course of events. We have in particular reviewed Articles 2, 33, 51 and 52 of the Charter. We are not yet convinced, on the basis of the evidence available to us, that the invasion of Grenada was a legitimate exercise of the right of self-defence. Nor are we satisfied that it was consistent with the principle of the prohibition of the use of force in international relations.

287. It follows from what I have said that there is much in the draft resolution that was adopted that we support. We deeply deplore the grave events in Grenada that led

to the murder of its late Prime Minister and the death of many innocent civilians. It should be obvious that, in keeping with the Charter, to which we all subscribe, we must show strictest respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Grenada. If all Governments, and not just those that participated in the invasion, had done so from the beginning, we would not be here today debating this tragic event.

288. But the resolution is incomplete. It looks only at what has happened and does not trace the path ahead. A country has been invaded; its political, economic and social life has been seriously shaken. The international community has a responsibility to help repair the damage. For the people of Grenada, the first priority is the full re-establishment of constitutional Government and the resumption of the economic development of their country. That must be our priority as well and should have been reflected in the resolution.

289. The resolution correctly requires that all foreign troops should withdraw. But the international community has a larger responsibility to the people of Grenada not to leave them to pick up the pieces alone or without adequate assistance. The Belgian amendment was a useful addition in this regard.

290. Normally it might be expected that the Secretary-General would be asked to fill that gap by providing United Nations assistance to Grenada in helping in the efforts to restore sovereignty to its people and in reconstructing the country. Whether or not that proves possible, Canada, along with other members, is considering what measures the Commonwealth can take to assist Grenada through the difficult months ahead and particularly to see what it could do to help Grenada to hold free and fair elections. Such assistance would be compatible with the Charter. Indeed, in this connection, we would ask the Secretary-General to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth in providing advice and guidance based on the experience of the United Nations with such activities.

291. I have outlined Canada's position on the military intervention in Grenada. I have made it clear that from this point on our primary concern must be the future of a country badly bruised by the events of recent weeks. Draft resolution A/38/L.8 addressed itself in generally satisfactory form to what had happened but was deficient in regard to many of the responsibilities and challenges that await us. We also consider that an opportunity should have been provided for us all to debate that important matter.

292. It was for these reasons that Canada abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

293. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The people and Government of Czechoslovakia are profoundly concerned at the recent developments in the Caribbean. As a result of growing activity on the part of forces which are preventing the free development of peoples in the region, there is an increasingly dangerous risk of the outbreak of a military conflict, which would bring immeasurable suffering to the people living in the region and as a consequence would create a serious threat to world peace.

294. The most recent aggressive act by the interventionist troops of the United States in peace-loving Grenada has evoked a wave of protest throughout the world. That dastardly invasion by imperialist forces represents an encroachment upon the independence and territorial integrity of Grenada and is in flagrant contradiction of both the Charter of the United Nations and the fundamental rules of international law. That act of naked

aggression is intended not only to deprive the people of Grenada of their inalienable rights but also to create a situation whereby the United States could with impunity decide the destinies of the peoples of Latin America and other parts of the world. The Government of the United States must realize that it bears full responsibility for committing that international crime.

295. Czechoslovakia maintains relations of friendship and co-operation with Grenada, relations based on mutual advantage, respect and the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs. In that spirit a governmental delegation headed by Maurice Bishop made an official visit to Czechoslovakia in October this year. That visit occurred at a time when the Revolutionary Government and the people of Grenada were successfully countering the increasing political, military and economic pressure of world imperialism, particularly that of the United States, and its attempts to isolate Grenada in the international arena. That visit occurred at a critical time in the international situation caused by the aggressive actions of imperialist forces undertaken on a global scale and leading to a perceptible deterioration of the world situation, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean. In that region particularly, the United States for some time has been inciting open hatred of Cuba, Nicaragua and the national liberation movements. The results achieved by the people of Grenada since the revolution of 13 March 1979 have shown that the Government of Grenada had chosen the correct course for the building of a new economy and the forming of a new political awareness.

296. Czechoslovakia greatly appreciated the active efforts made by Grenada in the international arena, particularly in the United Nations and within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in the interests of preserving peace, strengthening security and achieving social and economic justice. Grenada, like Czechoslovakia, realized that the struggle for peace is one of the dictates of our time, and disarmament accordingly is the most urgent question of the day. The course embarked upon by the people of Grenada was interrupted by violence in that act of aggression. There can be no justification for it. After all, the recent events in Grenada, which served as a pretext for the aggressor, were exclusively within the internal jurisdiction of that country. Furthermore, as emerges from the statement of the Military Council of Grenada, these internal matters did not threaten the course undertaken by Grenada or security in the Caribbean region, not to mention the security of the United States itself. The true reason for the aggression that was committed is entirely different. It was the ambition of the interventionists to suppress the revolutionary process in Grenada and to establish in Central America and the Caribbean area their own imperialist and colonialist domination. This was realized by Maurice Bishop himself, who, in the course of his official visit to Czechoslovakia on 4 October this year—that is, just before the events which were exploited by the aggressor as a pretext—pointed out, *inter alia*, “the increasing threat of imperialist armed aggression against Grenada”.

297. For that reason, Czechoslovakia voted in favour of the draft resolution, and the results of the vote, as was to be expected, make abundantly clear what Members of the United Nations think about the United States aggression against Grenada.

298. Mr. ESSY (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like to explain briefly the vote it cast on the Belgian amendment [A/38/L.9] to draft resolution A/38/L.8, concerning the situation in Grenada.

299. As ours is a democratic country, all of our institutions are based on the principle of free elections, and thus the Ivory Coast could only cast an affirmative vote on the Belgian amendment.

300. However, we abstained in the vote because we felt that the inclusion of this amendment in the draft resolution would not in any way change the substance and the spirit of the draft resolution, on which we also abstained.

301. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): Our delegation voted in favour of not taking a decision on the amendment in document A/38/L.9 simply because we wished to suggest what we felt were improvements to its language. Subsequently our delegation abstained in the vote on the adoption of that amendment simply because we wanted to submit a sub-amendment to the effect that the elections that were called for should be held after the withdrawal of foreign troops and within a period of from six months to one year, and should be held under international supervision. Our delegation agrees with the analysis of the two resolutions put forward by the representative of Guyana and we agree with the spirit of the Belgian amendment.

302. Coincidentally, Vanuatu has just concluded its own national elections and therefore we would never be opposed to any resolution calling for elections. Our abstention, therefore, was not a rejection of the notion of elections. Rather, we wished to add a specific mechanism to ensure that the elections in Grenada would be free, impartial and without any outside interference in any form or manner.

303. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Nicaragua and Zimbabwe [A/38/L.8]. We attach particular importance to the provisions in its operative part, as the naked armed aggression against the people of Grenada constitutes a flagrant breach of international law and a violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations. We condemn most resolutely the predatory attack of the United States and the mercenaries recruited by it against the people of Grenada, against a non-aligned State in the Caribbean.

304. Together with all States that have subscribed to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, the German Democratic Republic renews, here before the General Assembly, its demand for a cessation of that military act of violence and for the immediate withdrawal of the invasion forces from Grenada.

305. The situation in the Caribbean, which is marked by the operation of leathernecks in Grenada, the undeclared war which the United States is waging against Nicaragua, and the threat of military intervention being directed also against other countries of the region give evidence of an additional fact, namely, that the present United States Administration has raised institutionalized international terror to its official State policy. May all democratic countries in Latin America and elsewhere in the world understand that alarm signal.

306. We know only too well from our own historical experience that, under pretexts similar to those used today in Grenada—for instance the slogan of the “protection of nationals abroad” or the necessity of “preventive steps and measures”—the European continent burst into flames.

307. The United Nations is faced with the most urgent task of unifying all efforts made by States in their struggle against the danger of war and of mobilizing all potentials and reserves likely to promote peace with a view to

bringing back international developments to the road of common sense and political realism.

308. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Our delegation would have preferred to explain its vote before the voting, but in view of the events that occurred in the General Assembly we were not able to do so. Therefore at this stage my delegation will content itself with explaining its vote against the Belgian amendment, to which we did not actually object except on the ground that it suggested a framework other than a proper one. The amendment called for free elections to enable the people of Grenada to choose its Government. The failure to link this paragraph closely with the paragraph calling for the immediate withdrawal of United States troops leads us to believe that the elections would be organized by the United States occupation authorities and held under their supervision. That would prevent the people of Grenada from holding free elections.

309. Even more important is the fact that the United Nations, as a matter of principle and in accordance with the understanding of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, may not intervene in the internal affairs of any State.

310. The resolution, after the introduction of the Belgian amendment, means, *inter alia*, that the Secretary-General is called upon to submit a report within 72 hours also concerning the question of the elections. There is a clear contradiction between the aims of the resolution and the subject of the elections, which is a purely internal matter. We therefore wonder whether the United Nations has the right to impose any form of international trusteeship on Grenada.

311. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic voted in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.8, and we proceeded from the following premise. For a long time the world has witnessed with great alarm the stepping up of tension in Central America and the Caribbean caused by the aggressive actions of the United States against Nicaragua, Cuba and Grenada and by its direct support of the butchers of the people of El Salvador and other States. The independence and freedom of those countries have constantly been threatened. On 25 October this year, we saw the beginning of the bandit-like aggression against an independent State, Grenada, which became a symbol of annexationist and police action on the part of United States imperialism. The United States Marines undertook one more act of piracy in addition to a long list of similar crimes in the past. There are many links between those crimes which forge them into a whole. This time the false pretexts have been dragged out into the open, as, for instance, the pretext of the defence of American citizens in Grenada, who, as the facts have shown, were not threatened by anyone. The punitive expedition against Grenada was planned long ago in the Pentagon, as long ago as the Grenada revolution in 1979. Two years ago United States naval forces launched airborne manoeuvres against an island similar to Grenada and with an airport, which the President of the United States saw as a military target. And now it has been confirmed that in Grenada a civilian airport was also being built. The scenario of the manoeuvres carried out in fact involved lethal fire directed at Grenada where civilians perished and where there were attacks on a civilian hospital and embassies.

312. Having committed the attack on Grenada, the United States appeared before the whole world as a country which was violating the norms of international law and morality, as a Government whose violent actions became its principal political instrument. It has failed

to comply with its responsibility as a permanent member of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security and also with the obligation to maintain the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to acknowledge the inalienable right of every State, great or small, independently to choose its own course of development. The unfounded nature of attempts to justify the aggression by references to the so-called request from certain States of that region is confirmed by a well-known fact: the naval vessels of the United States moved towards the shores of Grenada long before the idea of such a request had been imposed upon those countries.

313. The intrusion into Grenada shows the contempt of the United States for the views of the non-aligned countries with regard to the threat to Grenada set forth at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March this year.

314. We cannot fail to point out the striking coincidences of strategy and tactics used by the United States in its aggression against Grenada with similar so-called preventive strikes on the part of the Israeli military against the Arab peoples in the Middle East and the aggressive actions of the racist régime of Pretoria against the front-line States in southern Africa. In these actions we see the same handwriting, the same contempt for norms of legitimacy and the lives of totally innocent people.

315. Apparently there is no limit to the unbounded cynicism, arrogance and hypocrisy of the United States Administration. The whole world had repeated confirmation of the unsavoury plans of imperialism against the freedom and independence of those countries, whether they be in the Middle East, southern Africa, the Caribbean, Central America, the South Atlantic, the Persian Gulf, or South-East or South-West Asia. A growing number of people are now realizing the purpose of the United States in building up the arms race and in undermining the negotiations to limit and reduce nuclear weapons. The military might of the United States is designed to suppress the freedom of nations to the advantage of the imperial ambitions of Washington. Surely this emerges from the words of President Reagan in his statement of 27 October this year: "We are a nation with global responsibilities. We are not somewhere else in the world protecting someone else's interests. We are there protecting our own." This imperial ideology cannot be concealed by any vaunts of democracy, freedom or human rights, including those we have heard at today's meeting.

316. The peoples of the world will learn a lesson from the invasion of Grenada but not the lesson which the United States military wants to teach them. They will not be subservient to the will of United States imperialism, and quite rightly, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries condemned this act of aggression and demanded its immediate cessation.

317. Together with the peoples of the whole world, the powerful voice of which is now being heard around the planet in protest against the United States intervention in Grenada, the Byelorussian nation resolutely condemns that aggression and calls for its immediate and unconditional cessation.

318. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): In voting on the resolution on Grenada, my delegation had a difficult choice to make, namely, voting against countries with which we enjoy friendly relations, as against the necessity of upholding the principles of the non-use of force, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. This was not an easy choice for us, since in

normal circumstances we would have found it difficult to go against our friends. However, the invasion of the small nation of Grenada is a serious matter which has put to the test the integrity of Member States and their loyalty to the principles of the Charter as well as the norms of international law through which Member States—particularly small, militarily weak States—hope to secure their national independence and sovereignty.

319. It is for this reason that we cannot emulate the behaviour of those Member States who are quick to denounce aggression and are loudest in their support for the principles of the Charter when one of the two super-Powers is involved but who unconditionally acquiesce in blatant aggression by the other super-Power, and the tragic invasion of Afghanistan is a case in point.

320. It is noteworthy that the 23 delegations which voted this afternoon against the Belgian amendment are the selfsame delegations which, year after year, vote against resolutions on the foreign occupation of Afghanistan. Unlike those Member States, we cannot base our actions and our votes on double standards. We would opt for consistency rather than for expediency. Hence our affirmative vote this afternoon in support of the resolution on Grenada.

321. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation, in the course of the votes taken this evening, abstained on the Belgian amendment and voted in favour of the draft resolution as amended. Our abstention on the amendment is justified not because of its purpose but because we have some difficulty in imagining to whom this request is addressed in the present context. Who is to organize the free elections to enable the people of Grenada democratically to choose a government, all the more so if one believes the press, according to which one of the purposes of the presence of the troops now in Grenada is indeed to form a provisional government, but nobody knows on what basis.

322. We voted in favour of the amended resolution, despite the fact that in our view the General Assembly should not have been satisfied with simply deploring the armed intervention in Grenada. It should have, in fact, condemned this intervention unequivocally.

323. It is with considerable concern that my Government followed the evolution of events in Grenada which ended in its being the victim of armed aggression. We have listened to the official explanations given to justify this armed intervention but our doubts remain all the more serious, in that the most staunch allies of the United States, as well as United States public opinion, do not seem to be convinced by the arguments adduced to justify this intervention. It has been said, in turn, that it was the members of OECS that, invoking a collective security pact, decided to fly to the rescue of one of their members, that it was the Governor-General of Grenada who asked for help, that United States citizens were in danger, and finally that the collective security operation was in order to dislodge Cuban and Soviet troops.

324. But, as regards collective security, what proof has been given to substantiate this thesis, which, to be credible, must presuppose that between the death of Maurice Bishop and the landing of the attacking troops the presence of foreign troops in Grenada increased to such a degree that it constituted a threat to the collective security of the community of Caribbean States?

325. If the collective security treaty binding the members of OECS is the legal basis for the intervention, how is it that a State that is not a party to that treaty not only took part in the armed operation but played such an important role that we wonder where the troops of the

States parties to the treaty are? Have they been relegated to the status of mere onlookers?

326. As the collective security argument is so lacking in credibility, the Governor-General of Grenada has been very conveniently pulled out of some magician's hat and made to say that it was he, the representative of Grenadian legality, who called for help. How convenient indeed, we are tempted to say.

327. Thus other arguments had to be found and recourse was had, in turn, to the need to protect citizens and to defend the island against the presence of Cuban and Soviet troops. Of course, in an environment marked by an innate aversion to communism, one could not fail to score with such arguments.

328. However, speaking of the protection of nationals, if a real and serious threat was hanging over the safety of American or other citizens, it is even more difficult to understand the legal masquerade used to justify their being rescued, because every State represented here today would certainly have understood a State exercising its sovereign right to protect the security of its citizens.

329. As far as the presence of Cuban or other troops on the island is concerned, even the American press, hardly to be suspected of anti-Americanism, reported no later than yesterday that the troops that invaded the island of Carriacou wondered whether there had been a mistake in their dropping zone, because there were no Cuban troops there at all.

330. The situation in Grenada and the way it has been dealt with by the Assembly this evening are full of paradoxes: the paradox of sovereign States voting against a provision calling upon all States to "show the strictest respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Grenada"; the paradox of States claiming to have invaded Grenada in order to rid it of oppressive foreign troops but none the less voting against a provision calling for the immediate withdrawal of the foreign

troops from Grenada; the paradox of States deploring the deaths resulting from internal violence in Grenada but not demonstrating the same sensitivity concerning the deaths of innocent civilians resulting from the armed intervention, as called for in paragraph 3 of the resolution just adopted.

331. But undoubtedly the supreme paradox is the fact that among those who have this evening pronounced the funeral eulogy of Maurice Bishop there are some who would probably have wished for nothing better than to see Maurice Bishop die a political death, democratic or otherwise.

332. We shall not be moved by their crocodile tears.

333. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): Austria voted in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by Nicaragua and amended by Belgium. We did so because we are of the opinion that the situation in Grenada involves fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. It is our firm view that those principles, above all the principle of the non-use of force, must be respected in all circumstances.

The meeting rose at 8.35 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983, document S/16077/Rev.1.*

² The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the paragraph.

³ The delegation of Senegal subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to participate in the voting.

⁴ The delegation of Australia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.