



Wednesday, 27 November 1974,  
at 3 p.m.

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Appeal addressed to the Government of Ethiopia .....	1129
Agenda item 25:	
Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations (continued) .....	1131

**President: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA**  
**(Algeria).**

***Appeal addressed to the Government of Ethiopia***

1. The **PRESIDENT** (*interpretation from French*): This afternoon I was approached by the heads of the regional groups, acting in concert, who informed me that they had asked Mr. Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania to make an urgent and important statement to the General Assembly. As I note that no objection is raised, I shall call upon him.

2. Mr. **SALIM** (United Republic of Tanzania): As Chairman of the African group for the month, I have asked for the floor to raise an issue which is of great concern to the Africans and, I am certain, to members of this Assembly. Unfortunately, due to pressure of time and the need to take prompt action, it has not been possible to consult all of my colleagues. It is, however, with the consent and support of an overwhelming majority of those I have been able to consult that I am taking the floor.

3. We have heard with tremendous concern and pain of the reported execution of numerous ex-officials in Ethiopia. We have further heard, with great anxiety, reports that further executions are imminent. According to those reports, among those who are likely to be executed is the former Emperor, Haile Selassie. I should add here, of course, that just before I came to this podium I heard a statement on the radio to the effect that the Ethiopian Government has made a statement denying any intention of executing the former Emperor.

4. Mr. President, these reports and, particularly, the news of the executions are sad news indeed. It is therefore with a sense of sadness and concern for human life, which all of us in this Organization deeply cherish, that on behalf of my African colleagues and in my own name I request you as our President, as well as the Secretary-General of our Organization, to intervene with the Ethiopian Government in this matter. We request you and the Secretary-General to send messages in the name of the Assembly and in the name of humanity appealing to the Ethiopian Government to spare the lives of all Ethiopians concerned. We do so

in conformity with our collective concern for human life and fundamental freedom. Many of our leaders in Africa have already made public appeals for compassion and consideration of human life. Many also have taken private initiatives. We, however, in the United Nations consider this initiative necessary only in our main interest of saving life and avoiding further bloodshed in that fraternal State.

5. We believe that any effort that you as the President of the Assembly, and that the Secretary-General of the United Nations, can undertake to avoid further loss of life would, in our opinion, be in the best interests of our collective humanity. In making this request I want to make it emphatically clear that we have no desire to intervene in the domestic affairs of that brother State. I believe that our Ethiopian brothers will understand the spirit in which this appeal is made.

6. Lastly, Mr. President, I have consulted with the Chairman of all the regional groups on this matter. They have indicated to me that because of the shortage of time it would have been very difficult for them to consult all the members of their respective regional groups, but I am sure they will find no difficulty in going along with an appeal from you, Sir, and from the Secretary-General of our Organization. In fact, I should add that the Chairman of the Asian group, the Chairman of the Arab group, the Chairman of the Group of Western European and other States, and the Chairman of the Latin American group have specifically asked that they should be associated with this appeal.

7. Mr. **BAROODY** (Saudi Arabia): What has happened recently in Ethiopia does not only concern Africa. It is of concern to all of us, regardless of ideology or political persuasion. However, what has been done already cannot be undone.

8. But there looms the figure of Haile Selassie, whose life may yet be in danger. He stood as an unshakable citadel when tyranny engulfed the world, when nazism and fascism were rampant. He was, and still is, a symbol of the fight for freedom.

9. It was my privilege to have met him in England in the 1930s, but I went beyond knowing him as a person. As a young man then, I tried my best to see that Ethiopia would be furnished with arms to defend itself against fascist colonialism. Mr. Martin, the Ambassador of Ethiopia at the Court of St. James in London, was a personal friend of mine, and I very well remember the message Haile Selassie sent to Mr. Martin saying that if we defended Ethiopia we were defending all those countries that suffered from colonialism. Who can forget when he stood before those nations which pursued a policy of accommodation during the days of the League of Nations? It is not becoming for me to mention names. Suffice it to say that I do not think anyone would object to what our brother, Mr. Salim, has just requested the President and the Secretary-General to do.

10. This is a question on which there can be no dissent. It is a humanitarian question. From this rostrum, a couple of years ago, I, as a monarchist, stood to plead to save a Communist when it was feared that his life was in danger. Fortunately, those who intervened did not go empty-handed, for the gentleman in question is still alive.

11. It is our sacred duty to do anything we can to see that the symbols of freedom and liberty will remain until nature takes its toll; and no man may take the life of another man because of differences of opinion on how to run a country.

12. Therefore, as one who has known Haile Selassie for the last 40 years, I do not think anybody should object to the request that we should rally our forces to ensure that this gentleman will stay alive and lead a comfortable life until nature takes its toll.

13. Mr. RAE (Canada): Mr. President, on behalf of the Canadian delegation I wish to take this opportunity to associate Canada specifically with the request in support of an appeal by you and by the Secretary-General in the sense so eloquently put forward by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who has urged restraint and moderation in regard to the present situation in Ethiopia.

14. In view of the long-standing good relations between Canada and Ethiopia, I wish to express our very deep distress at current reports that further executions without trial may take place. My delegation earnestly hopes that these reports will prove to be unfounded, whether they concern the highest in the land or those who are much less prominent.

15. Canadians whole-heartedly support the rule of law and unanimously reject violent solutions, especially when adopted without due process.

16. On these grounds, therefore, we wish to urge restraint and to make very clear that in so doing our motivation is entirely humanitarian. We therefore fully associate ourselves with the request which has been made.

17. Mr. GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia): As the historic judgement of the League of Nations so eloquently demonstrated in the memory of many here, Ethiopia has never sought to use force against others. The same tradition has always cautioned us that if we would live in peace with our neighbours, we must seek always to live in peace at home. Peace at home and abroad, abhorrence of violence at home and abroad have always guided our policies.

18. I must therefore confess that the reports about executions announced as having taken place have come as a shock. I say this because, in the seven months that have elapsed since the start of the revolution, the military authorities and the civilian Government at the time had made it a point to emphasize on repeated occasions that all persons arrested for offences against the State would be accorded a fair trial under normal judicial processes and in conformity with that long and vital tradition which I have mentioned existed in my country.

19. At this juncture I am still without the necessary direct and official information that would enable me to respond to the observations made by representatives in this Assembly. I should mention, however, that

on 4 October this year, when I last had occasion to address this Assembly [2257th meeting], I declared that in accordance with Ethiopia's traditions, the change of Government in my country had been brought about without a single shot having been fired and in a manner unprecedented in recent political history. In fact, on the eve of my departure to attend this session two months ago, the Provisional Military Government, soon after it had taken power, reiterated its previous pledges by stating in a proclamation made on 12 September that a special military tribunal would be established to try former and present government officials who might be charged with corruption and abuse of power. Furthermore, just a fortnight ago, on 13 November, it had already been announced officially that a commission of inquiry had ordered the opening of criminal proceedings against 35 former officials and others for breach of official duties. Finally, on 19 November, the Government *Gazette* announced the establishment of two special military tribunals to judge some 200 former government officials, as was announced on the radio, on charges of corruption and maladministration.

20. I am therefore awaiting information from my Government with regard to the manner of implementation of those announcements in the light of Ethiopia's traditional concern for the rule of law and for humanitarian ideals.

21. It is, of course, clear that representatives are free to discuss in this Assembly humanitarian concerns, as they have done with respect to many countries and on countless occasions. The essential condition, however, is that the provisions of the Charter, and in particular paragraphs 4 and 7 of Article 2 thereof, be scrupulously respected. It is in this context that I comprehend the humanitarian traditions and concerns which have impelled representatives to appeal through you, Mr. President, to my Government.

22. I shall, of course, promptly transmit to my Government the views expressed here this afternoon, together with the request that I be supplied at the earliest possible moment with all the information and views on this matter. If need be, I shall make them clear in the future.

23. In the meantime and in closing, let me voice the conviction that, as its long history and tradition have shown, Ethiopia will remain faithful to its humanitarian ideals and its unswerving devotion to the cause of peace and the rule of law at home and abroad.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to summarize the situation to make sure that I have correctly understood what action is being called for from the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

25. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, speaking on behalf of the African group, has informed the General Assembly, after consultation with various heads of regional groups, of the concern of the members of the General Assembly over recent events in Ethiopia.

26. The representative of Saudi Arabia, on the one hand, and that of Canada, on the other, have spoken in support of the request made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania on behalf of the

African group as a whole. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia has given the General Assembly the clarifications available to him, given the means of communication that are at his disposal at the moment. He has given an undertaking to the General Assembly that he will inform his Government of the legitimate concern of Members of our Organization.

27. I infer from this short debate—in view of the differences in time zones, and also in view of the increasingly alarming nature of the press releases reaching us to the effect that another group of people might be executed tomorrow, Thursday, and a third group on Saturday—that the General Assembly would wish both the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, acting in accordance with the United Nations Charter and with the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to do all they can to save the human lives now in danger and provide them with a minimum of protection through what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia has referred to as “a fair trial under normal judicial processes”.

28. It is quite clear, therefore, that in the minds of members of the General Assembly, collectively and individually, the action does not in any way represent interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State.

29. Is there any objection to my interpretation? Since there is none, I take it that I have correctly understood the significance of the action.

30. Before passing on to agenda item 25, I request the representative of Romania, in his capacity as Vice-President, to replace me so that I might immediately undertake the necessary action as indicated.

*Mr. Datcu (Romania), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 25

### Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations (*continued*)

31. Mr. HUSSEIN (Somalia): My delegation also is very deeply grieved by the shocking news of the death of U Thant, third Secretary-General of the United Nations. U Thant had shown, during the comparatively long term that he served as Secretary-General of the United Nations, a remarkable sense of statesmanship and a spirit of selfless dedication to the promotion and enhancement of the ideals and objectives of the United Nations Charter. As a result of his untiring sense of duty and his strict faith in the cause of peace, justice and humanity, my delegation believes that the late Secretary-General, U Thant, played an exemplary role in the creation of a favourable atmosphere for the smooth conduct of international relations. His name as a great statesman and as a man of peace and human brotherhood will be placed in the annals of history.

32. My delegation wishes to express its profound sympathy and condolences to the Government, people and family of the deceased, at the same time wishing them the strength and forbearance that they need at this particular time when they have sustained such a

great loss. It is some consolation to all of us that the spirit of his wisdom will remain as an influence for good so long as mankind's liberation is continued in this august Organization.

33. May the Creator rest his soul in eternal peace.

34. It is claimed by those who oppose the restoration of the lawful rights in the United Nations of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia that that would constitute interference in the domestic affairs of the Cambodian people, whose exclusive right it is to choose their own political régime or system of government.

35. The irony of that claim lies in the fact that the tragic Cambodian war, in which hundreds are being killed each day and in which tens of thousands have been rendered homeless and destitute, was set in motion by foreign interference in the domestic affairs of that country, by foreign subversion of the right of the people to choose their own form of government.

36. This interference and its continuing effects make a mockery of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which states that:

“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.”

The United Nations would be guilty of ignoring and devaluing one of its most important principles if it ignored the circumstances under which Prince Sihanouk, a democratically chosen leader, was forced into exile and the puppet Lon Nol régime was installed.

37. It is common knowledge that the Lon Nol régime was set up through the military and financial backing of a well-known foreign Government. The recent public disclosure of the part played by American agents in the overthrow of the democratically elected and democratically conducted Government of the late President Allende of Chile comes as no surprise to those who are familiar with similar activities in South-East Asia. But whether the support of the Lon Nol régime has been given through open or undercover channels, it is generally agreed that the régime, which controls only a few isolated enclaves, including Phnom Penh, would fall immediately if its foreign support were withdrawn.

38. A factual report in *The New York Times* of 8 September 1974 stated that United States aid to the Lon Nol régime is running at more than \$600 million a year in publicly known and reported categories, and that unknown millions are being spent on other “hidden costs”. Another report, in the edition of 27 August 1974, concluded that this aid had always been crucial for the régime's existence, but as the war ground on for four and a half years, the régime's resources, never large, had virtually ceased to exist and American money and weapons had become—and I quote directly from the report—“its only crutch”.

39. In those circumstances, it is not surprising that the Royal Government of National Union, which is in effective control of 90 per cent of the territory, has maintained that peace talks cannot begin until American aid to Phnom Penh is stopped and the Lon Nol clique is removed.

40. If the question we are discussing was simply one of rival régimes vying for international recognition, there would be sufficient evidence, on practical grounds, to conclude that the Government that has the allegiance of a large majority of the population, that is in control of most of the territory and that was constitutionally elected was the one that should be recognized by the international community. But the issue cannot be viewed as simply an internal Cambodian affair. The issue is the much larger one of whether a large and powerful State is to be allowed to use its military and economic power to overthrow the democratically chosen leader of a small country, whose desire for neutrality ran counter to the interests of the big Power. The world community cannot and must not agree that the just powers of government are derived not from the consent of the people directly concerned but from the illegal manipulation of a foreign Power.

41. It is against that background that the General Assembly must initiate measures in support of constitutional government in Cambodia and to bring an end to the bitter and unduly protracted war which is devastating its land and its people.

42. It is for that reason that my delegation subscribes to draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3.

43. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Let me first join other speakers and express the deep sadness of the Australian Government and people over the passing away of our greatly loved former Secretary-General, U Thant. I should like to add my personal tribute to a man whom I came to know and esteem greatly from the very first days of his assumption of office here in the United Nations. I can do no better at this time than to read out the statement that my Minister for Foreign Affairs made in the Australian Parliament on hearing the grievous news. Mr. Willesee said:

"All Australians will be sad to learn of the death in New York of the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant. He served his country with honour and became the first United Nations Secretary-General from the so-called third world, to the lasting credit of both. He went on to discharge the highest office in the United Nations Organization with the greatest distinction, during a decade fraught with crisis in the United Nations and for a period longer than any other Secretary-General.

"The office that U Thant held has been described with justice as the most impossible job in the world. It is a greater tribute than any I could pay to recall that after his first term U Thant was reappointed for a further five years as Secretary-General and would have received the confidence of the United Nations for a third term had he not elected to retire. The cause of peace is the poorer for his passing.

"On behalf of the Australian Government, I offer to his widow and to his daughter the condolences of the Australian people."

44. The General Assembly has come once again to discuss the question of Cambodia, and we find ourselves being threatened with a determination on the nature and composition of its Government and its representation in the United Nations. One more year has passed and we still find Cambodia in a situation

of acute internal strife amounting to civil war, a situation that remains very little altered from where it stood a year ago. Civil wars, unhappily, are still a fact of life in our imperfect world, and if the United Nations decided that it should intervene with a substantive judgement in all of them, it would have its hands full, indeed over-full. Wisely, it normally does not do so, which makes it all the more questionable, in our view, that some States should presume to set the United Nations up as an arbiter in the present struggle in Cambodia.

45. There is no denying that this is a civil war of grievous proportions and our first thought must be for the Khmer people themselves. We can feel only the deepest sympathy for all the innocent people in that land of ancient culture and civilization who have become caught up unwittingly and unwillingly in an internecine dispute stimulated and aggravated by the bitter, long-lasting and still unsettled struggle among the people of its next-door neighbour, Viet Nam. It is tragic for those of us who have had the enjoyment of visiting Cambodia, even a few years ago, to see what disastrous consequences can overtake a contented and self-disciplined people when they find themselves deeply involved, against their will, in a conflict not of their own making. We cannot remain unmoved by the losses that the Khmer people have suffered in these past few years—the loss in human life, in property, in disorganization of their whole traditional pattern of family living.

46. The next thing that has to be said is that this is a situation that only the Khmer people can settle among themselves, and be allowed to settle, free from any *diktat* from outside, whether from the United Nations or from any other source.

47. A lot has been said in the course of this debate by those who say they support draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, about the principle and the right of self-determination. If self-determination means what it is supposed to mean, it must surely rest on agreement among the Khmer people themselves as to how they want to be governed and who will govern them, and not on a decree forced on them by the United Nations. As the representative of Thailand said in his lucid and well-reasoned statement here yesterday, "... the Khmer people themselves should be allowed to solve their own political problems peacefully, free from outside interference" [2298th meeting, para. 93] in whatever form. This is a clear case where Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter applies with all its force.

48. Some relevant questions can be asked, and indeed have been asked, regarding the claims made by supporters of the régime headed by Prince Sihanouk. For example: If indeed that régime in fact controls 90 per cent of the land area of Cambodia and enjoys the support of 80 per cent of its people, as we have been told repeatedly, this year as we were last year, why do we not have some evidence of an established apparatus of government operating within that generous area of territory in the presence and under the guiding hand of its head of State?

49. My delegation has in fact been struck by the tenuous and perfunctory nature of the arguments advanced by the supporters of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. They seem to be under the assumption, without being able to adduce any evidence to support



it, that Prince Sihanouk was deposed by some kind of foreign *putsch*. Now, anybody who recalls what happened in that turbulent period of March 1970, or anybody who studies the record, will know perfectly well that it was indeed foreign intervention, but from an altogether different quarter from the one that has been widely alleged here. It gave rise to the outburst of popular protest and disaffection that set in train the events leading to Prince Sihanouk's deposition.

50. All these events are well known to, and well remembered by, those countries which are the closest neighbours of Cambodia in the South-East Asian region and which have declared their support for draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. They know that the change of Government in March 1970—whether they were happy with it or not—was brought about in accordance with Cambodia's constitutional processes and by a unanimous vote of the Cambodian National Assembly.

51. My delegation believes that the views of these countries closest to Cambodia command more authority on this question than the views of countries far removed from the region. In spite of enormous difficulties, Lon Nol has now been in office as head of Government of the Khmer Republic for almost five years, and he is still operating from the country's recognized seat of Government. The Australian Government holds to the view that so long as the present Khmer Government remains in office in Phnom Penh, Australia will continue to recognize it as the lawful Government.

52. It is a peaceful settlement of the civil war in Cambodia that the United Nations should be trying to encourage, instead of trying to impose a government on the Khmer people. This last course, as the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines reminded us only this morning [2300th meeting] contains serious and grave implications that we would all of us do well to ponder. Whatever decision we make here is not going to bring about peace in Cambodia, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Khmer Republic pointed out yesterday [2299th meeting]. Meanwhile, it is only the Government in Phnom Penh that has so far made any effort to bring the civil war to an end. Thus far, its attempts to establish contacts with Prince Sihanouk's supporters and to lay the groundwork for negotiations have met with no response whatever. The best service that this Assembly can perform at this time is to give its blessing to these overtures and to lend them all possible encouragement in voting the good offices of the Secretary-General as desirable. This is the purpose of the draft resolution that my delegation has co-sponsored, and we commend it on the ground that its adoption will constitute an act of genuine responsibility on the part of the United Nations.

53. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like at the outset to associate my delegation with the President of the Assembly and with other delegations in expressing our grief at the sad news of the death of U Thant who, for 10 years, as head of our Organization demonstrated true devotion to the purposes and ideals of the Charter and an acute awareness of the problems of those peoples who were struggling for their independence and their sovereignty. The people of my country, because of its direct contact with U Thant in moments which

were dramatic for its future, will always remember him as a loyal and sincere friend of small countries and a stubborn defender of the principles of international law and of the ideals enshrined in the Charter.

54. The Assembly is now continuing its consideration of an item which, despite its importance and the interest it has for the large majority of Member States, it was unable to conclude in sufficient time at its twenty-eighth session because of the manoeuvres of those who, lacking any better arguments, were compelled to use procedural devices to prevent this Assembly from expressing itself freely on the question on the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. However, during that postponed debate, my delegation was among those which were in time to speak in the debate before it was so surprisingly brought to an end. That is why we do not consider it necessary now to reiterate our substantive position or our arguments with regard to this item. It will be sufficient for us to affirm here that we continue to maintain the same attitude to this problem that we have assumed since the occurrence in Cambodia, first of the imperialist plot and then of the North American invasion and the establishment of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, to which we immediately gave our full diplomatic recognition and with which we entertain the most brotherly relations.

55. However, we should at this time like to refer to some of the allegations made by those delegations which are once again attempting, by one means or another, to prevent the General Assembly from restoring the rights of the Cambodian Government. Above all, we must reject the claim that what are called—and in a very arbitrary way—the neighbours of Cambodia are alleged to have some special role to play in this debate.

56. In this connexion, we should like to emphasize particularly that no part of the Charter of the United Nations or of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly or of United Nations practice gives any validity to that concept. If the idea that the opinions—if they exist, if they are unanimous—of the neighbours of a given area ought to have greater weight than the views of the international community as a whole were to be accepted, that would be the same as giving a kind of veto or right of veto distributed by region or subregion, a purely temporary expedient, which some delegations would use only in connexion with this question of Cambodia as in the past they used it for 22 years when the General Assembly was considering a similar situation regarding the usurpation of the legitimate rights of a Member of this Organization.

57. Above all, we wish to stress that we are quite sure that some of the closest neighbours of Cambodia would, if they could do so, vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 because of a conviction which may be superior to that of any other State, since they themselves have had a very similar experience to that of the Cambodian people as it resists foreign intervention. Not one of the Indo-Chinese States that, together with Cambodia, have had to confront imperialist aggression would maintain the criterion which is attributed to the so-called neighbours of Cambodia. The attitude and the position taken on this item by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam is well known as is that of the

Revolutionary Provisional Government of South Viet Nam, both of them immediate neighbours of Cambodia, countries bordering on Cambodian territory and victims, like Cambodia, of the same North American intervention.

58. With regard to the other Indo-Chinese neighbour, Laos, its delegation explained yesterday [2299th meeting] the peculiar situation in which that country finds itself—a situation which, none the less, does not make it possible to place it in the same group of so-called neighbours which we have heard mentioned here constantly as an argument.

59. However, we should like to add that, if that argument were to be taken at all seriously, then the situation in our debate might be somewhat different.

60. We wonder, for example, whether the United States delegation has the same preference for consulting the neighbouring countries in a particular area. If it had, then perhaps that delegation, and some of those that have joined it as sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 might be expected to request a new meeting of the Security Council, to change the negative vote that prevented that body from adopting firm decisions with regard to the South African régime, despite the fact that the recommendations concerned had the total support not merely of a group of neighbouring States, but of all the countries composing the African continent.

61. We wonder what might have happened if this approach that the United States delegation and some of its allies are invoking against the Cambodian people had been accepted by them when all the Arab countries of the Middle East that had sponsored certain draft resolutions on the question of Palestine, all of which were voted against by the United States delegation and some of those who are supporting it by adopting the same stand this year.

62. As we all know, we could take this analogy further, by referring to the United States veto in the Security Council in Panama, and to its vote and the votes of other delegations on the admission of Guinea-Bissau some time ago, but I do not need to weary the Assembly by demonstrating that the argument concerning the views held by Cambodia's neighbours is simply a pretext that is only being made use of in this debate in order to confuse the Members.

63. Another argument which has been used maintains that those of us who propose the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union appear as promoting United Nations interference in the domestic affairs of this State, while those who are attempting to postpone for yet another year the just solution of this problem are in this instance the defenders of the principle of non-intervention. For this purpose they insistently reiterate that in Cambodia there has been a simple change of government, followed by a civil war in which the United Nations has no role to play, since both events fall strictly within the domestic jurisdiction of the State, and have no international implications.

64. It is strange to see that some delegations want us to ignore facts that are incontestable and are trying to make us forget that, while we here in this Hall are debating the question of the representation of Cambodia, not far from here, in United States territory,

the courts are still studying events that cost the lives of some young United States citizens during strong protests that occurred, here in the United States, as a result of that coup d'état and the so-called civil war in Cambodia. How very strange! What an extraordinary domestic event it must have been that it could provoke international repulsion and protests even in United States territory when, in Cambodia—if the facts are as presented by the United States delegation—there had been nothing to indicate foreign interference in what took place between March and April 1970.

65. However, the facts and the history of the Cambodian case in the United Nations are well known. The records exist, documents exist, in which the Royal Government of Cambodia denounced the United States bombings of 1969, a year before the coup d'état against Prince Sihanouk. There are records of their repeated denunciations to the Security Council because of the ceaseless intrusion of Saigon and United States troops all along its borders, and, lastly, there is a record of what occurred as the culmination of this intervention in 1970.

66. Some speakers have spoken of the so-called Cambodian parliamentarians and their unanimous agreement in March 1970 to oppose the Royal Government of Cambodia. They did not mention, of course, the hidden "parliamentarians" of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States who, through some special legal procedure, had apparently received constitutional powers in that country. And above all they failed to mention the participation of 110,000 United States and Saigon "electors" in full uniform, armed to the teeth, who crossed the Cambodian borders in April 1970. If in Cambodia there truly had been such a simple and straightforward process as the downfall of an unpopular and undemocratic Government, it would be difficult to justify the need for such a dramatic surprise invasion, unauthorized by the competent bodies of the invading countries, by these 110,000 uniformed "electors".

67. It should also be explained why from that date until now the same policy of military interference and support for the Phnom Penh clique has continued. This is the only answer to the question of some speakers today as to why the popular forces have not been able to conclude their work of liberation in the territory of Cambodia. They ask this as if it were a question of simply marching or walking through the fields of Cambodia to Phnom Penh, and as if the Royal Government has not yet entered that part of its territory because it is non-existent or unconcerned, saying nothing of the fact that this is a territory in which there are still between 4,000 and 5,000 United States military advisers; in which, according to Mr. Schlesinger, the United States Secretary of Defense, an average of 700 air reconnaissance missions are carried out each month by the United States Air Force to support the Phnom Penh clique; a territory into which the United States injected a total of \$350 million of military aid in 1973 and is planning to provide double that amount this year; a territory that was bombed for six months, between January and August of 1973, by B-52 strategic bombers, and F-111, F-4 and F-105 tactical bombers, which unleashed over Cambodian territory between 4,000 and 5,000 tons of bombs per day for six months—which is equivalent to six Hiro-

shima-type atomic bombs per month. And this lasted for more than six months—for 195 days and 195 nights.

68. Those who carried out such acts against a small and weak people, casting themselves in the role of innocent archangels, as if they had nothing to do with the tragedy of the people of Cambodia, express ironical wonder from this rostrum that this people has not yet been victorious in its struggle. This people—we reiterate today as we stated last year—has already liberated most of its territory, that is to say, 90 per cent of its national territory, in which more than 80 per cent of the population lives. The support the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia is receiving, despite all the United States aid and resources made available to support the Lon Nol clique, has put 90 per cent of the territory of the country out of bounds to the recipients of \$700 million in United States aid, to those who are backed up by ultra-modern American aeroplanes and bombers.

69. A recent report of the United States Senate Foreign Affairs Committee quite clearly defined the true essence of the sovereignty of the Phnom Penh régime and also defined the sovereign. In that report it was said that the United States Ambassador in Phnom Penh, Mr. Gunther Dean, "... is giving strategic military advice to Lon Nol and tactical counsel to the higher officers under him". In another part of the same document it was indicated that employees of the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh go out regularly to the battlefield in order to give Lon Nol's officers advice on how to command, how to prepare troops, ensure the safety of the rearguard and so on.

70. As can be seen, the Phnom Penh régime—which someone defined last year as being a municipal régime since its authority did not seem to extend beyond the border of the capital—apparently is operating as a kind of annex to the United States Embassy. Therefore its exclusion from this Organization would not mean its absence from this Hall, because it could be represented more appropriately and with greater authority by the equivalent of Mr. Gunther Dean in this precinct.

71. My delegation believes that the time has come for the Assembly to take the decision it should and ought to have taken at the twenty-eighth session, restoring the full rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, a loyal Member of this Organization, an active and faithful defender of the principles of non-alignment, independence and peace, a Government recognized by a large number of States Members of this Organization, which participates fully in various international activities and particularly in those connected with the non-aligned countries which, in August 1972, at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown, recognized it as the only lawful representative of Cambodia, an agreement which was to be confirmed and expanded subsequently at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973. At that same Algiers Conference more than 70 heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries appealed to this General Assembly urgently to adopt relevant measures to restore the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia.

72. If the heads of State of the non-aligned countries made such an appeal, it was because they were aware that what is involved is not a matter interesting merely the people of Cambodia—much as it does concern them—nor their immediate neighbours, but rather the fact that the just solution of this problem is of crucial interest to all the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. What is really before us is the question whether we shall let the will of an imperialist Power interfere in the domestic life of a sovereign State, depose its legitimate Government, unleash thousands of tons of bombs upon its people and invade its borders to attempt to thwart the will of those people—shall that prevail or the criterion espoused by the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization who wish to defend the principles of the Charter and guarantee the rights of each country, however small it may be?

73. The alternative before us today—as it was for 22 years when we discussed the representation of China, or as it was last year with regard to Cambodia—is whether we shall take the only decision in consonance with the Charter and in consonance with the will of the majority of the Members, which is to approve draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, restoring to the Government of Cambodia what belongs to it and expelling those who have been usurping its rights, or adopt any other decision whose only effect would be to postpone the solution of this problem for one more year and permit the bombs, machine guns, interventionists and dollars from abroad to continue to prevent the Cambodian people from exercising their rights. We feel that there can be no question about the choices that must be made, and if this Assembly is freely to express its views, if its Members can indicate their will despite all the pressure, manoeuvres and procedural and other kinds of devices used here by those who disregard the rights of the people of Cambodia, then we are convinced that the General Assembly will render justice to Cambodia, to itself and to the principles it must defend.

74. Mr. ROMÁN (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Nicaragua would like to begin its statement in this debate by joining with the delegations that have spoken previously in expressing, on behalf of its Government and people, its most profound grief upon the death of U Thant, a leader of peace in the world, whom my delegation had always considered to be a saint. We would request the representative of Burma to transmit this expression of grief to his wife and family. Nicaragua had the great honour to receive him with the full honours paid to a head of State when he visited our country, and both the admiration and respect Nicaragua feels for U Thant led two years ago, in a private ceremony at his residence in Harrison, New York, to the presentation to him by the head of our mission, Mr. Guillermo Lang, of the highest honour that Nicaragua can offer: the Grand Cross of the National Order of Ruben Dario, awarded by the decision of the Grand Master of the Order, General Anastasio Somosa.

75. Cambodia was a monarchy until 9 October 1970, the date on which the Republic was proclaimed. His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk was its king for many years, from 1941 to 1955. From 1955 to 1960 he served as Prime Minister, then as

chief of his party, then from 1960 to 1970 as constitutional head of State. In 1960, the two chambers of the Cambodian Parliament appointed him head of State. On 18 March 1970 the same two chambers withdrew their vote of confidence in him and unanimously decided to remove him from his post as head of State.

76. Although these facts are known to all of us and have been frequently repeated in one way or another, I did wish to summarize the history of the constitutional problem of Cambodia, or Khmer, to demonstrate that this is an internal, domestic problem whose solution falls exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Cambodian people, and not within that of this august General Assembly of the United Nations.

77. Now, with regard to the item before us, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations", my delegation would like to explain its position and the reasons why it is a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, which represents one more effort in the struggle being carried out in the United Nations to ensure victory for the juridical and legal forces over the misinterpretations and vested interests which can only jeopardize peace and security in the world in the future.

78. We have no wish to interfere in any way—and we wish this to be put on record—in any domestic affairs or problems that the Government of the Khmer Republic may have within its own territory, but we should like to ensure respect for the cordial and harmonious diplomatic relations our Government entertains with that country. We should like to address an appeal to all delegations present here to exercise, in a spirit of moderation, the good will that we should all show, so that our world body can avoid the criticisms, largely unjust, which are continually published in an attempt to discredit the actions and the honest co-operation we all strive for here. This particularly interests Nicaragua because it was one of the original signatories of the Charter of the United Nations.

79. The delegation of Nicaragua firmly believes that, without a doubt, the course most consonant with the Charter of the United Nations is to maintain firm principles, and to appeal to the parties to the conflict to initiate a domestic dialogue, making use of the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Mr. Kurt Waldheim, who, with his experts and his own experience, could make a valuable contribution to the resolution of this conflict which has raged so long and cost Cambodia such suffering.

80. For the above-mentioned reasons my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, of which it is a sponsor; we are convinced that it is the best way of achieving peace in Cambodia and reaffirming the legal principles that would always prevail in the General Assembly of the United Nations. We strongly urge that it be given priority in the vote, and hope that it will win the votes of the majority of the Members of this august General Assembly.

81. Mr. KANTÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): It was with truly great sorrow that the delegation of Mali learnt on 25 November of the death of U Thant, the third Secretary-General of our Organization. The whole world shares the affliction of the Burmese

people, because U Thant identified himself with the United Nations and remained to the last a man of duty who allied, in a particularly happy combination, the intransigence of the militant with the humility of the Buddhist believer. He will remain for mankind, which he served with so much dedication and heart, a great figure of his time. My delegation associates itself with the eulogy pronounced on the 25th of this month by yourself, Mr. President, by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the representatives of regional groups and the representative of the host country in tribute to his memory. But the greatest tribute, indeed, that we could pay to the memory of U Thant will certainly be that of taking up the torch he lit and continuing the great work he undertook and to which he devoted his whole life. In other words, to work for rapprochement between peoples and for the strengthening of peace throughout the world.

*Mr. Lang (Nicaragua), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

82. My delegation requests the representative of Burma to be good enough to transmit to the people of Burma, to its Government and to the family of the deceased our most sincere and heartfelt condolences.

83. Following these serious and grave words, I should like to present the point of view of my delegation on the question we are considering. This item, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations", is one of the grave crises affecting the third world, which has become since the end of the last world war, as we know, the testing ground for the new weapons of mass destruction developed in the laboratories of the imperialist Powers.

84. This, unfortunately, is one of the sorry realities of our time. The Cambodian crisis, which is of concern to us today, is a tragic overflow of the Indo-Chinese drama. The crime of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk and of his people, who for five years have been facing aggression, was to have refused to become involved in the plot that was hatched against heroic Viet Nam. We all recall, in this connexion, that it was after a long struggle of liberation, marked in its last phase by the "royal crusade", that Cambodia acceded to independence on 9 November 1953.

85. As in the anti-colonial struggle, the people and their King, filled with that faith, fervour and Buddhist determination characteristic of them, struggled to build a strong and democratic State and to make of Cambodia a land of work, an oasis of peace, as Prince Norodom Sihanouk liked to call it.

86. From 1955 to 1970 remarkable stability prevailed in the country. The policy of peaceful coexistence practised successfully and rigorously by the Government reaffirmed its authority on the international level. The economy of the country became prosperous.

87. Let us listen to the words of General de Gaulle, in his memorable statement on 1 September 1966 at Phnom Penh:

"We are witnessing under the very dynamic impetus of Your Royal Highness a domestic development of hundreds of schools, hospitals, dispensaries, and thousands of small and medium-sized enterprises, thousands of kilometres of roads



and trails, tens of thousands of hectares of plantations, all carried out by Cambodian engineers, experts and workers . . .”

That is a tribute that carries authority because of the stature of its author.

88. This oasis of peace was certainly much too beautiful in the heart of a region that was torn by war. The policy of neutrality proclaimed by the law of 6 November 1957, scrupulously observed by the Royal Government of Cambodia in its international relations, was furthermore incompatible with the well-known and bellicose strategy of containment and of blocking communism which prevailed, and still prevails to this day, in South-East Asia. It must not be forgotten that imperialism had also not digested the refusal in 1954 of Prince Norodom Sihanouk to have his country adhere to the military pact of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization [SEATO].

89. Schemes were therefore hatched, beginning in 1958, in order to put pressure on the peaceful kingdom. Some of its immediate neighbours played a primary role in the various plots. These latter first resorted to groundless territorial claims in order to create a climate of tension, which was to cover and justify their criminal adventures. Provocations and armed incursions followed. Attacks were launched, with the complicity of treacherous Cambodians, against the person of the King and against the economy of the country.

90. The most notable of these activities were the plot of 1959, in which the felonious General Dag Chhuan was implicated, when a time-bomb was sent to the royal palace; the attempts to strangle the economy in 1963; and the assassination attempt on the bridge on the way from the Phnom Penh airport. From 1962 to the end of May 1969, the forces of aggression violated the Cambodian borders 1,864 times on land, 165 times by sea and 5,149 times by air.

91. All of these armed ventures of the Asian members of SEATO were to fail pitifully before the vigilance and the fierce determination of the Cambodian people to defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.

92. The United States continued to put pressure upon the Royal Government in order to get it to negotiate. However, the intransigence of the latter ultimately caused them to lose patience and they began to show signs of irritation. The refusal of the Royal Government to take part in the combined American-Vietnamese military operations against the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam was certainly the last straw. Open aggression was then decided upon against “the country of smiles”. However, it was necessary to find a pretext, and one was manufactured in due course. Prince Norodom Sihanouk was accused of complicity with the Vietnamese patriots and the fiction of sanctuaries did the rest.

93. On 18 March 1970, while Prince Norodom Sihanouk was on an official visit outside the country, the corrupt Prime Minister, Lon Nol, and a handful of traitors, on the orders of their masters, carried out an ignoble coup d'état. Let us mention here that the *Colombia Eagle*, a cargo vessel loaded with arms and

ammunition, happened to be cruising in Cambodian territorial waters not far from the port of Sihanoukville.

94. In response to the appeal of Prince Norodom Sihanouk of 23 March 1970, the Khmer people, recovering from their initial surprise, mobilized around their historic chief in the National United Front of Kampuchea in order to chastise the imposters.

95. In the days that followed, huge manifestations were organized in Phnom Penh and in all the provinces of the country against the imperialist interference and the violation of legality by the clique of Lon Nol, Sirik-Matak and In Tam. The traitors, taken aback by popular wrath, reacted with a bloody repression which resulted in the deaths of several thousands. The people nevertheless did not lay down their arms. They continued their action throughout the whole of the territory opposing the puppets and their infernal machinery of repression.

96. In order to come to the rescue of those quislings who were cornered, the United States invaded Cambodia on 30 April 1970 with an armada of 110,000 men powerfully equipped and supported by aeroplanes and the navy. The country was submitted to continual and intensive bombings.

97. This deadly war is continuing to the present day against the peaceful people of Cambodia, in spite of the undertaking of the United States, under the terms of the Paris Agreement,<sup>1</sup> to withdraw its armed forces from the Indo-China peninsula.

98. From the end of January 1973 to 15 August 1973, all the strategic and tactical aircraft of the United States Air Force based in South-East Asia were concentrated upon Cambodia. B-52s, F-111s, F-4s, F-105s and so on, unloaded, during 195 days, between 4,000 and 5,000 tons of bombs per month; in other words, the equivalent of six atomic bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima.

99. In spite of the decision on the disengagement of United States troops adopted in 1973 by the Congress, 4,000 to 5,000 military troops are still operating in Cambodia under the cover of “technical assistance”. The United States Department of Defense recently recognized—on 25 November, in fact—that the United States Air Force is continuing its activities in Cambodia, in spite of the Paris Agreement and in spite of the law putting an end to the military engagement of its country in South-East Asia.

100. The Cambodian crisis is thus not a domestic affair, as some would wish us to believe. The Khmer people is fighting on its own soil, a deadly war against foreign troops which have made assaults on its territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence. The aggression perpetrated by the United States of America and some of its allies in SEATO against Cambodia constitutes a flagrant violation, not only of the neutrality of that country, affirmed by the Geneva Agreement of 1954,<sup>2</sup> which is binding on all members of the international community, but also of the United Nations Charter. It has imperilled peace and contributed to an exacerbation of tension in South-East Asia.

101. By its motivations, its repercussions and its developments, the Cambodian crisis is bound to be of concern to our Organization. It comes much more

logically under Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter than under Article 2, which some are wont to invoke in order to get us off the right track. Indeed, the Cambodian crisis, which results from a typical and deliberate aggression against the Khmer people for the purpose of imposing upon it a policy contrary to its philosophy, its traditions and its deep-rooted aspirations, could at any moment, develop in a way that would make the whole of South-East Asia go up in flames.

102. The second Viet Nam war—which is still in progress—was indeed also brought about by what is referred to now as the “Tonkin Gulf incidents”.

103. Nor can our Organization rely, for a settlement of the Cambodian crisis, on action by the countries of the region, which are in the main already involved in it, as in the case of the Viet Nam war, either because they have taken part in the aggression or because their territory is still being used as a base of operations for the invading forces.

104. In spite of the respect and great consideration that we have for the countries of Asia, we are bound to recognize that the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] is not the Organization of African Unity [OAU]. The latter draws its authority and prestige from the fact that its member States are not part of any military bloc, and harbour on their territory no foreign military bases whatsoever. The confidence that OAU enjoys internationally results quite rightly from this policy of non-alignment, which all its members are strictly observing. That can certainly not be said of ASEAN, whose members are for the most part also members of SEATO, and whose territories are moreover bristling with foreign military bases.

105. What have those Asian States done to stop the Indo-China war, which has now been waged for more than 25 years in their immediate neighbourhood? We recall that at its 2191st meeting, on 5 December 1973, at the instigation and through the manoeuvres of certain delegations, by a very small majority—53 votes to 50, with 21 abstentions—the General Assembly postponed to its twenty-ninth session consideration of the agenda item entitled “Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations”. They felt that manoeuvre was necessary much more because they feared seeing the whole truth exposed concerning the cruel war imposed upon the gentle Khmer people than because they wanted to settle the crisis. The international Organization had once again shirked its responsibilities. The decision of 5 December 1973, being a delaying tactic, could not lead even to the beginning of a settlement of the crisis. It merely delayed the return of peace to Cambodia, where the war actually intensified in 1974.

106. One year after its adoption we are therefore still at the starting-point, except that this time, of course, we have in addition a feeling of guilt, because of the pointless continuation of the carnage and the destruction there. That decision was thus an advantage for the traitors and the fomentors of war, who were given a breathing space, although they were unable to take advantage of it because of the combative spirit of the People's Armed Forces of National Liberation of Cambodia. Those armed forces have

strengthened their operational capacity and their firepower with the equipment abandoned in the field by the enemy they are pursuing on all fronts. They continue to enjoy brilliant victories in all the theatres of operation and are reinforcing the authority of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, virtually over the whole of the Cambodian territory.

107. Today Lon Nol and his ilk are bottled up in the Phnom Penh agglomeration, which has been transformed into a fortress with the residual forces of the Lon Nol horde, now decapitated by the nationalists. Fourteen-year-old youths are being drafted to fill the gaps in the army.

108. As for the Royal Government, it controls more than 90 per cent of the national territory, with some 85 per cent of the entire population of the country. The liberated zones are accordingly returning to an active life in sharp contrast to the state of war that prevails at the doors of the enclave still in the hands of the traitors. They have political, administrative, economic, social and cultural structures that are highly organized. The Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has returned from exile; it has been established for more than a year on the national territory, and is effectively supervising the liberated zones. For the first time since the beginning of hostilities, Cambodia has had a surplus in its cereal production. Indeed, the liberated zones exported 50,000 tons of rice in 1973 as a result of the new planting methods introduced into the country by the Royal Government of National Union. The rice yield per hectare has doubled and even tripled in certain regions, which are reaping three harvests a year in some cases. The inhabitants are fleeing from the enclaves that are still controlled by the puppets of Phnom Penh, to go to the liberated zones where order, security and even a relative abundance prevail.

109. In 1974, five States have recognized the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. That Government's international prestige is growing day by day. It is taking part in all the international activities of the Non-Aligned Movement. It is represented by ambassadors in all the continents. By 30 October 1974 it had been recognized by 62 States of the world.

110. As for the puppet régime of Phnom Penh, it owes its life exclusively to the military and financial assistance of and the food sent to it by the United States. Famine and poverty are rife in the few pockets it is trying to control. These pockets are enclaves in the liberated zones, and they cannot communicate either between themselves or with the outside world. They are even supplied by American aircraft. They receive everything from the United States: arms, ammunition, food, rice and even salt. For the fiscal year 1974/75 alone, the aid allocated to support the clique of traitors amounts to \$700 million. That would be enough to carry out the medium-term and long-term programmes against the drought in the Sudano-Sahelian region, containing some 30 million persons. Thus we see how the surpluses and the available means of the world are wasted.

111. There is total insecurity in the enclaves belonging to the illegal power, and criminality is skyrocketing. The social atmosphere there is explosive. Only recently, AMCEK—that is, the association of

teaching personnel in Phnom Penh—published a manifesto in which it taxed the Lon Nol régime with being nothing but a pressure group with the aim of encouraging nepotism, favouritism and despotism. In that document the association also denounces what it calls the systematic corruption of the régime and its failure in the economic, political and social realms.

112. During 1973, Lon Nol himself accused his anti-constitutional administration of immobility and corruption.

113. In a recent statement, the university students of Phnom Penh said the following:

“The present war is a war between, on the one hand, the armed peasant masses, the victims of all kinds of oppression, exploitation and contempt, and, on the other, a handful of traitors in power and of vultures from the United States of America.

“The question of Kampuchea must be solved in accordance with the real situation of Kampuchea and in a specific way. The Kampuchea people must be allowed to solve its own problems. We must not place ourselves on the side of the wolves and the assassins but, rather, on the side of the people of Kampuchea.

“The handful of traitors that has brought untold suffering and hardship to the people must be chased out. The ‘state’ apparatus must be broken, as well as the political institutions and the fascist administration of the Phnom Penh traitors, who can prolong their agony only with the massive assistance of foreign imperialism.”

114. Those are the opinions of the most representative and informed elements of the Khmer people. No better picture could be painted of the degradation of the situation in the so-called Khmer Republic. That régime has rotted to such a point that several members of the Long Boret Government have threatened to resign.

115. During a bloody confrontation between the police and students in Phnom Penh, the so-called Minister of Education and his Deputy were treacherously assassinated by the régime's hired killers. That apparently was a settlement of accounts between the various rival factions of the puppet clique.

116. That is the situation in Cambodia. The victory of the Khmer people, who are fighting for the national well-being, is irreversible. The enormous financial, military and economic assistance that the United States is daily pumping into illegal Cambodia cannot rescue the Phnom Penh traitors, whose days are now numbered.

117. Our Assembly assumed a heavy responsibility when, at its twenty-eighth session, it decided to postpone the consideration of the Cambodian crisis.

118. My delegation is convinced that the overwhelming majority of delegations here will not be taken in by the game and manoeuvres of those whose interest is served by the prolongation of the war in Cambodia, with all its misery, sorrow and destruction and its untold suffering. The latter have indeed been disavowed by their puppets, who have been cornered by the patriotic forces. On 25 November this year, the so-called Parliament of Phnom Penh adopted a motion in which it called upon the Secretary-Gen-

eral of the United Nations to help the so-called Khmer Republic to ensure the restoration of peace in Cambodia, without foreign interference.

119. What does that mean if not that the illegal Lon Nol régime and its allies in the United Nations are not guided by the same facts? Our Assembly must take that fully into account and reject draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, which is only a diversionary proposal. It cannot agree to assume the responsibility for a further prolongation of the war in Cambodia.

120. Puppetry is a factor of insecurity because it encourages interference in the domestic affairs of States. It underlies the tragedy in Indo-China, which is now more than a quarter of a century old, and it is the cause of the instability reigning in South-East Asia. Thieu, Park Chung Hee and Lon Nol, like those who preceded them in treachery—Ngo Dinh Diem, Syngman Rhee and Kao Ky—are the main obstacles to the restoration of peace in South-East Asia.

121. In the Cambodian question we have, on the one hand, the Khmer people, with all it represents in terms of moral and human values, and, on the other, its executioners, a handful of traitors manipulated from outside who are striving to ensure the decimation of their brothers and sisters by foreign aircraft. The former—that is, the Khmer people—are the very source of power, whereas the latter—that is, the traitors—are nothing but a band of dastardly usurpers who have been sullied by the crimes they have committed against their people.

122. The Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has all the attributes of sovereignty—that is, territory, a representative character, and authority over the liberated areas; but the Lon Nol régime is nothing but a myth.

123. There is no doubt that the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, which has given a new impetus to our Organization by its memorable votes on the credentials of the representatives of the racist Pretoria régime and on the question of Palestine, will face up to all its responsibilities in the Cambodian matter by restoring the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. There will then no longer be a puppet régime in Phnom Penh, a régime that exists only by virtue of the usurpation of the seat in the United Nations that belongs to the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. These phantoms will then end up somewhere in the world, far from Cambodia, where they will spend the immense sums they have amassed at the expense of the Khmer people. Peace will then return to Cambodia, with all its beneficial effects on the serious state of tension that has prevailed in South-East Asia for a quarter of a century.

124. Our decision will also be a stern warning to all potential traitors who are waiting in the shadows for a signal from their masters to enslave their peoples and set their countries on a course of blood and fire. By taking that decision, we shall be making an inestimable contribution to the cause of peace in the world.

125. Mr. SALAZAR (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation joins in the grief felt by the entire international community upon the death of U Thant, who so effectively accomplished his tasks as Secretary-General of the United Nations

during 10 critical years in the life of the Organization. U Thant placed his great intelligence and selfless devotion at the service of peace and the best interests of the peoples of the entire world. In his great undertaking, he won for himself the respect and admiration of all men of goodwill. Through the delegation of Burma, my delegation wishes to offer its condolences to the people and Government of Burma and to the bereaved family.

126. My delegation decided to participate in the General Assembly's debate on the agenda item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations" because we consider it our duty to define our position in a matter of great importance for the life of this Organization and because we feel an obligation to express our views for the purpose of safeguarding principles that we consider of very high significance.

127. Our Organization is of course based on acceptance by all Member States of a series of rules contained in the Charter, rules that they have committed themselves to obey and respect. This juridical framework has established a fabric of relationships that makes it possible for certain areas of understanding to exist among nations that are very different from each other, whether for reasons of origin, traditions, ethnic composition, size, or the social and political systems governing them.

128. This Organization, therefore, owes its life and its future survival, with its capacity to provide mankind with such highly desirable benefits for international peace and harmony as it has thus far succeeded in doing, to its attachment to the principle that it is based on a pluralism of States. This fact finds its basis in the Charter of the United Nations, which sets forth very clearly the rights and duties of the States that compose it.

129. No one can deviate from the agreed principle that it is accepted in the United Nations that States participate side by side with other States with which they have great affinities, in the same manner as they participate side by side with States with which they may have great differences. It is dangerous to deal with matters in any other way and to attempt to accommodate any situation to the special preferences of certain States.

130. This is precisely what my delegation believes is occurring in the case of the item now under discussion. To claim not to recognize as a fact the existence of the Government of the Khmer Republic would be tantamount not only to ignoring a reality but also to being at variance with the very Charter of the Organization.

131. It should be quite clear that Cambodia is a State and, as such, it has been a Member of the United Nations for a long time. It should also be quite clear that those who are entitled to rule in that State are those who at present are in charge of the Government of the Khmer Republic. We are faced with the dangerous situation in which there is a dispute as to the representative character of those who are actually exercising the functions of government in the Khmer Republic, while at the same time an attempt is made to enthrone, through the subterfuge of a resolution, a certain group

as being representative which in reality and actual fact has no true existence in Cambodia.

132. It is a fact recognized by history that the previous leader of the Cambodian Government was deposed not by force, but by a decision of the Parliament taken in accord with the Constitution of the country. It is also a fact that the present rulers of the country came to power not through the use of force, but by constitutional methods.

133. The United Nations, the principle mandate of which is to promote and maintain peace, must be very careful indeed never to allow itself to be led into contravening these lofty aims. We are therefore opposed to any attempt in this Organization to impose a leadership and a government on a Member State in disregard of the true facts, something which would imply a clear interference in the internal affairs of the Khmer people. The United Nations cannot, without establishing a sorry precedent, impose the leadership of a man who has lived in exile for several years, while at the same time there exists a legitimate Government exercising its powers on the basis of the constitutional rules of the country.

134. The inconsistent efforts of those supporting draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, which would deny the representative character of those at present ruling the Khmer Republic, reveal a lack of firmness and solidity in their arguments.

135. Every Member State expresses itself through its Government, and when its Government is brought into question, the rights and privileges to which it is entitled under the Charter are to a certain extent infringed. The argument according to which a Government is to be deposed because, in the judgement of those who so argue, it does not represent its people, is a disguised way of changing the structure of a Member State in which those who are carrying on the functions of government are those entitled to rule.

136. The presence of a Member State here should not be made to depend on our pleasure or displeasure. Recognition of its true existence as a State is beyond any preferences or ill-will that may be felt in its regard. Its validity is found in its very existence as a State. For that purpose it should meet certain conditions that are indeed present in the case of the Khmer Republic but absent from the fictitious entity, recognition of which is being sought to the exclusion of the Khmer Republic.

137. Who can deny that the Khmer Republic meets, in its status as an organized community, independent and autonomous in form, the traditional conditions that define it as a State, that is to say, territory, population, and effective authority or ability to rule? And who could reasonably assert that such elements exist to form an entity in the shape of a State deserving of international recognition, in the case of the deposed régime of Prince Sihanouk?

138. It would, therefore, be going too far to restore to the representative's seat in the United Nations a fictitious entity and at the same time to dislodge a Government the existence of which no one doubts.

139. The comparisons drawn by some of the sponsors of the draft resolution with the case of the People's Republic of China cannot stand up to any serious



analysis. Those comparisons are being made by some people who are attempting to justify the removal of the Khmer Republic from this Organization. In the case of China, no one can ignore the fact that its entry into the United Nations was postponed because of disagreements between permanent members of the Security Council and not because that great nation's existence as a State was really in question.

140. Moreover, my delegation is concerned by the fact that there are those who wish to impose a "status" in disregard of the clear principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. That is being done in total disregard of any consideration of the will of the Khmer people. Undoubtedly what the Khmer people think and wish to do with regard to their own Government must be taken into account. It is quite surprising that countries so frequently jealous about preserving self-determination are now endorsing a draft resolution designed to do nothing less than say exactly who is to represent a people within this Organization, and doing so without consulting the will of that people—in other words, behind its back.

141. My delegation has reason to believe that the people of the Khmer Republic have been consulted and have granted to their leadership a legitimate mandate. That cannot be ignored without trampling underfoot the hackneyed principle of self-determination of peoples. This organization should in no way whatsoever be invited to take measures which would encroach upon the oft-expressed will of a people to resolve political matters which fall within its exclusive purview. For a country such as Costa Rica, with a tradition of respect for the will of its people, that is the most solid argument for preventing a solution of the questions concerning the Khmer people in a way which would imply outside interference.

142. However, as regards those who do not have an equal devotion to the will of a people, we would ask them to abstain from any interference, at least, out of deference to the ideals of the Charter of this Organization, which quite clearly states in Article 2, paragraph 7:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter . . ."

143. Another thought which emerges from the debate is that the item has been submitted and dealt with at a moment when the world, because of the policy of *détente* practised by the great Powers and supported in a sense of solidarity by a large majority of the nations of the world, has banished the last remnants of the fanatical period of the cold war. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 seem to have forgotten for a moment the climate now prevailing in the world and they have introduced into this item cold-war language, which many of us, perhaps over-optimistically, thought had been buried. *Détente* is nothing more than a belated acceptance of the fact that it is possible for differing political régimes to coexist in the world, abandoning the old thesis of the fanatics of both sides who had persuaded themselves at the height of the cold war that it was impossible for different social and political systems to coexist.

144. My delegation is unable to close its eyes to the existence of a domestic struggle in Cambodia, with regard to which the established Government has the duty of maintaining internal security, as it has been doing. Any action taken in the United Nations should be designed to avoid prolonging the suffering and the loss of life and property that has occurred because of the internal conflict.

145. In this situation the measures expected of the United Nations should be an appeal to the parties to the conflict to cease fighting and begin negotiations in order to find a peaceful solution acceptable to the entire Khmer people. That is why my delegation, together with other delegations, has sponsored draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, and hopes that it will be adopted by the General Assembly.

146. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The Romanian delegation would like to associate itself with those who have paid a tribute to the memory of U Thant. With the death of U Thant, the United Nations has lost a great man, entirely dedicated to the purposes and principles of the Charter, a man who sincerely believed in the destiny of this Organization and did everything in his power so that the United Nations might rise to the high hopes that the peoples had placed in it. For Romania, which saw in him a harbinger of peace, the very symbol of this Organization, his memory will always live in our hearts, together with the memory of all those who have dedicated their lives to the cause of peace and understanding between nations. In offering to the delegation of Burma the condolences of the Romanian delegation, I would request that delegation to transmit to the bereaved family our condolences on the grievous loss they have sustained as a result of the death of U Thant.

147. The Romanian delegation, at the twenty-eighth session, presented at length its position on the question now under discussion. We therefore do not wish to repeat here all the arguments in favour of the proposal designed to achieve the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations; but at this stage in our debate, which is only a continuation of the debate of the twenty-eighth session, we merely wish to make some comments relating to the new elements that have emerged in the meantime. We are thinking in particular of the submission by a group of States of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. The sponsors of that draft resolution are proposing that, in the last analysis, the Organization should divest itself of the question of the representation of Cambodia on the pretext that the Khmer people should be given the opportunity to resolve its own political problems by peaceful means, without any foreign intervention.

148. I should like to repeat here that, as far as we are concerned, Romania has always been in favour of respect for the right of each country, of each people, to decide for itself without any interference or intervention from outside. My country has made the inadmissibility of intervention in the internal affairs of other States one of the fundamental principles of its foreign policy and its relations with all other member States of the international community. True to that position of principle, Romania has condemned the foreign intervention in Cambodia committed four years ago by those who plotted and carried out the coup d'état

against the legal Government of Cambodia and the lawful head of that State. The problem we are discussing now is but a sequel to the events that took place in March 1970.

149. We consider that the United Nations and its Member States have the duty of ensuring that the consequences of foreign intervention in Cambodia are not transposed in the United Nations through an illegal representation of that country. That is all the more necessary because it is a small country and a victim of foreign intervention. What we are asking is not that the United Nations offer any solutions to the Cambodian people in respect of questions that concern it directly; what we ask is that the United Nations respect the will of that people by putting an end to the present unlawful and unjust situation relating to the representation of its country in the United Nations.

150. As far as we are concerned, it is quite obvious that, although it concerns negotiations between the parties concerned for the purpose of a peaceful solution to the problem of Cambodia, draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 pursues the same goal as that achieved at the twenty-eighth session by a simple motion of a procedural character. It is equally clear that, under the guise of impartiality, this draft resolution merely proposes that the General Assembly continue to support the present régime in Phnom Penh.

151. Romania firmly supports the National United Front and the Royal Government of National Union presided over by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the head of State, in their just struggle for the establishment of a free Cambodia, a Cambodia that is independent and democratic, and for the fulfilment of the lawful aspirations of that people.

152. We are firmly in favour of respect for the right of the Cambodian people to make its own decisions without any outside interference, and the Romanian Government considers that only the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has the right and the capacity to express the aspirations, the interests and the will of the Cambodian people. Accordingly, it is only that Government which is entitled to represent that country in the United Nations.

153. I should like to express once again the conviction of the Romanian delegation that in bringing to a close the present debate by restoring the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, as is proposed in draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, the General Assembly will make a valid and real contribution to the restoration of peace in that country, a peace that is necessary to the Cambodian people to enable it to devote all its efforts to the reconstruction and the economic and social development of its country.

154. Mr. CAESAR (Grenada): My delegation has taken the floor to explain briefly the reasons which prompted Grenada's sponsorship of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. However, before doing so, I would crave the indulgence of the Assembly to express to the bereaved family of the late U Thant and also, through the Burmese delegation, to the Government and people of Burma the sincere condolences of the Government and people of Grenada on their profound loss.

155. During my country's maiden speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations, my Prime Minister, Mr. Eric M. Gairy, expressed Grenada's position with respect to non-interference in the internal affairs of Member States when he said:

"Our policy commitment to the cause of universal peace, in the context of the present disposition of international politics, is firmly rooted in the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of nations. We are therefore opposed to the division or dismemberment of sovereign States through outside interference or subversion."  
[2233rd meeting, para. 301.]

156. It is precisely in keeping with that expressed policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of a State that my Government has decided to sponsor draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1.

157. As a new Member of the United Nations, my country is not in a position to benefit from the experience of dealing with the intricate manoeuvring, and indeed what I might term pressure tactics, which seem to be employed with the specific intention of distorting issues. Our position is determined, therefore, by a careful examination of the facts at our disposal. In this context, it is the opinion of my delegation that the problem we are attempting to solve, the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations, is one which by its very nature directly involves the inalienable right of the people of Cambodia to decide its own destiny.

158. The official position of the United Nations on this question of the inalienable right of a people to decide its own destiny is unequivocally clear and needs no further clarification on my part. Therefore, in the opinion of my delegation, the resultant effects and indeed the consequences of any action on the part of the United Nations such as is implicit in agenda item 25 and attempted by draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 would be tantamount to interference by the United Nations in the internal affairs of a Member State.

159. Furthermore, agenda item 25, as it appears, not only suggests an attempt on the part of the United Nations to insult the people of Cambodia by trying to dictate to them who, in the opinion of the United Nations, is more capable of representing them; it is, above all, indicative of a calculated and dangerous attempt to undermine the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a State.

160. However, these unfortunate implications, by their very nature, do not make for any positive contribution to the efforts of the Cambodian people for a peaceful settlement of their dispute but rather fan the fires of disunity and create and maintain a false hope in the minds of some Cambodians, and apparently in the minds of a few delegations here, that disunity and continued internal strife in Cambodia constitutes the key to solving the Cambodian problem—a problem which, in the opinion of my delegation, concerns the very survival of the people of the Khmer Republic.

161. My delegation has no authority to discuss in this Assembly the personality of Prince Sihanouk, and whether or not he would be better able to lead the Khmer Republic, or to discuss the personality of

those who comprise the Lon Nol Government, and their ability or inability to administer their country. These are matters for the people of the Khmer Republic themselves to decide.

162. My Government and people are fully aware of the fact that somewhere along the line something went wrong in the Khmer Republic. Incidentally, this fact is substantiated by the very action of the United Nations in placing the question of Cambodia on its agenda.

163. My delegation is also aware of the fact that whatever happened in the Khmer Republic occurred during the time when, by a constitutional act, the people of the Khmer Republic had vested their implicit trust in Prince Sihanouk as the constitutional head of their Government.

164. My delegation knows, too, that, above all else, the people of the Khmer Republic themselves were the first to realize the plight which had befallen them. In recognition of that plight, the people of the Khmer Republic came to the conclusion that Prince Sihanouk had betrayed their trust and therefore, exercising their inalienable rights by another act of Parliament, they removed Prince Sihanouk from the high office of chief of State.

165. Who are we to challenge this action on the part of the people of the Khmer Republic? Who are we to dare even to suggest that Sihanouk should be restored as head of Government of the people of the Khmer Republic?

166. The people of the Khmer Republic have exercised their inalienable right, and have elected by democratic, constitutional means a government of their own choice. My delegation, my Government and my people recognize this right of the people of the Khmer Republic to elect their own Government. We further recognize the Lon Nol Government, which has been constitutionally and democratically elected, as the legitimate Government of the people of the Khmer Republic.

167. In effect, draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 urges the people of the Khmer Republic to hold talks with a view to achieving a peaceful settlement of their internal disputes, requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to lend appropriate assistance to the people of the Khmer Republic in their search for peace, and calls upon all Members of the United Nations to respect the decision reached by the people of the Khmer Republic. My delegation believes that, barring interference in the internal affairs of the Khmer Republic, draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 provides the United Nations with the best means at present of assisting the people of the Khmer Republic in their search for a peaceful settlement of their dispute. My delegation sponsored this draft resolution, and we respectfully urge other delegations to support it.

168. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): My delegation wishes first to join with those who have already spoken in mourning the death of our late Secretary-General. U Thant had many great qualities. He was a man of wisdom and he was a man of moral courage. He impressed all those who came into contact with him by his humanity, his gentle courtesy and his deep religious conviction as a practising Buddhist. But, above all, he was a man of great integrity, a man whom

all people felt they could trust, whatever country they came from, and whatever political ideologies they held.

169. My Foreign Secretary has already sent a personal message to the widow of U Thant on behalf of the British Government. In this he said that U Thant was known to everyone in Britain as one of the leading world statesmen of his generation and as a man wholly dedicated to the search for peace. He was both a great Burmese patriot and an outstanding international figure. His leadership of international affairs as Secretary-General of the United Nations was indeed characterized by a combination of profound integrity and of deep humanity.

170. The item we are considering today calls upon the General Assembly to restore what are described as "the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations". The draft resolution tabled by the sponsors [A/L.733 and Add.1-3] would have this Assembly recognize the so-called Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, presided over as head of State by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, as the sole lawful representative of the Cambodian State and people; the draft resolution would have us recognize its representatives as the sole lawful representatives of that State in the United Nations, and would have us expel the representatives of the Khmer Republic from the seat they occupy in the United Nations and in all related organizations.

171. This is, of course, exactly the same proposal as was put to this Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. We were told then, as we are being told now, that virtually the whole of Cambodia was in the hands of Prince Sihanouk and his supporters. We were told that the Government of the Khmer Republic was on the point of collapse. A year has now gone by and Prince Sihanouk is, as far as I know, still in Peking. His relations, indeed, with the Khmers Rouges seem to be somewhat puzzling. He told *Le Monde*, with a frankness which must have embarrassed some of his patrons, that he had "almost no relations with the Khmers Rouges" and that he found them "Stalinist" and "antipathetic".

172. But whether Prince Sihanouk is in Peking or Algiers is immaterial. What is relevant to our consideration of this item is the fact that he is not in Phnom Penh as head of State of the Government of Cambodia. Indeed, he is not in Phnom Penh at all. The Government which is in Phnom Penh, the Government of the Khmer Republic, which is represented in our Organization, is, on the basis of all the accepted criteria, the legal Government of Cambodia. It came to power by constitutional means, indeed, it came to power under the same Constitution as the one from which Prince Sihanouk himself derived his authority. Despite internal constitutional changes in Cambodia since March of 1970—notably the change to a republican form of government in October of that year—there has been no change in the essential structure of government and there has been no interruption in the discharge of essential governmental functions. The Government of the Khmer Republic controls the majority of the population; it controls the capital and most of the provincial capitals.

173. There are, no doubt, Governments represented here today which do not approve of the present Khmer

Government. There may well be some which would prefer to see a government presided over by Prince Sihanouk installed in Phnom Penh. But, if I may be allowed, I should like to quote the words of one of the founding fathers of the United Nations, the late Sir Winston Churchill, who said:

“Recognizing a person is not necessarily an act of approval . . . One has to recognize lots of things and people in this world of sin and woe that one does not like. The reason for having diplomatic relations is not to convey a compliment but to secure a convenience.”

174. The issue before us, therefore, is not which leader and which set of politicians we should prefer to see guiding the destinies of Cambodia, for that is a question for the Cambodian people themselves to decide, and to decide without outside interference. Nor is it for us to decide which government is likely to be in power in Cambodia next week, next month, or even next year. We have to deal—all of us—with the representatives of the Government that is in power there today, and it is its representatives, therefore, who are entitled to be seated in the United Nations. Tomorrow anything may happen, but fortunately we are not required by the Charter of the United Nations to be prophets. All we are required to answer here is the practical and factual question whether the so-called Government of Prince Sihanouk satisfies the criteria for representation in our Organization in place of the present representatives of the Khmer Republic.

175. In the view of my Government, Prince Sihanouk and his colleagues do not. They satisfy none of the criteria for recognition which would justify receiving their representatives at the United Nations in place of the representatives of the legitimate Government of the Khmer Republic. It is not argued that he has won the civil war. Indeed, it could not be so argued, since that war is still continuing. What is argued is something much more abstruse—even eccentric—that though he has not won the war we should nevertheless treat him as if he had, because he is the participant in that war who somehow or other deserves to be the winner and, indeed, would be the winner if the present Khmer Government were not receiving aid from outside, and perhaps if the war were being conducted according to well-established United Nations principles. The argument is the result of fallacious reasoning based on an unsound hypothesis. It implies a certainty as to political and military consequences, which is, to say the least, somewhat audacious. The proposal put forward in draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, sponsored by Algeria and others, thus amounts, in our view, to a gross attempt at interference in the domestic affairs of the Khmer people.

176. Moreover, to adopt a resolution restoring the rights of Prince Sihanouk's so-called Government in these circumstances would constitute a very dangerous and undesirable precedent. I need not remind this Assembly that we are not considering a unique phenomenon. The world is full of exiled leaders, both princes and commoners. Some seek asylum in Peking or Moscow; others go west to Paris, Rome, London or New York; the pleasure-loving establish themselves, perhaps, in Estoril or on the French Riviera; the ambitious take refuge in a neighbouring State, poised for and perhaps plotting an early return to power in their

native country. One could cite examples of such exiled leaders from every region of the globe represented in this Assembly today. This is why I submit that we should consider very carefully indeed the decision we are being asked to take in draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3—not only in the immediate context of Cambodia, but also lest we open the floodgates to other such items.

177. Do we really wish to see the United Nations increasingly involving itself in the domestic affairs of Member States in order to influence which political group should predominate and which should represent that State at the United Nations? Do we really wish to encourage the absurd situation whereby we accepted as the representatives of a given State at the United Nations persons who by definition would not be in a position to speak for that Government in power in the State itself? It is for all these reasons that my Government regards the proposals contained in draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 as both ill-founded and dangerous. It will be no surprise for the Assembly to hear that we will vote against that draft resolution and that we would urge others in this hall to do likewise.

178. But although my Government, for the reasons I have just stated, is opposed to the General Assembly's prejudging the political outcome in Cambodia, we recognize as well as anyone in this hall that the present tragic situation in that unhappy country is one which legitimately concerns us all as human beings. While we are speaking here today, Cambodians on both sides are fighting and dying. There are over 2 million refugees, and the economy of that already poor country is being destroyed. Our first concern here at the United Nations should therefore be to try to bring an end to the fighting and to promote a peaceful political settlement. My Government believes that this objective can best be achieved through direct negotiations between the Khmer people themselves, without outside interference. The Government of the Khmer Republic has already proposed unconditional talks; we urge their opponents to take up that offer.

179. But we also believe that the United Nations should exert its own prestige and its own authority to bring the two sides together. We should authorize our Secretary-General to assist the two parties in achieving a peaceful settlement, leaving it to him to decide the most appropriate way in which he can render such assistance. We are confident that, in response to a request from this Assembly, the Secretary-General would undertake that task with his customary zeal and dedication to the cause of peace. We also believe that Member States should undertake to respect the outcome of the talks between the parties and not take any other action until the results of these efforts are considered by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. Such are the proposals set out in draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, of which my Government is a sponsor. We do urge all those States which wish to end the bloodshed and encourage a peaceful political settlement in Cambodia to vote in its support.

180. Finally, I should like to refer to the letter addressed to you, Mr. President, by the Permanent Representative of Thailand, on behalf of the sponsors of our draft resolution, requesting priority [A/9875]. We are asking that our draft resolution be voted on first because we believe that, before considering so serious



and so drastic a step as the seating in the United Nations of the representatives of an exiled leader and the expulsion from this Organization of the representatives of the Government actually in power in the country concerned, the Assembly should be given the opportunity to consider, first, a more moderate and, in our view, a more constructive line of action; one directed not at passing judgement on the domestic affairs of Cambodia, but at ending the fighting and promoting a peaceful settlement. It is with these considerations in mind that I appeal in this Assembly for support for our request for priority as well as for a favourable vote on the draft resolution my delegation is sponsoring.

181. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados): The delegation of Barbados could not, in good conscience, begin this intervention without paying tribute to U Thant, whose untimely death last Monday has left the international community bereft of one of its greatest statesmen ever. U Thant was a man of peace. He was unswerving in his support for the purposes and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. As Secretary-General he epitomized by his conduct the true principles of non-alignment, and scrupulously avoided any unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of States.

182. U Thant was a great son of Asia and the third world. He was always anxious to let those elements of his personality be clearly understood. His principal consideration—as he was always anxious to counsel me since the days when he was the Permanent Representative of Burma here—was to uphold the respect for the dignity and worth of the human person. Man was the centre of the universe. All other things were of lesser value and must subserve the interests of man. That was his philosophy.

183. The United Nations will have other Secretaries-General; of this I have no doubt. But I respectfully make bold to declare that it will be a very long time before we get another Secretary-General who so commanded the admiration and respect of the entire world as U Thant did. *Requiescat in pace*: may his soul rest in peace. And may the guardians who transport only the great ones to the portals of the Valhalla, in the happy fields beyond the tomb, be gentle and benign as they escort this triumphant hero to his last resting-place.

184. In a certain sense it is somewhat ironical that we should be discussing South-East Asia—the Cambodian question—at the beginning of the same week in which one of Asia's greatest sons, a man of justice and unflinching respect for the United Nations Charter, has died. I would not like to appear to take unfair advantage of U Thant's death, but it would seem to me to be somewhat symbolic—there must be a meaning—that U Thant died at 3 p.m. on Monday, at the same time and on the same day that we were due to commence this debate on Cambodia—or the Khmer Republic—a debate which is a clear interference in affairs which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Khmer people.

185. You will recall, Mr. President, that with the news of U Thant's death at 3 o'clock on Monday this debate was delayed for several hours, as if that great Asian statesman were giving us the final benefit of his counsel, saying, "Stop—think carefully before

you proceed to violate the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, especially with relation to my part of the world, to that part of the world to which I intend to return even now".

186. The present Government of the Khmer Republic has been in existence since 18 March 1970. The present Khmer Government came to power in a peaceful, orderly and constitutional manner. The present Khmer Government came to power by a ballot and not by a bullet, like so many of the Governments which now make this illegal challenge to the Khmer Government by inscribing this item on the agenda of this Assembly.

187. I seriously invite my colleagues to check the Governments of the delegations sponsoring draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 and see how many have military Governments or Governments which have come to power by revolution or by coup d'état. Easily, I submit, 80 per cent of those States have Governments which have won power by force of arms, *vi et armis*, and whose legitimacy, *ipso facto*, is under challenge by some section of their own populations.

188. On the other hand, the present Government of the Khmer Republic came to power by a vote in a joint session of the National Assembly and the Council of the Kingdom, which resulted in a 92 to nothing decision against Prince Norodom Sihanouk. It was therefore a unanimous vote of Parliament—not the army—against Prince Sihanouk. There were no guns held at the heads of the parliamentarians who voted. They did not act under duress. They were essentially the King's men. Lon Nol, who was then Prime Minister, was hand-picked by Sihanouk himself about seven months before. There were no troop movements. There was no coup d'état. It was a constitutional and peaceful action in the normal process of democracy. In this process, we must remind some of our friends, Governments are won and lost by simple votes. We do not need guns in this process—the democratic process. Some of us who are still lucky enough to have this system operating in our countries remember well how it works. I know that there are those of us who have not seen the normal democratic process of voting and constitutional manoeuvre operate for such a very long time in their own countries that they may have forgotten, perhaps, how democracy and its process works. I am pleased to reassure my colleagues, however, that voting still takes place in Parliament, and if a Government fails to win a vote of confidence then it falls and a new Government which can command a majority in Parliament takes over. This happens still—this is still the process. And that is what happened in the Khmer Republic on 18 March 1970.

189. Prince Norodom Sihanouk, whilst on a journey to foreign lands, lost a vote of confidence in a joint session of Parliament by 92 votes to nothing, and he lost his Government. It was as simple as that. Not a shot was fired. Not a soldier moved. And all was at peace in the realm of Cambodia.

190. Those delegations which have persisted in interfering in the domestic affairs of the Khmer Republic have been predicting since the twenty-eighth session, in this self-same illegal debate, that fire and brimstone would fall upon the heads of the Khmer Government; that it would not last for more than a few months; that the foreign insurgents operating in the north of

the country and terrorizing the poor, innocent inhabitants would soon march on Phnom Penh and seize that Government; that Prince Sihanouk, who lives in splendid isolation as the regal guest of a big country—which only yesteryear described men of Sihanouk's estate as the idle, decadent rich and barnacles upon the body politic—would swiftly return to a tumultuous welcome of the Cambodian people. These same countries repeated the falsehoods and distortions of fact and history again here in this debate when they ignominiously declared that Sihanouk controls 90 per cent of the territory of the Khmer Republic and 80 per cent of the population.

191. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Government of the Khmer Republic is growing stronger each day. It is pacifying more and more of the harassed northern territories and clearing away more and more of the insurgents who are exported illegally from North Viet Nam into the Khmer Republic.

192. At the beginning of this debate we heard the first two speakers interject a new and vicious element. They have now resorted to slandering the Government and people of the Khmer Republic. They accuse the Khmer Government of corruption, bribery and inefficiency, and of being puppets of the United States. They accuse the United States in its turn of supporting the Khmer Government and of defending that Government against the so-called attacks of the Sihanouk régime in exile.

193. These are unfair and ungracious allegations, unsupported by any scintilla of objective evidence. One of those speakers asserted that a coup d'état was promoted from abroad and carried out under the threat of machine-guns. But there were no guns in the joint session of the National Assembly and the Council of the Kingdom on 18 March 1970. The only machine-guns fired were the 92 votes against Sihanouk, without a single salvo in his defence.

194. Comparisons are nearly always invidious and painful, but to make slanderous attacks against a friendly non-aligned State really does invite comparisons even if, for the better part of valour, one should think and ponder, but perhaps not mention open secrets. It would indeed be painful to publicly state what we all in the third world softly talk about when we contemplate the fate of present Governments and past glamorous heroes—still alive, we hope—of those self-same Governments.

195. And what about the argument that the Khmer Government is being propped up by a bigger imperialist Government? Well, who supports Sihanouk? Where does Sihanouk live today in exile? Well, have we forgotten the late 1960s in Africa, and have we forgotten how certain metropolitan Powers kept their troops stationed on the soil of certain independent African States to give ready assistance to certain Governments that were in imminent danger of being overthrown?

196. The fact is that there is nothing wrong with a Government accepting or seeking the assistance of a friendly Power, whether that Power is big or small. This is a legitimate exercise of sovereignty, in the submission of the delegation of Barbados. But we should not think that that exercise of sovereignty by accepting assistance should be the exclusive pre-

serve of certain third-world States, but should not be exercised by the legitimate Lon Nol Government at Phnom Penh. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. But what is even more important is that those of us who live in glass houses should not throw stones. He that comes into this Assembly and makes pompous and sanctimonious preachments on how other Governments ought to behave must come into these chambers with clean hands.

197. The Prime Minister of the Khmer Republic admitted that his Government solicited and benefited from tactical air support in its fight against the North Vietnamese invaders and the Khmer Rouge, in the insurgency in the north of his country. Well, what is wrong with that? Did not the British and the French give tactical air support and ground support as well to independent African States in 1964 and 1966? Or was it only right for the British and the French to assist, but not for the Americans?

198. My Government and my delegation as presently constituted could never be called a lackey or a running dog for the United States, or any other Government for that matter. The United States Government, I suspect, would be the first to testify affirmatively to this assertion of plain fact. For we are too wedded to principle and objectivity. We are a very independent people and nation. The British delegation will tell you that Barbados was the first nation ever in the history of colonial experience to make a unilateral declaration of independence from Britain in the seventeenth century, long before the United States or Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia. We have no lessons, therefore, to receive in the independence of spirit or conviction.

199. It is unfair to say that the United States installed the Lon Nol Government in the Khmer Republic. It is equally unfair to say that the Lon Nol Government is a puppet of the United States. It is further unfair to say that the United States conducts an imperialist war in the Khmer Republic against the Sihanouk government-in-exile. If the United States is friendly to the Lon Nol Government, giving that Government assistance upon request, does that, *ipso facto*, make the Lon Nol Government a puppet of the United States? For, if so, then what about Sihanouk? If Sihanouk and his clique in exile receive hospitality, provider, support and hegemonic protection from another big Power, does that make Sihanouk a puppet of that other big Power?

200. I do not answer these questions. I simply pose them for my colleagues to ponder them—like the Virgin Mary—in their hearts.

201. My delegation feels constrained to indicate the degree of alarm with which we detect the level of dishonesty that permeates this debate. First of all, it is an illegal debate. The inscribers of the item and the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, while postulating themselves as non-aligned countries have unsolicitously interjected themselves into the affairs of the Cambodian State and people. They have placed themselves in self-righteous judgement upon the Cambodian people. In their draft resolution they are seeking to tell the Cambodian people who should be its Government. They seek to inflict upon the Khmer people a bankrupt Royal Government whose only union is a band of the Prince's lackeys and henchmen

who will in their turn eliminate Prince Sihanouk himself if they ever seize power again in the Khmer Republic.

202. I say "dishonesty" because the Khmer Republic is a poor, small, third-world, non-aligned country that is confronting the same problems that most of us in that classification have had to encounter. Insurgency by rebellious groups supported by foreigners is known to most of the sponsoring Powers of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. Yet, they would have this Assembly remove the representatives of the lawful Government of the Khmer Republic, which has been in power for over four years and is getting stronger day by day, and they would have the Assembly decide to reimpose Prince Norodom Sihanouk upon the people of Khmer.

203. But, even so, we cannot be sure that it would be Sihanouk. For Sihanouk has already indicated time and time again that he is not interested in returning as head of State or head of Government. One suspects that the real aim is to impose lackeys and stooges of some outside Power. The Royal Prince would appear to be very happy in exile. But these countries are supposed to be non-aligned countries, yet they have taken an aligned position in this domestic dispute of a poor sister State. I dread to think what greater infamy is left for the big Powers to place upon our heads in the Non-Aligned Movement. The duty of a brother is to help a fallen brother in distress, not to visit further calamities and abominations upon him. My delegation, the delegation of Barbados, denounces this attitude on the part of the sponsors of this draft resolution.

204. The non-aligned group practises double standards and the truth is not in it. The Non-Aligned Movement has fallen upon very inglorious days. But I draw some comfort from the fact that when this draft resolution and subject was raised at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers, it caused great controversy in that meeting, a split in the group, and it was barely passed by a consensus vote to hide the real division which it engendered and still engenders today. There is no unanimous view in the non-aligned group on this subject. There could never be, because a number of Governments know that what we are doing to the Khmer Republic and its people is wrong, unjust and plainly immoral. We would not like it for ourselves. Why do it to the Khmer Republic? That is why my delegation deplores the tactic of certain non-aligned countries, the so-called progressives in the group, visiting or writing to other third-world countries saying that this was a unanimous decision of the non-aligned group. That is not true. The non-aligned group is hopelessly divided on the subject and Governments and delegations should feel quite free to vote on this matter in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. Draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, submitted by Algeria, Senegal and others, must be defeated. Fair-minded Governments and delegations should vote against that draft resolution.

205. There are differences between certain factions in the Khmer Republic. That is to be conceded. A civil war is going on. The Government of the Khmer Republic is firmly in control of the vast majority of its territory and its people. It functions as a Government.

It is fighting against the armed foreigners within its gates in the northern part of its territory. As we understand it, the Khmer Government is a firm, effective Government in the circumstances. Prince Norodom Sihanouk and his band of merry men live a life of benign and splendid isolation in the land of euphoric exile. The merry Prince has no desire to return to the Khmer Republic as head of Government. One suspects that he does not care what really happens to the Khmer people. The delegation of Barbados considers that the indigenous people of the Khmer Republic alone should sit down together and work out a peaceful solution of their problems. No States in Africa or Europe, or the other points of Asia, should interfere with that peaceful process. For one thing, it is none of their business. The Khmer people should be encouraged by this Assembly to sit down and reason together. And we should help them only by our prayers. I know that that is what U Thant would have counselled from his reservoir of Oriental wisdom.

206. It must be of some significance that all the countries of South-East Asia, as distinct from those in Africa and the Middle East which sponsor draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, support an approach in draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 which encourages a peaceful settlement of the internal civil dispute in the Khmer Republic.

207. I should think that the South-East Asian countries are in a better position to know what is happening in, and what is best for, the Khmer Republic. I regard those States of South-East Asia as authorities on South-East Asia—not the African States which have sponsored draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, not States several thousand miles away. That is why the delegation of Barbados formally supports the proposal of the representative of Thailand [A/9875] for priority consideration of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1.

208. My delegation respectfully exhorts all peace-loving States to vote for draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 and to reject draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, which advocates a violation of the United Nations Charter and represents an abandonment of the principles of non-alignment. Draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 is an unworthy document.

209. The only role that this Assembly has in the civil strife in the Khmer Republic is to assist the Khmer Government and its people in resolving that civil conflict by peaceful means.

210. Mr. BANDA (Zambia): I wish to associate myself with all those who have preceded me in expressing their delegations' condolences on the loss of U Thant. This Organization and, indeed, the world as a whole will miss his wisdom and statesmanship. May his soul rest in peace.

211. Zambia is a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 concerning the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations. Speaking almost at the end of the general debate, my delegation will refrain from going into details about the grave situation in Cambodia. To do so at this stage would be superfluous, since a number of participants in the general debate have already, very eloquently and convincingly, dealt with the basic facts which compelled us

once again to call upon the General Assembly to act decisively in the interest of the Cambodian people.

212. The people of Cambodia are well known for their commitment to peace. For many years Cambodia stood out as an oasis of peace in the war-torn region of South-East Asia. Under the Royal Government headed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia scrupulously pursued a policy of neutrality and non-alignment. That policy was obviously anathema to a foreign Power bent on pursuing a war of aggression against the people of Indo-China. Consequently, at the instigation of that Power, a puppet clique, headed by Lon Nol, conducted a coup d'état against the lawful Government of Cambodia. That marked the beginning of an era of misery and turmoil in Cambodia which continues to date.

213. The Lon Nol régime remains in power only because of the support of its masters. Without the massive military and other forms of assistance that it is receiving, that régime would have long since collapsed, for it does not enjoy the support of the people of Cambodia, which have had to resort to an armed struggle in an effort to regain their national pride and dignity, based on neutrality and non-alignment. In spite of this involvement on the part of a super-Power, the forces engaged in an armed struggle against the Lon Nol régime now control over 90 per cent of the Cambodian territory which is inhabited by over 80 per cent of the population of that country.

214. It is indeed a great pity that the lesson of Viet Nam has not been learnt. The massive military and economic assistance provided to the Lon Nol régime by those who put it in power cannot break the will of the Cambodian people. Theirs is a just struggle, and because of that fact alone they are bound to win. The Lon Nol puppet régime is indeed not unaware of that fact. It is because it realizes the inevitability of its military defeat that it is now clamouring for negotiations. That is a face-saving tactic on the part of the régime and its imperialist masters. Quite understandably, the Royal Government of National Union has refused to enter into negotiations with a band of traitors and puppets.

215. By its very nature, the question of Cambodia cannot be called an internal affair of the Cambodian people. Action at the United Nations, as envisaged in our draft resolution, cannot be called interference in the internal affairs of the Cambodian people. The genesis of the Cambodian problem, namely, the foreign-inspired coup against the Government of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, is what constitutes foreign interference and, in fact, a most flagrant contravention of the United Nations Charter. Our draft resolution merely seeks to correct the anomalous situation concerning the representation of Cambodia in the United Nations. To condone the presence in our midst of the representatives of the puppet régime of Lon Nol would be tantamount to approving interference by a super-Power in the internal affairs of the Cambodian people; it would also be tantamount to acquiescing in super-Power designs for spheres of influence and hegemony.

216. It should be noted in this connexion that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, headed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, continues to enjoy the support and recognition of an impressive number of progressive Member States of the United

Nations. The non-aligned group of countries, of which Zambia is a proud member, has left no doubt as to where it stands in this matter.

217. At the Georgetown Conference, held in 1972, the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries adopted a resolution in which they demanded an immediate end to armed and other forms of intervention in Cambodia by a super-Power and pronounced themselves in favour of the solution of the Cambodian problem on the basis of the five points contained in the statement by Prince Norodom Sihanouk on 23 March 1970.

218. In 1973, at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers, the non-aligned countries reiterated their demand for an immediate end to foreign aggression in Cambodia, called upon peace-loving and justice-loving countries to give official recognition to the Royal Government of National Union as the sole legal Government of Cambodia, and reaffirmed the solidarity of the Non-Aligned Movement with the Royal Government of National Union in its struggle at the international level, including at the United Nations.

219. A decision by this Assembly in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union would, as it should, give encouragement to the Cambodian people in their struggle against external aggression. It would reassure them that theirs is a just struggle for genuine independence and sovereignty, free from foreign interference. Moreover, the experience of Cambodia vividly exposes the plight of the people of the third world in their struggle against imperialism and for national independence and sovereignty.

220. By the adoption of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, the General Assembly would thus side with progressive humanity in the pursuit of justice, peace, freedom and human dignity. Such action would unquestionably be a furtherance of the objectives of the United Nations.

221. My delegation would therefore like to express the hope that the General Assembly will adopt draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 by an overwhelming majority. It is needless for me to say that we reject the manoeuvre of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 to have that text given priority over ours during the voting in this Assembly.

222. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): We shall never forget U Thant, for that great humanist has left a permanent mark on the work and the spirit of the United Nations. He devoted a large part of his life to the search for peace and understanding among peoples. U Thant served the United Nations and its ideals of justice, peace and progress courageously, loyally and selflessly.

223. We Mauritians feel this loss even more deeply because of the special ties, born of a mutual esteem that later became a solid friendship, which for long united the late U Thant to our head of State. The deceased always gave us the benefit of his solicitude and friendship.

224. We express to the United Nations, to Burma and to the family of the deceased our heartfelt condolences and we assure them of our support in this trying hour.



225. After that deserved tribute that I have humbly paid to the memory of a man to whom the United Nations owes so much and to whom it is now paying its last tribute, I turn to the question of Cambodia.

226. When almost a year ago, on 4 December 1974, I spoke here on the question of Cambodia,<sup>3</sup> I dealt with the aspects of the question as a whole. Above all, I tried to show the similarity of that question to the colonial phenomenon with which we Africans, perhaps more than anyone else, are so well acquainted.

227. Indeed, at the beginning, what was involved here was a foreign occupation whose only aim was to transform Cambodia into an enormous military base, from which the Indo-Chinese people could be more easily dominated, despite their invincible will. To be more precise, on 18 March 1970, a coup d'état organized and led by foreign forces put an end to legality in Cambodia, just as it put an end to several years of political stability and economic progress there. Since that time, the Cambodian people have risen up, like any other people that wished to die in dignity or live in freedom would have done.

228. The Cambodian people is each day gaining further successes on the battlefield as well as on the diplomatic level. The Cambodian people, within the National United Front of Cambodia and under the leadership of the Royal Government of National Union, has already liberated almost all of the national territory and the majority of the people. An administration is functioning—of course, under the restrictions imposed by war—in the liberated areas, and it has the unreserved support of the Cambodian people.

229. On the diplomatic level, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has been officially recognized by more than 60 countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America as the only legal and lawful Government of Cambodia.

230. Those are indisputable facts, which should lead our Assembly to restore the lawful rights in this Organization of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, led by Prince Sihanouk.

231. Three main objections have been raised to the request that many countries, including my own, have made to the General Assembly. We have listened to those objections with even more attention and interest because among those who have raised them we have many, and in some cases powerful, friends. But it must be admitted that those objections do not stand up against even the briefest and least detailed analysis.

232. The first objection is that the decision we are asking the General Assembly to take would constitute a dangerous precedent because any Government placed in power through a national revolution could find itself expelled from the United Nations. That analogy can in no case be validly invoked in relation to the Lon Nol régime. That régime is not the result of a national revolution and, what is more, it is not the régime chosen by the Cambodian people. The Lon Nol régime exists only because it served as a cover for a foreign occupation which to this very day keeps it alive artificially. If that foreign intervention were difficult to verify, many of us could be entitled to have doubts, but the fact is that the intervention took place before the eyes and with the knowledge of everyone and the objectives were publicly and offi-

cially announced, and therefore no one with any objectivity can speak of a national revolution.

233. Hence, it is exactly the opposite that could constitute a dangerous precedent. For it would be sufficient for a foreign Power, unhappy with a certain country, to occupy the national territory of that country and to establish a régime at its service for our General Assembly to sit by passively and watch the installation of a new form of colonization.

234. The second objection is that this is an internal Cambodian question and that the Cambodians must find a solution to it. We have proved that since a foreign occupation is involved, that is not the case. Indeed, the problem goes beyond the Cambodian framework; it is a colonial problem of a specific nature. We might nevertheless have been able to support that argument if it had not become the work-horse of those who have been passive or even interested spectators at the crumbling of Cambodia's neutrality and freedom.

235. The third objection is that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia is a government-in-exile and, as such, does not have the right to represent the Cambodian people. How can we honestly believe in such an objection when we know that several Governments represented in this Assembly were in the beginning governments-in-exile? As such, they embodied the will of their people for independence and freedom, and the determination of their people to struggle against occupation or colonization by force. From the end of the Second World War to this very day, all such governments, without any exception, have ended up as the only representative and lawful Governments.

236. Even if the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia had been a government-in-exile, without any direct link with the national territory, the argument could in no way be a convincing one. And with all the more reason, when one knows that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, ever since last year, has had practically all its departments on Cambodian territory.

237. As can be seen, then, the objections raised to the restoration of the lawful rights in the United Nations of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia cannot validly be supported. Our General Assembly, consequently, is in duty bound to take the decision dictated by its principles and purposes, namely, to restore to the genuine representatives of Cambodia their seats in the United Nations, replacing those who at present occupy them. And it is for this reason that I invite all Members of the General Assembly to give their massive support to draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3.

238. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The death of U Thant, the third Secretary-General of the United Nations, was a great loss to the international community. My delegation would like to associate itself with the moving words of condolence expressed by different delegations, especially those spoken by the chairmen of the African and Arab groups. There is no doubt that U Thant was an outstanding international personality by virtue of the invaluable services he rendered to this Organization. During his tenure of office, U Thant helped the Organization overcome many hurdles and difficulties in fate-

ful moments of its history. Those who knew U Thant, or worked with him, testify to his wisdom, his devotion, his integrity and his humane qualities. U Thant leaves behind a wealth of wisdom which will inspire international civil servants for generations to come. We request the delegation of Burma to convey to its Government and to the bereaved family our most sincere condolences.

239. Once again this year we meet to discuss the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations. We note with regret that ever since the twenty-eighth session a savage war has been waged in Cambodia. There is a great loss of life and extensive devastation in that country. It seems to us that Cambodia is experiencing the same tragedy that has befallen other parts of the Indo-Chinese peninsula: savage wars, great damage to property, and many martyrs who have fallen defending their fatherland and their freedom. The day before yesterday it was Korea, yesterday it was Viet Nam, and today it is Cambodia. To us, the tragedy in Indo-China is one, the struggle of its people is indivisible, and the aggressor is one.

240. Cambodia, ever since its independence in 1953, has followed a policy of neutrality, friendship and co-operation with the countries of the third world. We have witnessed, during the recent history of the country, the great efforts of its leader, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to preserve its independence, neutrality and friendship with all. In his endeavour to achieve such a policy, Prince Sihanouk resisted persuasion and pressure to join military alliances and to allow the establishment of foreign military bases in his country. For these good reasons, we can see why the Cambodia of Prince Sihanouk gained world-wide respect and friendship from all peace-loving countries.

241. We all recall the chronology of the Cambodian question. We recall a super-Power, which in 1970 was bogged down in the paddy-fields of South Viet Nam. In Viet Nam we witnessed with admiration how a small nation of rice-growers could defeat the might of the material and technological capabilities of a super-Power. Thus the people of Viet Nam have proven to the world that might never triumphs over the principles of self-determination and inadmissibility of foreign intervention.

242. To serve its policies in Viet Nam, that super-Power endeavoured by all means to persuade the Government of Prince Sihanouk to help it in its intervention in Viet Nam. But persuasion, threats and limited aggression against the country were not effective. Alas! That Power had no option except to extend its aggression.

243. They have used in Cambodia the same tactics of intervention: the fictitious, so-called coup d'état was staged; agents were installed as a government; military equipment and advisors poured into Phnom Penh.

244. But the Cambodian people has learned from the history of the Indo-Chinese peninsula how to defend its freedom and independence. The population has taken up arms under the guidance of the programme of the National United Front and the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. Today

the Lon Nol régime is besieged in the capital, the major part of the area of Cambodia and the majority of its population having come under the control of the Government of Prince Sihanouk. The Lon Nol régime is protected from the people of Cambodia by the might of a foreign Power, and that Power is also defending that unlawful régime in international organizations.

245. The United Nations Charter and United Nations declarations and resolutions stand opposed to foreign intervention and aggression. The United Nations is called upon today to lend its moral support to the people of Cambodia in their difficult time and in their tribulations. The United Nations is called upon to uphold the people of Cambodia in its resistance to aggression and foreign intervention in the exercise of its right to self-determination.

246. Some delegations have questioned the advisability of the presentation of our draft resolution in document A/L.733 and Add.1-3. They have chosen to interpret our initiative as one of merely replacing the present representatives by others, and they have drawn their own conclusions from such a reasoning. They consider that replacing representatives by others will not serve the cause of the people of Cambodia; that it will not stop the savage war raging in that land.

247. This is a deliberate attempt to misinterpret our motives. To my delegation, the restoration of the lawful rights of the Government of Prince Sihanouk is a condemnation of foreign intervention; it is moral support by the international community of the lawful and legitimate struggle of the people of Cambodia; in fact, it is support for and endorsement of the legitimate struggle of all small States to preserve their independence, their right to self-determination and the territorial integrity of their land.

248. Our draft resolution seeks to negate and undo the machinations of the international strategies of the super-Powers that seek to exploit other peoples for their own ends. It is a rejection of those who seek to dominate the world through spheres of influence; our initiative is a blow to those who have chosen to be agents of imperialism, old and new.

249. My delegation considers the support of our draft resolution as support for the struggle of the third world, symbolized and incarnated in the Non-Aligned Movement. It is an implementation of the Declaration of the Fourth Non-Aligned Conference held in Algiers last year. That Declaration states:

“The Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government emphasizes that the third world continues to be the favourite battlefield for colonial wars and imperialist plots. The situation in this part of the world is characterized by armed resistance to colonial systems and imperialist aggression and by the struggle for the safeguarding and consolidation of national independence and the economic and social advancement of peoples.

“ . . .

“The national liberation movement is confronting the increasingly accentuated action and political, economic and military mechanisms that tend to freeze the existing situation and to introduce new

forms of oppression and exploitation aimed at checking the process of third-world emancipation.”<sup>14</sup>

250. The peace, the negotiations and the cease-fire that they are advocating do not correspond to the real meaning of those words. They are an attempt to ease the pressure being exerted on the Lon Nol régime and a design to perpetuate the *status quo* and thus divide the country. How can we call on the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia to accept such a suggestion, which it considers as an attempt to halt its fight against foreign intervention?

251. We hold the Cambodian people dear to our hearts. We are the last to wish that the present war should continue in that unhappy land, and for this reason we have been trying to uncover the root causes of that unfortunate situation. To us they are the intervention of foreign Powers. While we aspire to lasting peace for Cambodia, we do not accept the foreign subjugation of the people of that land.

252. For these good reasons we call on the General Assembly to adopt draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3.

253. Mr. EKUA MIKO (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to express on behalf of my Government and my delegation, as well as on my own behalf, the deep consternation and profound grief with which we received the news of the death of the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant. U Thant was a man we all knew as one who gave warmth and life to our Organization, a man who devoted all his efforts to achieving unity and understanding among the Members of the United Nations. His loss is indeed a hard blow not only for the Organization but also for the world community.

254. My delegation, through my humble person, wishes to convey my Government's most sincere sympathy to the United Nations family, to the Government of Burma and to the sorrowing Mrs. Thant and the members of her family. We therefore ask the representative of Burma to transmit these expressions of deep sorrow from my Government to his Government and to the bereaved family.

255. In contrast with the feelings of sorrow I have just expressed, it is with real happiness that we view the success achieved so far by the General Assembly under the just and wise leadership of its President, and my delegation wishes again to express to him its hearty congratulations on his deservedly occupying that presidency. My delegation is convinced that under his leadership the successes achieved so far, which are triumphs unprecedented in the history of the United Nations, will remain a feature of our deliberations to the end of this session.

256. We are today, finally, discussing the legitimate cause of the people of Cambodia, the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, which the fascist forces of imperialism sabotaged last year by resorting to their accustomed methods and manoeuvres to maintain the *status quo* favourable to their diabolical interests. Today, at last, we have a chance to show the baselessness of the superfluous arguments the faithful servants of imperialism are trying to put forward in order to distort the true situation of the people of Cam-

bodia, branding as intervention in the internal affairs of Cambodia the action of the United Nations in seeking a solution to an injustice which, whether by inadvertence or as a result of manoeuvres alien to the wishes of the United Nations, this Organization has committed against the people of Cambodia.

257. Do the imperialists perhaps not know the true meaning of interference in the internal affairs of a State? My delegation believes they know perfectly well, because the violation of the right of States to sovereignty is clearly part and parcel of the behaviour—the well-known behaviour—of the imperialist-fascist forces themselves, which, we know perfectly well, has sown hatred and division among peoples. We are well aware of the causes and the origins of the sufferings with which the peaceful populations of Korea, Viet Nam and Cambodia are afflicted, those populations who have been poisoned by the same enemy which extends its arms like a gigantic octopus towards the Middle East and various other parts of the world susceptible to its influence. My delegation believes that this diabolical force of the imperialist Powers has indeed interfered in the internal affairs of Cambodia, establishing a remote-controlled puppet Government to promote its own interests, without heeding the lawful rights of the people of Cambodia. That is interference in the internal affairs of Cambodia.

*Mr. Bouteflika (Algeria) resumed the Chair.*

258. Those who wish to distort the situation may do so, but my delegation and all those delegations of countries of the world which love the freedom of peoples know that they cannot say they feel, much less tell the truth, when it is harmful to the interests of their protector, the absolute lord and master of their decisions. My Government knows this enemy, because it is a victim of its intrigues and temptations.

259. My delegation considers that Lon Nol's Government cannot in any way represent the people of Cambodia here in the United Nations or anywhere else, except perhaps before its own masters who prefabricated it. This Organization is based on the concept of democracy. The principle of sovereignty we attribute to the States of the world in this modern era is based on this concept of democracy, which emanates from the people, which knows what it wants and what it does not want. My delegation believes and considers that the Government of the so-called Khmer Republic is a kind of castle built in the air without any base to support it. In the opinion of my delegation, a "government" in the meaning of the word does not simply mean a group of two or three individuals. Within the concept of a sovereign State, the authority of that government must democratically emanate from the people itself, whether in a republican or a monarchical system. That government must be capable of representing its people. It must be capable of being listened to and respected by it. Only thus can one assign the status of government of a State to this or that person or group of persons. My delegation thinks that this element is lacking in the group of puppets of Mr. Lon Nol. This group of individuals does not have that legal base to become the Government of Cambodia and to represent its people in the United Nations.

260. Another one of the essential elements within the concept of a sovereign State is that its government

must exercise authority over a population situated in a specific area of the globe. I wonder in what territory the population over which the so-called Government of the Khmer Republic exercises jurisdiction is to be found. If such a territory exists, it is confined to a small part of the capital, Phnom Penh.

261. Faced with the absence of the necessary characteristics of a State—territory, population and a government capable of guiding the destinies of its people and watching over its interests—I should like to reiterate here the position of my Government, which has already been presented in this forum during the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Friendship with Peoples in his speech of 26 September 1974, when, among other things, he stated:

“My Government, in referring to areas of hostilities, appeals to the parties to subordinate their ambitions and individual appetites to an attempt to find appropriate solutions. The human lives lost in Cambodia can never be justified by the fascist Government of Lon Nol. It is well known by all how legitimate is the struggle of the Royal Government of Prince Sihanouk, who was the victim of imperialist aggression, when the sovereignty of the Cambodian peoples was trampled under foot, and when that popular and democratic Government was replaced by another puppet government guided by remote control by imperialist reactionaries. My delegation is convinced that this General Assembly will find a solution, a way to restore the legitimate rights of the Royal Government recognized today by most countries which are Members of this Organization.”  
[2244th meeting, para. 56.]

262. Therefore the General Assembly of the United Nations, as well as each and every one of the Members of the Organization, must strive for a solution to the Cambodian problem. This necessity should not be labelled in any way as interference in the internal affairs of Cambodia; it is the imperialists who are exercising the right of sovereignty which belongs exclusively to the Cambodians themselves. Consequently, the representatives of the Lon Nol group cannot speak in the name of the Cambodian people if they are remotely controlled by Washington and, like the minority group of South Africa, are not capable of representing anyone but themselves.

263. The truth of the situation prevailing in Cambodia should not be concealed by the United Nations, still less by those who are taking advantage of the situation by posing as people who know the problem, because of their proximity to it. If we were to concede the argument, we should automatically be departing from our aim of maintaining peace throughout the world, an aim which gave rise to the creation of the United Nations. Besides, this type of argument is not important any longer in the light of the experience acquired three years ago with regard to the recognition of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

264. Permit me to bring to the attention of the representatives the fact that the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations is no more than the recognition of a fact by our Organization and one more act of justice in favour of the people of Cambodia. We are not trying to restore Prince Norodom

Sihanouk to power here, because that is something the Cambodian people themselves must do, but my delegation believes that, through its struggle against the Government of Lon Nol, this people has expressed its will more than sufficiently. The Government of Prince Sihanouk exercises sovereignty over 80 per cent of the population of Cambodia, in an area of 90 per cent of the country.

265. We must bear in mind that our Organization is at the service of the populations of the globe and not in favour of the interests of one individual or system in particular. The admission of the representatives of the people of Cambodia must be made taking into account the just cause of the population of that country.

266. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 have been described as delegations committed to certain convictions. As far as my delegation and, I think, also the other sponsors of this draft resolution are concerned we are not surprised at the use of ideas such as these—ideas lacking meaning and justification. We have explained clearly here our arguments on what is and should be the Government that represents a people in our Organization. We have spoken in defence of the interests of a population and not an individual or group of individuals. I wish to stress that we should not forget that three years ago an injustice was redressed in favour of an entire people which has a very high human potential in the world community, the People's Republic of China, which had been denied its lawful rights in our Organization. This injustice had no other basis than the diabolical wishes for domination and the secessionist ambitions of imperialism. We should not forget that these facts have always tended to weaken the spirit and the orientation of our Organization.

267. Taking into account the afore-mentioned facts, my delegation asks the General Assembly to consider the cause of the Cambodian people and not that of a group of puppets and asks it to vote in favour, without reservations, of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, which restores to the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia its lawful rights in the United Nations. If we recall that the General Assembly has denied the right of participation in its debates to representatives of the minority and racist Government of South Africa because it does not represent the South African population, it should not be misinterpreted when in the same circumstances we demand the just right of the people of Cambodia to be lawfully represented. Once again I invite the members of the General Assembly, in compliance with our obligations to maintain peace and justice throughout the world, as well as respect for the provisions of the United Nations Charter on the right of all peoples to self-government, all to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, of which my country is a sponsor.

268. However, I do not know whether it would be too much to ask—although I know that it will seem like a joke in bad taste for some, it would in fact be a sign of good will and bowing to truth and justice which would honour them—that the sponsors withdraw draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, which tends to perpetuate the imperialist domination in Cambodia. Those delegations, sponsors of that draft resolution, prefer the



*status quo* to a just and definitive solution of the problem.

269. To conclude, I should like to emphasize and point out here that my Government, led by its President for Life, His Excellency Macias Nguema Biyogo, scrupulously respects the concept of the sovereignty of States, and, for that reason, any Government based on or born of interference and imposed against the will of the people will never have the recognition of my Government. My Government jealously defends its sovereignty, which emanates from the people of Equatorial Guinea, and, both internally and externally, the diabolical forces of the imperialist Powers in their attempts to infringe its sovereignty will meet its unswerving opposition. For that reason, my Government can never extend its recognition to the Government of Lon Nol's group, prefabricated by the imperialists, because we consider them to be without body or soul, objects owned by the imperialist Powers, which do not take into account the lawful interests of its people.

270. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): It is with a deep sense of loss and sorrow that I join those speakers who have preceded me in paying homage to the late U Thant, third Secretary-General of the United Nations. His loss is deeply felt, not only by the people and Government of Burma, but indeed by the entire international community.

271. U Thant will be remembered for his great dedication, integrity, wisdom and quiet courage by which he won the profound respect and confidence of all Member States. He will be remembered by those who had the privilege and the good fortune to know him personally as a good friend and a most kind and considerate person. At this sad hour, my delegation wishes to extend its deepest condolences to the Burmese delegation and, through its intermediary, to the Government of Burma and to Mrs. Thant and the other members of the bereaved family. May U Thant rest in peace.

272. My delegation has listened with great attention to the statements made by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. They are all Indonesia's friends. We maintain with all of them the closest relations of friendship and co-operation, either bilaterally or within the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and elsewhere. My delegation has to confess that, representing a country no less non-aligned than any of our friends who have sponsored draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, we are not convinced by their arguments. My delegation is, however, impressed by the way they have tried to arrogate to themselves the right to decide for the Khmer people whom they should accept as their leader and which Government should rule and represent them, and to have the General Assembly sanction their arrogation. Some of them are trying to project themselves as having the monopoly of the fight against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and to give the impression that others who in this Khmer question do not think like them are tools of imperialism, at best dupes, misled by imperialist tactics.

273. Indonesia's credentials in the fight against imperialism and colonialism in whatever form or manifestation are firmly enough established for us not to be bothered by innuendoes in the statements of some of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and

Add.1-3. We were one of the original founders of the Non-Aligned Movement, and our record, either as revolutionary fighters for our own freedom or as committed supporters of the fight for freedom of others, be it in Asia, Africa or Latin America, speaks for itself. Indonesia's position has always been guided by our conviction that each problem we face has to be evaluated on its merits. Indonesia's evaluation has always been and will continue to be based upon the principles to which we are committed, principles formulated for the first time at the Bandung Conference<sup>5</sup> and afterwards adopted and reformulated by the Non-Aligned Movement. And in the commitment to those principles, which include the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries, Indonesia is inseparably linked together with the other non-aligned countries. Our solidarity with the Non-Aligned Movement is based upon our freely and independently undertaken commitment to the same principles. With regard to their practical application, however, we reserve the right to use our own judgement, based upon the merits of each case. Indonesia is not prepared to be bound *a priori* by any view, from whatever source it may originate.

274. The case in favour of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, of which Indonesia is a sponsor together with many others, including non-aligned countries in South-East Asia like Malaysia and Singapore, can in fact rest with the statements which have already been made by its sponsors during the course of our debate. Those statements, made by the representatives of Thailand, Paraguay, Singapore, Japan, Fiji, Malaysia, Uruguay, the Philippines, New Zealand, Liberia, Australia, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Grenada, the United Kingdom and Barbados in my view have already effectively neutralized the arguments of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, aimed at recognizing the so-called Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia under the leadership of a deposed head of State who is living in exile.

275. It has been said that you may be able to convince the permanent representatives but you will not be able to change their vote. My delegation thinks that if anybody can be convinced he should be after hearing the views expressed by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, whose aims are to stop the fighting in Cambodia and to give the Khmer people the opportunity to solve the problem of leadership and government through peaceful negotiations. As for their vote, I leave it to their conscience.

276. Being a sponsor and representing a country closely situated to Cambodia, my delegation considers itself in duty bound to contribute to the debate.

277. At the twenty-eighth session, I had the opportunity to address the Assembly on the question of the Khmer representation.<sup>6</sup> I tried to explain the facts around the Khmer problem as my delegation saw them and continues to see them, in order that the Assembly, which is called to make a decision on the question of the representation of the Khmer people in the United Nations, will have a possibility of doing so on the basis of a balanced knowledge of the developments in Cambodia.

278. May I be permitted to remind the Assembly of some of those facts?

279. I should like to stress once again that there exists in the capital of Cambodia, in Phnom Penh, an indigenous Government, duly elected by the people in accordance with their own constitution. I should also like to underline the fact that Prince Sihanouk was deposed through procedures provided by a Constitution which came into being to accommodate the wishes of the Prince. When the two houses of the Cambodian Parliament unanimously decided to depose him as head of State and to appoint in his place Mr. Cheng Heng—at that time President of the National Assembly of Cambodia—the then existing Government under Prime Minister Lon Nol continued to remain in power. There has therefore never been a question of the constitutional Government of Cambodia being deprived of its right to represent Cambodia in this Organization. It is a fact that afterwards the Kingdom of Cambodia became the Khmer Republic through a popular vote. This is nothing special as so many kingdoms have become republics during the last 25 years, unless, of course, one has a special preference for royal governments over a republican régime. I should like to make it absolutely clear that recognition of a Government does not imply in any way agreement or disagreement with, let alone support for, its policies.

280. Some years ago it was claimed that 80 per cent of the population and 90 per cent of the territory were under the control of the Sihanouk forces, that it would just be a matter of time before they would occupy the whole country, including Phnom Penh, the capital. This claim was already made in 1970, long before last year's debate in the General Assembly. It was echoed last year by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. The same claim is now repeated. Apparently the sponsors are *plus Sihanoukist que Sihanouk*. They are more convinced of the success of the Sihanouk cause than Prince Sihanouk himself, who, a year ago in his interview with Allman which appeared in *The Guardian* of 18 September 1973, very frankly made the following statement:

“Lon Nol will be able to stay many years in Phnom Penh. Alas, we will not take Phnom Penh this year, nor next year, nor for many years”.

Prince Sihanouk emphasized further:

“At the moment we cannot take any major towns. I must be frank.”

281. Prince Sihanouk apparently knew the situation in Cambodia; he has been proven right. The forces of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia have not taken Phnom Penh. No major town has been taken; the contrary is true. The Khmer Government has succeeded in liberating some provincial towns; and the fact remains that Prince Sihanouk is still in exile. He has still not returned to Cambodia, 90 per cent of whose territory it is claimed is occupied by his forces. As far as the forces of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia are concerned, we still do not know where exactly it is functioning in spite of the claim of control of 90 per cent of the territory and 80 per cent of the population.

282. Indonesia's stand in the Khmer question is not dictated by considerations of like or dislike with regard to persons or systems, but mainly by our conviction

that principles are involved which, if not upheld, will create a precedent endangering not only individual countries but also undermining the United Nations. Let me stress once again that Indonesia, like the other countries of South-East Asia, sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, has nothing against Prince Sihanouk. Let him come back to Cambodia on the popular support he claims to have. Let the Khmer people express freely their decision to accept him as their leader in whatever capacity it may be—King, Prince, head of State, President—and Indonesia will have no difficulty in recognizing him as such. But why does the Prince not return to Cambodia? Why does he not stop the fighting and the killing among his people, and return to power on the strength of the popular support which is claimed to be his? Many Governments represented in this Assembly cannot boast of the support of 80 per cent of their people. It is evident that there must be some discrepancy between claim and reality.

283. The Assembly would have done well if it had accepted the invitation, extended by the Prime Minister of the Khmer Republic in his statement before the Assembly in the general debate [2263rd meeting, para. 33] and repeated yesterday by the Khmer Minister for Foreign Affairs when he addressed this Assembly, to send a fact-finding mission to Cambodia [2299th meeting, para. 35]. If that had taken place, the General Assembly would have been in a better position to evaluate the arguments presented to it by the opposing side. The question is now whether this Assembly is going to base its decision on such debatable claims as put forward by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. Let me state once again the view of my delegation that in any case, the General Assembly has no right to dictate which régime is going to represent Cambodia and the Khmer people in this Organization. It is for the Khmer people, and the Khmer people alone, to decide.

284. It will, indeed, be a mockery if the United Nations, which for the last 30 years has been prevented for one reason or another from getting involved in the Indo-China conflict, should now all of a sudden consider itself competent to intervene in Cambodia not to bring peace to the country but to impose a leadership and a Government on the Khmer people, which in reality means—and nobody can deny this—an encouragement for continued fighting and killing among the Khmers.

285. It is certainly not my intention to belittle in any way the seriousness and danger of the conflicts in the Middle East and in Cyprus, or the loss of life and the human suffering involved in both conflicts, when I remind this Assembly that the loss of human life, the amount of human suffering, has not been less in Indo-China compared with the Middle East and with Cyprus. Hundreds of thousands of people have died in Indo-China; people continue to die daily. Millions are maimed, displaced, and living in misery and despair. Yet the United Nations has all these years been forced to turn a blind eye to what is happening in Indo-China. My delegation is of the view that if the United Nations should now get itself involved in any part of Indo-China let that involvement be for the restoration of peace, for the healing of wounds, for assistance to the millions of victims of a war which

has lasted for more than a generation, for the lessening of their suffering and misery; and certainly not for encouraging continued bloodshed, which is against everything the Charter stands for.

286. Will it not be tragic if at the same time that our Organization is making every effort to stop the fighting in the Middle East and in Cyprus and to restore peace to those regions, calling upon the parties to negotiate, we are encouraging continued killing and bloodshed in Cambodia? Can it be because in the Middle East and in Cyprus the interest of the big Powers are directly involved and we are afraid that the fighting may develop into a global war that we are making every effort towards a peaceful solution in the Middle East and in Cyprus, exhorting the parties to negotiate? Would it not be cynical if the United Nations, on the other hand, were to encourage the fighting in Cambodia because in Cambodia there are only Khmers killing Khmers, and in our evaluation the possibility of the fighting there exploding into a global war is remote?

287. The sponsors who, apart from China, are thousands of miles away, may not have had the opportunity to study the Khmer problem as thoroughly as they should have. Some claim, however, that the countries of South-East Asia and the Pacific have forfeited their right even to contribute ideas on how to solve the Cambodian problem peacefully, but that they, countries thousands of miles away, have a better claim to impose a solution on the countries of the region.

288. Let me assure them that we, the neighbours of Cambodia, are directly and vitally affected by what is happening in the Khmer Republic and in Indo-China, like the Arab countries are directly and vitally affected by the Middle East problem and like the African countries are directly and vitally affected by the problem of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* on their doorstep. It is our view, the view of the countries of South-East Asia, that in finding solutions to problems like the Middle East, like colonialism and *apartheid* in southern Africa, we should primarily be guided by the views of our brothers in the region immediately and vitally affected by those problems. Our record in the United Nations is ample proof of that attitude. Of course, we have not done so expecting reciprocity, but we hope that our friends will at least try to take into account our considered views when they decide to assist us in trying to solve the problems of our region. This, I should like to emphasize, does not mean, as some speakers have contended, that they were to be excluded from the efforts to find a solution for problems outside their region. We do welcome and appreciate their concern for South-East Asia, especially as we know that they are facing many problems of their own in their regions. But we should like to see that concern expressed in a constructive manner in order to bring peace to the Khmer people and not to impose a leadership and a régime upon them which, as everybody knows, in reality means continued fighting and killing among Khmers, increased suffering and misery for the Khmer people.

289. My delegation strongly believes that all outside intervention aimed at worsening the Khmer tragedy should cease, and that every effort should be made to help the Khmer people solve their problems through

peaceful negotiations among themselves, if indeed we want to do something.

290. In this connexion may I refer the Assembly to the statement of the representative of Laos, when he spoke yesterday evening. He said:

“The conflict now rife in Cambodia pits one group of Cambodians against the other. In our understanding, this is strictly an internal affair.”  
[2299th meeting, para. 181.]

He should know, not only because his country is one of the closest neighbours of Cambodia, but because his country has passed through similar experiences during the last 25 years or more.

291. It is with these considerations in mind that Indonesia has joined the other countries, including those in the region, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. As a sponsor, my delegation would like to express its support for the request made earlier by other sponsors that priority be given to that draft resolution, that it be voted on before draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3.

292. We are gratified by the support of the countries of the Pacific, of America and Europe, which have joined us in sponsoring draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. It is a simple draft resolution, aimed at stopping the fighting, at trying to find a solution for the question of representation through peaceful negotiations among the indigenous parties and at giving them the opportunity to make their decision in peace. It is not a draft resolution intended to maintain the *status quo* in Cambodia.

293. A most dangerous precedent would be established if draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 were to be adopted by the Assembly, dangerous not only for the United Nations, but also for every one of us who one day might be confronted by the same situation as the one now prevailing in Cambodia. At every turn, all of us in this Organization have underlined in our statements the necessity for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the need to solve conflicts peacefully through negotiations. And yet what we are requested to do now is just the opposite—to take a decision in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, which forbid interference in the internal affairs of Member States, a decision whose only effect would be to continue the fighting and killing among the Khmers, to continue the suffering and hardship for the Khmer people.

294. All of us have been talking about how to make the United Nations more effective, and yet at the same time we are asked to undermine the very principles of the Charter, the scrupulous implementation of which is absolutely necessary if the United Nations is going to become more effective and more credible.

295. My delegation has listened with great interest to the statement made by the representative of Saudi Arabia [paras 7-12 above]. In his special manner he has reminded the Assembly of some truths which are worth pondering over. My delegation appreciates his good intentions in proposing amendments that are designed to avoid a confrontation. Those amendments, in our view, merit our serious consideration.

296. My delegation would like to appeal to the Assembly to call a halt to this effort to undermine the

effectiveness and the credibility of the United Nations, and appeal to those who in their statements have always insisted on a peaceful settlement of disputes to be true to themselves, and to those who do not want the United Nations to intervene in their internal affairs to oppose the move to make the United Nations do just that in the internal affairs of Cambodia.

297. In conclusion, my delegation would like to express publicly its appreciation and gratitude to Mr. Romulo, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines and a former President of the General Assembly, one of the most prominent statesmen of Asia and the world, for addressing this Assembly in person to be the interpreter of the deep feelings of the peoples of South-East Asia on the question of Cambodia and of our apprehensions with regard to the repercussions it may have on the United Nations itself. Indeed, the countries of South-East Asia do feel deeply about the Khmer problem—not less deeply than our Arab brothers feel about the Middle East question or our African brothers feel with regard to the problems of colonialism and racialism in their region.

298. Let the Assembly live up to its responsibilities to uphold the principles of the Charter. Let us do justice to the entire Khmer people. Let us not by our actions undermine the very structure of the United Nations. All of us, including those who are now apparently prepared to undermine it, may one day be in need of the Organization with its moral authority intact. I commend draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 for the massive support of the Members, together with our request for priority.

299. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has before it the following documents: first, draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, and proposed amendments thereto, which are contained in document A/L.744; secondly, draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 to which amendments have been proposed in document A/L.745. Thirdly, the letter of the Permanent Representative of Thailand [A/9875].

300. In order that our work may proceed smoothly, I propose to the Assembly that we proceed as follows. I shall first call upon those delegations who wish to speak on the request for priority contained in document A/9875, in accordance with the rules of procedure.

301. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): At this stage of our debate on Cambodia, the importance of which has been emphasized several times from this rostrum, it seemed to us that all of us here were simply engaged in awaiting with calm and dignity until the hour of truth strikes.

302. Unfortunately, ploys and manoeuvres have not been abandoned by certain parties who would wish to divert the attention of this Assembly from its major concerns. A request is before us, in direct contradiction of the rules and traditions of the Assembly, to carry indulgence to the point of reversing the order in which the Assembly should pronounce itself on the two draft resolutions submitted under item 25.

303. Rule 91 of the rules of procedure says that, if two or more proposals relate to the same question, the General Assembly shall vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. Of course, since the Assembly is the master of its rules of pro-

cedure, it can always decide otherwise; but there must be some pressing need or grounds for such action.

304. In the case of the question under discussion, we have before us two draft resolutions, one in document A/L.733 and Add.1-3, dated 1 October 1974, and one in document A/L.737/Rev.1, dated 13 November 1974. The first draft resolution is sponsored by 37 delegations, and the second by 23. Draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, with 37 sponsors, was not merely submitted before the second draft resolution, but submits, in the same words, the draft resolution on which the Assembly was to pronounce itself on 5 December 1973, at its twenty-eighth session, if a decision for adjournment had not been taken at that time.<sup>7</sup>

305. Therefore, the dual priority of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 is further borne out by the very wording of item 25, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations". We must not forget that that is precisely the item we are discussing. This Assembly should seek no type of action other than an action in accordance with the wording of item 25 itself when it was put on the agenda.

306. Of course, we are not at all opposed to the notions contained in draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. Like the sponsors of that draft resolution, we realize that the situation in Cambodia is of concern to all Member States of the United Nations, and that the Khmer people should be able to resolve its own political affairs without foreign intervention. We recognize that.

307. As for putting an end to the martyrdom and the sufferings of the Cambodian people, the 23 sponsors know that it is not just to this Assembly that one must address oneself if one wishes to achieve this. Everyone knows that it is the United States which is behind the nightmare the Khmer people has been experiencing. Was it not President Nixon who, in December 1970, eight months after the intervention of American armed forces in Cambodia, said: "The commitment of the United States in Cambodia is probably the best American investment in the sphere of foreign assistance"?

308. The indulgence shown by this Assembly on 5 December 1973 vis-à-vis those who regard themselves as the gendarmes of the world has, in effect, been tantamount to encouraging them to continue their aggressive interference in the affairs of other States.

309. We have noted that among the 23 sponsors of the draft resolution are those countries which are the very ones that serve as bases for the American bomber forces which have tried in vain to reduce the towns and villages of Cambodia to rubble. None of those sponsors has ever spoken out in protest against the blind and terrible bombing to which Cambodia has been subjected over these last four years and which, in the first half of 1973, reached a barely credible level of savagery and intensity.

310. Since 5 December 1973, the date on which the Assembly suspended its debate on Cambodia, none of those who offer to lend their good offices has said or done anything likely to bring peace to that part of the world. The sad, tragic truth is that the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 would like to repeat their feat of last year by having the United Nations



once again abandon its consideration of such an urgent and important issue. To postpone a decision once again on the question of Cambodia—because that is really what is at issue—would certainly prolong the agony of the illegal puppet government of Phnom Penh, but it would also exacerbate the terrible sufferings of the heroic people of Cambodia and thereby encourage the American aggressor to continue its imperialistic policies of hegemony not only in Indo-China but in other parts of the world.

311. Yesterday it was Cyprus, tomorrow it will be one, two or three other small countries, which will once more find themselves the victims of these bloody policies of international banditry. We can ask ourselves now, "Whose turn is it next?"

312. When taking the floor here this morning [2300th meeting], the Permanent Representative of the United States told us that the problem of Cambodia should be of concern only to the countries that are neighbours of Cambodia. He named them, forgetting the main ones, of course, that is, the countries of Indo-China: the People's Republic of North Viet Nam, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet Nam and even Laos, which are without any doubt those most directly concerned and whose views on the matter are hardly likely to be the same as his.

313. The representative of the United States criticized one Asian country, a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, by saying that that country is sponsoring a draft resolution on Cambodia when it is 3,000 kilometres away. But what about the United States? Where is the United States—two kilometres away perhaps? The United States, which is situated more than 10,000 kilometres away from Cambodia, can intervene militarily in that country, although other countries are not even entitled to deplore the crimes and sufferings that are now being inflicted on the Khmer people.

314. The needs of international collective security entitle all Member States to raise their voices whenever justice and the freedoms of peoples are flouted. We are told that Sihanouk is not in Phnom Penh and that, if he did go back there, it is not certain that peace would be restored. I shall not go into that. What I can say is that Lon Nol has been in Phnom Penh for the last four years and peace has not yet been restored. And that is a fact. Let us restore the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, presided over by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, and then see whether between now and the thirtieth session peace has been restored.

315. As to the form of government that Cambodia should adopt, we say, and we repeat here, that for us that is not the question. It is not for the United Nations to impose on Cambodia any particular form of government. The Cambodian people itself has already made its choice. It has chosen once and for all and bravely. The stubbornness and determination with which that heroic people has struggled for four years against the aggression of one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful, countries in the world is surely the most irrefutable and clear-cut reply which can be given to those who call in question the choice made by the Cambodian people.

316. I have already described the reasons why I am not surprised to see Thailand at the head of the sponsors of the 23-Power draft resolution. That country serves as a base for the United States Air Force, which has been bombing Cambodia for the last four years. I must add that the case of Japan is not surprising either. I recall the desperate efforts made by that delegation four years ago to persuade the Members of the United Nations of the necessity of continuing to assert that the representatives of 800 million Chinese were to be found in Formosa and in the person of Chiang Kai-shek, the chief of State that they had defeated. Most of the sponsors of the 23-Power draft resolution are the same ones who for 25 years argued that the People's Republic of China did not belong in the United Nations. Most of the sponsors of the 23-Power draft resolution are the same ones who fought to the bitter end to oppose the restoration of the rights of that great country. Among those delegations, again, we find those very few countries which opposed the proposal that the spokesmen of the Palestinian resistance be heard in this hall. Those same countries are the ones which still do not want to admit that the presence of the Pretoria racists in this Organization is a source of shame for the Organization. Those are the same delegations which last year voted against the fact of the existence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

317. Likewise, we are surprised to find the delegation of the United Kingdom among the 23 sponsors, when that country has just taken a diametrically opposite position on Cyprus by denouncing, not without courage, the aggression committed against that small country, and is maintaining its confidence in Archbishop Makarios, the President of the legal Government of Cyprus.

318. Speaking from this rostrum a short while ago, the representative of the United Kingdom said:

"But whether Prince Sihanouk is in Peking or Algiers is immaterial. What is relevant to our consideration of this item is the fact that he is not in Phnom Penh . . ." [Para 172 above.]

I put the following question to the representative of the United Kingdom in the light of his remarks: Where is Archbishop Makarios now? Is he in Nicosia? Yet the United Kingdom continues none the less to place its trust in Archbishop Makarios. I will not reproach it for that, because my delegation and my country also believe that the lawful head of the Government of Cyprus continues to be Archbishop Makarios.

319. We have become used to expecting more discernment from the British Government. It is true that there are no British bases in Cambodia, but I refuse to believe the other reason which springs to mind, that Cyprus is in fact a European country and Cambodia is an Asian country and under-developed.

320. The Cambodian tragedy is sufficiently grave for this Assembly to refuse to lend itself to sordid procedural manoeuvres that are not to the credit of either their movers or the Organization. I realize that those who request priority consideration for a draft resolution that would merely postpone a solution to this pressing problem are relying on a lack of will on the part of certain delegations, which would seize the opportunity given them to shirk their responsibilities.

But I am convinced that no delegation in this hall will fall into that trap.

321. Two draft resolutions have been submitted on this item. We must consider them calmly and fairly, in accordance with the order of priority stipulated by our own rules of procedure. We owe at least this fairness to the memory of those who gave their lives in defence of the freedom and dignity of their martyred people.

322. Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia): The motion to give priority to the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1 over our draft resolution, document A/L.733 and Add.1-3, is unwarranted and unfair because it tends, first, to disrupt the orderly proceedings of the Assembly by arbitrarily attempting to deny our draft, the draft of 37 sponsors, its rightful place, and its priority established in good time; and, secondly, in effect it postpones once more, as last year, the Assembly's debate and decision on this urgent matter. Let us be quite clear what it really means.

323. The other draft resolution is a simple device for postponement of the decision for one more year. It has no substance as it asks what its sponsors know full well to be irrelevant, for no one is going to talk to the Lon Nol group, which represents nobody. So, the only result would be one more year of the same.

324. In short, in opposing most strenuously this ill-conceived and ill-timed move, we ask this Assembly to reject it, to adhere to the regular procedure and to the fair application of the rules. This Assembly should not have the normal conduct of its work thwarted by unreasonable requests. Consequently, let us vote on the proposals in their established and regular order.

325. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to express support of the request for priority made in the letter from the representatives of Thailand [A/9875]. At this stage of the debate, I do not wish to speak at length, but only to make a few brief remarks on the motivation which leads us to support this request for priority.

326. Draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, which my delegation is honoured to sponsor, is one of conciliation and equity. It does not embody the triumph of one thesis over another. If we have requested priority, it is simply from a desire to avoid making this body vote first on a draft resolution that would make the General Assembly an instrument for collective intervention. We have explained during the debate that we do not think that is the mission of the United Nations.

327. Therefore, in the light of the intransigence that characterizes draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, we have submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly a text that promotes and fosters good offices, gives the Khmer people an opportunity to solve their problems and tries to offer, with United Nations assistance, the best possible solution conducive to understanding between both parties.

328. We desire for the Khmer people a peace without victors or vanquished and we do not want to arrive at it through manoeuvres, as was recently stated by one of the speakers who preceded me here, but rather in an absolutely clear and proper way—through a letter that was distributed to everyone and whose intent I hope I have made clear in this brief statement.

329. Mr. INGLES (Philippines): My delegation supports the request submitted by the representative of Thailand in document A/9875, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, that that draft resolution be given priority over any other draft resolution.

330. My delegation respectfully submits that priority between two or more proposals does not, and should not be made to, depend solely on the order in which the proposals have been submitted. If priority did depend solely on the order of submission, it would not have been necessary to adopt rule 91 of our rules of procedure. Rule 91 qualifies the rule that proposals should be voted upon in the order in which they have been submitted by the phrase "unless it [*the Assembly*] decides otherwise". Obviously rule 91 contemplates cases where following the fortuitous order of the submission of draft resolutions would be illogical or impractical.

331. My delegation believes that in the circumstances the nature and the substance of the proposals should be taken into account; indeed, they should be the controlling factor.

332. In the present case we have, on the one hand, draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, which would, without much ado, recognize the Royal Government of National Union, presided over by Prince Sihanouk, as the lawful representative of the Cambodian people. We have, on the other hand, draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, which would caution the General Assembly not to take precipitate action on the matter but to enlist the aid of the Secretary-General to assist the indigenous parties to settle their differences by and between themselves, without outside interference.

333. Clearly, if we adopted draft-resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 right away, apart from the fact that it is illegal and *ultra vires* it would not stop the fighting in Cambodia. That is crystal clear. On the contrary, it would encourage or lead to further bitter fighting in Cambodia and would prolong the tragic suffering of its unhappy people. At the same time, we would have thrown away a golden opportunity for the Secretary-General to perform a function inherent in his position, to permit the peaceful settlement of disputes.

334. My delegation therefore appeals to this Assembly to give the Secretary-General the precious opportunity to assist the parties to come to a peaceful settlement. That would be in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and with the valuable tradition initiated by Trygve Lie and followed by Dag Hammarskjöld, by U Thant and now by Mr. Kurt Waldheim, to make available the high office and prestige of the Secretary-General to promote, assist and encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes.

335. Hence, my delegation hopes that the Assembly will decide to give priority to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. If the Secretary-General should not succeed, there will be time enough for the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 to resubmit their proposal. But let it not be said that the United Nations was put to the test and found wanting, because it was blinded by passion, because it chose not to take the path of conciliation but, on the contrary, to pursue the

road to continued strife. That way lies a crisis of confidence for the United Nations.

336. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I see that the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak. I shall call on him, but I would ask representatives to inscribe their names on the list of speakers sufficiently in advance so that we can organize our work and so that I can conduct the proceedings with the objectivity expected of me by the Assembly, which has placed its confidence in me.

337. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): For your information, Mr. President, I did not place my name on the list of speakers because it is not my habit to prefabricate speeches. I listen very attentively to what my colleagues have to say about any question, both pro and con, and then I decide whether I should address myself to that question.

338. I have spent a lot of time during this session, and particularly yesterday, trying to devise a way in which we could act to save peace in South-East Asia. We have seen what happened in Viet Nam. We have seen what happened in Korea between 1950 and 1953. Any house which is divided against itself is bound to fall. The United Nations is one of those houses. This Assembly is divided against itself.

339. Very frankly, those who count noses, or votes, have, if I may say so, told me that the proponents of the draft resolutions are running like horses, neck and neck, as if it were a race, and that people are almost gambling on who will win. Is that not shameful, gambling here—"Who do you think will win? Who do you think will win?"—setting aside the agony and the suffering of the Cambodian people. This is what drove me to submit identical amendments to both draft resolutions. Nobody can say Baroody is manoeuvring so that one party will win and the other party will lose. I did not consult with anyone in submitting my amendments, and, God is my witness, my purpose was to bridge the differences and give the United Nations a chance, in accordance with the provisions of this Charter, which I personally saw signed in San Francisco.

340. And what does the Charter say? Are we acting in conformity with the provision of the Charter that appears in the very first paragraph of the Preamble:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war"

and then later in that paragraph:

"to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends, to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength"—

"unite our strength", not "split our strength"—

"to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples".

341. Are we having a race here with votes, as to which draft resolution will win and which one will have priority? Is that not shameful, in the light of what I have

just now read to you to recall to your minds that provision of the Charter? Or is the Charter, like holy books, being set aside, with the ceremony of voting on whether or not a particular one should be accorded priority being observed instead? This is nothing but a ritual. Are we to pay attention to the ritual, or to the Charter? "We the peoples", not "Governments". "We, the peoples of the United Nations". We saw to it at San Francisco that we did not say "We, the Governments", because Governments are expendable and they may be under pressure. And who can assure us that the Government of Sihanouk or the Government of Lon Nol is not under pressure? They are under pressure. This is why I introduced my amendments to the two draft resolutions, because both of them are deficient. They see only their personal interests—perhaps inadvertently, perhaps subconsciously. They forget that we are here "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom".

342. What will be the result of either of those draft resolutions as they are now, without being amended? What will be the result? Continued strife. And who will pay? The Government of China or the Government of the United States? Perhaps they will pay money—I do not know—but who will pay in life and treasure? The Cambodian people, just as the Korean people, has paid a stiff price and may pay still more in life and treasure unless we come to some sensible solution. Who told the great Stalin and the great Truman to draw an imaginary line, now known as the 38th parallel, that divided a single people on ideological grounds? As if we have not learned a hard lesson from what happened in Korea and what subsequently happened in Viet Nam, we are now committing the same error of compartmentalizing ourselves on the basis of ideology or of petty national interests. No one dared open his mouth this morning. I was waiting to see whether my amendments would draw forth some comments; even if anyone was against them, he should say so. They are factual. But no one, nobody of either camp, opened his mouth.

343. Are you afraid of my amendments? Declare forthwith, if I may say so, you, the delegation of China, and you, the delegation of the United States. Dare you declare, "We accept Baroody's amendments", and bridge the gap and finish with this question on a peaceful note, instead of trying to insult one another by bringing Archbishop Makarios into the scene, and bases? Who does not have bases? My good friend from Senegal, I do not want to open this matter; but if you want to open it, I would remind you that I had been speaking about those bases before Senegal was elected a Member of this Organization. We told the people who wanted bases to get out. But sometimes it is not easy to tell them to get out. Let us not confuse the issues. Let us behave with singleness of mind, instead of gabbling about priorities, instead of getting submerged in ritual and ceremony, while the code of ethics, the moral code, goes begging by the wayside.

344. Anything that does not lead to peace or at least give peace a chance should be anathema in this Assembly.

345. Is it too much, Mr. President, before you put anything to a vote, procedural or otherwise, to ask whether either of the two parties—because there are two parties—accepts my amendments? I think that if

the sponsors of the two draft resolutions accept those amendments, there will be no problem. What is the alternative? The alternative is continued war, and there will be a curse on the heads of those who opt for strife rather than for giving peace another chance.

346. I formally request you, Mr. President, just to say, as our President: "Before you vote on anything, even before you vote on priority, I have a request from Baroody"—I am doing this directly, of course, but I will do it through you—"does anyone have any comment as to whether these amendments may be accepted and thereby resolve our problem?"

347. I mentioned the Royal Government of National Union of Prince Sihanouk; I mentioned the Government of the Khmer Republic; I did not bypass the special interests of the major Powers either. But give this house a chance to work towards peace instead of trying to see who wins. Go to the race course here—or you can have off-track betting—but here in the corridors do not bet on which party will win.

348. A house divided against itself will fall. I warned you; and if, though God forbid, something happens, at least I will have the satisfaction when the roof comes down on our heads—and I am ready to die with you—of knowing that I will die with a clear conscience.

349. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We are now in the process of considering document A/9875, submitted by the representative of Thailand to the United Nations. Rule 88 of the rules of procedure says quite explicitly in its last sentence that:

"The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

I repeat:

"The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

I shall therefore put to the vote immediately document A/9875. I call upon the representative of Thailand on a point of order.

350. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): I hope you will bear with me, Mr. President. I shall not take much of your time, Sir, but I am sure that you and all representatives present here must be fully and thoroughly aware of the very strong feelings and views of the South-East Asian delegations and Governments on the question of Cambodia. I had not intended to speak. I listened attentively to the statements made by the representatives of Senegal, Algeria, Uruguay and the Philippines; and the representative of Saudi Arabia was given the opportunity to express some of his views concerning the amendments he submitted this morning.

351. As I understand it, what I am going to say in a few minutes relates to conduct of the voting under rule 88 of the rules of procedure.

352. The amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia this morning caught us by surprise. We understand his motives, of course. His intention is to try to bridge the differences, basic differences between the two groups of sponsors. He attempted to reconcile those differences and to restore peace and tranquillity not only to the Assembly but

also to the territory of the Khmer Republic, and particularly to its people.

353. The sponsors of our draft resolution [A/L.737/Rev.1] have had the opportunity of studying carefully his amendments, contained in document A/L.745. Since the representative of Saudi Arabia has come to the rostrum and categorically, and in no uncertain terms, put the question to both groups of sponsors, I should like now, Mr. President, to respond to his kind request. I should like also to respond to him in the spirit of friendliness and co-operation.

354. I would merely say, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, that we look upon his amendments with favour, and in principle we would be prepared to accept them.

355. I should like to say just a few further words. I had inscribed my name as a speaker to explain the position of my delegation and perhaps that of other sponsors in regard to the amendments proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, as well as on draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. I hope, Sir, I shall be given another opportunity to reinforce the support that I have in principle expressed to the representative of Saudi Arabia.

356. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before calling on the representative of Senegal, may I draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that it will have to take a decision first on document A/9875 before considering draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 and the amendments thereto [A/L.744].

357. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): After what you have said, Mr. President, perhaps I should have waived my right to speak, but I merely wished to draw the attention of the representative of Saudi Arabia to the fact that amendments cannot be considered until the proposal to which they refer is considered. Now, at present we are considering the matter of priority. After we have decided this we shall then consider the proposals that have been made, and the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 will then be able to express their views on the amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

358. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the request in document A/9875, submitted by the representative of Thailand, that priority in the voting should be given to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. The representative of Senegal has requested a roll-call vote.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany (Federal Republic of), Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti,



Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia.

*Against:* Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic.

*Abstaining:* Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burma, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon.

*The request in document A/9875 that priority in the voting should be given to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 was adopted by 58 votes to 56, with 20 abstentions.*

359. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now pronounce itself on the amendments submitted by the delegation of Saudi Arabia in document A/L.745. First, I call upon the representative of Thailand.

360. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank you for the impartiality that you have shown in the conduct of the proceedings this afternoon on a very important question. You were good enough, Sir, to give me the floor about half an hour ago to say a few words in response to a certain delegation which had spoken before me. I should like to express my deep appreciation to you, Sir, for allowing me that opportunity.

361. Secondly, the General Assembly has just voted on a very important aspect of the question of Cambodia under item 25. I should like to express, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, our appreciation of the very strong and unequivocal support that 58 delegations have found it possible to give to reinforce the course of justice and fair play and to support the course of constructive reconciliation and pacific settlement of political conflict. We should like to thank those 58 delegations who have placed the principles of the Charter over and above political interests or ideology. We thank them also for the genuine concern they have expressed by their votes for the well-being of the people of Cambodia.

362. Earlier I had the opportunity of responding to a very conciliatory message given to the Assembly this morning by my good and learned colleague, Mr. Baroody of Saudi Arabia. He made a very eloquent statement outlining his delegation's views on the principles of self-determination and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States. Mr. Baroody, in his long and distinguished career at the United Nations, has always adhered to the principles and purposes of the Charter. As I said earlier, the representative of Saudi

Arabia, as I understand it, attempts to reconcile the basic differences between the two groups of sponsors. In fact, he tries to promote not only peaceful settlement between the two parties of sponsors in the Assembly, but also a peaceful settlement of the conflict in my part of the world. We, the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, respect his motives and are ready to co-operate with the delegation of Saudi Arabia in its effort to bridge the differences of the two groups of sponsors.

363. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, of which Thailand is one, have studied the Saudi Arabian amendments as contained in document A/L.745. We have studied them very carefully. Earlier I did take the liberty of speaking on behalf of the sponsors and saying that we would accept in principle the amendments aforementioned. I must confess that while we were studying the amendments this afternoon, there was some element in them which caused us some difficulty and concern. And yet we took into account the fact that the delegation of Saudi Arabia could not be expected to submit amendments which would fully satisfy our side alone. Therefore, in a spirit of compromise and co-operation, the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 have authorized me to announce that we would agree—perhaps with some reluctance—to the amendments of Saudi Arabia as contained in document A/L.745.

364. We should, however, like to express our hope and our wish that the representative of Saudi Arabia, having gone half-way, as we have tried to do, would kindly consider one very minor suggestion in addition to his amendments—the text of a paragraph which, with due respect to the representative of Saudi Arabia, I should like to suggest as an additional operative paragraph, which would become operative paragraph 3 in his amendments [A/L.745], and would perhaps read something like this:

“Decides not to press for any further action until Member States have an opportunity to examine the report of the Secretary-General.”

This additional paragraph does not differ basically from the amendments proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, and yet we feel that its addition would clarify the situation and make his amendments clearer to the General Assembly.

365. We, the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, are trying our best to meet him half-way. We should like to express our hope that the representative of Saudi Arabia will consider our minor subamendment, as read out by me, in a spirit of friendliness and harmony. Naturally, if the representative of Saudi Arabia finds no difficulty or inconvenience in accepting our proposal as read out and finds it possible to incorporate the new paragraph as operative paragraph 3 in his amendments, then on behalf of the sponsors I can state categorically that such a procedure would save the time, not to speak of the money, of the United Nations and would also help to facilitate the smooth proceedings that we have been engaged in tonight. We, the sponsors, plead with him to find his way clear to accepting our proposal and to including it in his amendments and we will give full and unequivocal support to the amendments as proposed by him.

366. While I am speaking I should like to take just another minute more of the Assembly's time. I need hardly stress again the importance that we, the 200 million people of South-East Asia, attach to this question of Cambodia. We seek justice. We do not seek an imposed decision from outside. It is the people of Cambodia themselves who have to live with the decision of the United Nations. Decisions in the United Nations cannot change the realities in the field. We who live in New York, in other parts of Asia, Latin America, or Africa, for that matter, can take a decision lightly because we do not have to live with that decision or with the consequences of any unjust decision that we might be tempted to pass in this General Assembly.

367. Mr. GUTIÉRREZ MACÍAS (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation I should like to request a separate vote on paragraph 4 of the amendments submitted by the delegation of Saudi Arabia in document A/L.745. I also request a separate vote on the paragraph that has just been proposed by the representative of Thailand, if it is put to the vote.

368. Mr. NAÇO (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Albania firmly opposes draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. In my statement yesterday afternoon in the General Assembly [2299th meeting], I emphasized that the United States is hiding behind the sponsors of this draft resolution and actually invented this draft.

369. We must emphasize once again that this draft resolution is intended to defend the intervention and aggression of the United States in Cambodia and to use the United Nations in order to interfere in the internal affairs of Cambodia. Behind the smoke-screen of non-intervention in the internal affairs of Cambodia, the authors of this draft resolution have done everything possible to conceal the fundamental fact that the question of Cambodia was created only by the intervention and aggression of the United States as well as to conceal the truth that the United States is even now continuing its intervention and to carry on its aggression in Cambodia. What is more, this draft resolution actually calls for legalizing that intervention and aggression.

370. Some have openly sought to have us believe that they have always been concerned with the sufferings of the people of Cambodia. The truth cannot be concealed by such declarations. Everyone knows who has really supplied the so-called special forces and the so-called regular forces to participate in the dirty war of aggression of the United States against Cambodia and all of Indo-China. Everybody knows who has provided the military bases for the United States. Everybody knows who provided logistical support for the aggressive forces of the United States, thus deriving enormous profits from the war. Everybody also knows that those countries are among the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. Nor have they put an end to their activities. These facts are sufficient to prove their duplicity in speech and action as well as their sheer hypocrisy. These facts also are sufficient to prove that draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 was submitted purely and simply to serve the policy of ongoing aggression and intervention by the United States in Cambodia.

371. Quite obviously, to adopt this draft resolution would mean to encourage intervention and aggression by American imperialism against an independent, sovereign and non-aligned country as well as being a grave violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter. Peace-loving countries that uphold justice must not tolerate that. We believe that all these countries will categorically reject this draft resolution.

372. Furthermore, the delegation of Albania is opposed to the amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

373. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes very briefly—because actually very few words are needed for this—to explain the vote it will cast in connexion with document A/L.737/Rev.1, which has been called a draft resolution by some countries.

374. Before doing so, we wish to make it perfectly clear that our delegation understands that we have already come to the stage of explanations of vote on this document. I say this because we are witnessing a repetition of an old story, a story that was acted out in almost identical stages in this same Assembly hall three years ago.

375. I have before me a document containing the verbatim record of the 1976th meeting of the General Assembly, held on the afternoon of Monday, 25 October 1971, starting at 3 p.m. and ending—I hope that we shall be more fortunate this time—at 11.25 p.m.<sup>8</sup>

376. Then, too, there was a discussion and vote on priorities; then, too, there were amendments; then, too, the Assembly witnessed the same attempt to prevent a decision from being taken on the substantive draft resolution on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

377. In this same Assembly hall, practically the same facts and events as those that took place on that historic night have recurred. Indeed, many of the same personalities are present. I notice only two absences: Mr. Bush of the United States, who carried out such tireless efforts of all kinds on that night, with many interventions made as though they were points of order, and a certain Mr. Liu. Mr. Liu has not been present in this hall for some time, nor does the régime that he represented occupy any seat in the United Nations. It so happens, according to what I have read in the press, that Mr. Bush is now in Peking.

378. We are invited tonight to follow the same procedure whose results and practical application will one day also be contained in a document such as this. My delegation does not wish to fatigue the memory of any of those present in this hall, but we affirm with pride that today we can look back to what happened here three years ago and be fully satisfied. Let representatives remember that one day in the future what we do here today will go down in history in a document like this. There will be recorded the desperate efforts of some to confuse the Assembly, to hamper the presentation of facts as they really are. History will record the desperate efforts of some to complicate the procedural development of the meeting, and there also will be the record of the vote of each and every one. In the future not everyone will be satisfied with the way in which he acted on this occasion, just as I am

convinced that not everyone would be prepared to repeat now what he did earlier in regard to the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

379. Having said this, I affirm that my delegation will vote against the document that carries the symbol A/L.737/Rev.1, which some representatives have presented as though it were a draft resolution, basically, among other reasons because, as they are very well aware, it is not a draft resolution. It is simply an attempt to prevent this Assembly from approving the only draft resolution it has before it, which is essentially the same as the only draft resolution that it had before it a year ago and that could not be voted on then because lengthy procedural manoeuvres were started to prevent us from taking the only just decision there was to take. Those manoeuvres are being resumed tonight in the motion made earlier concerning the so-called priority of this document, which is an anti-draft-resolution to the only draft resolution we have before us. Since the only practical effect of this document is to prevent the General Assembly from taking now the decision it should take—and this is stated twice in the document, so that there should be no doubt about it—my delegation must categorically oppose it. One of the preambular paragraphs states that the United Nations should not take any action on the question, and it is claimed that this idea is part of the draft resolution on an item which specifically refers to who should represent Cambodia in this Organization. Operative paragraph 3 repeats the same thing: “decides not to take any other action until the results of these efforts are considered by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session”. The only practical effort of the so-called draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1 is to maintain here the spurious régime of Phnom Penh and maintain there the dirty United States intervention against the Cambodian people, with the generous help of some distinguished sponsors of the so-called draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1.

380. We believe that we should not continue to repeat the sad history of 22 years relating to the lawful rights of China, but that we should look forward to that hour, which was rather late, of that night when the General Assembly defeated one by one every manoeuvre of imperialism that was preventing it from taking just action.

381. We therefore repeat that we shall vote against this document, as we shall therefore also vote against all the amendments submitted in regard to it. We appeal to all representatives to adopt a similar attitude, which is the only way to prevent this new manoeuvre directed exclusively at preventing the General Assembly from pronouncing itself on the only draft resolution before it, the only one that we can with justice adopt, in order to resolve the problem we had already decided to consider at this session.

382. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): My delegation has listened very attentively to the debate on this issue but, as many representatives will have noticed, it has conspicuously refrained from participating. On the other hand, I consider it incumbent upon us to explain the reason why we shall abstain on all the draft resolutions in this debate.

383. While doing so, I am sure that our colleagues in the non-aligned group will understand that Nigeria

has a special reason as a member of the non-aligned group, in the special circumstances of hard personal experience, for taking the line that it has decided to take. We believe by the very nature of the non-aligned group that allows freedom of action for its members, that it will be quite in order and consistent with that policy that we should not go all the way with some of the members of the non-aligned group.

384. Nigeria speaks from experience since it has had a bloody civil war, which confers on it a special experience we would not wish on our worst enemy. In this regard, I think we must be true to ourselves and to our consciences. I recall with a very heavy heart at this particular moment, with the body of U Thant lying in state at this very hour, how during our time of travail he supported the cause of maintaining one Nigeria. I am reminded of Polonius' words of advice to his son in *Hamlet* when he says, among other things:

“This above all: to thine own self be true,  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man.”

385. The Nigerian civil war was won many times over on the pages of *The New York Times* and other similar-minded media. And many attempts, even by supposedly friendly States which attempted to internationalize the Nigerian problem, were contained by the astuteness and integrity of U Thant. Such attempts were resisted successfully and contained.

386. For we believe that every developing country—and indeed some of the developed countries—has a skeleton in its closet. It was Nigeria in 1967-1970. It is Cambodia, or the Khmer Republic, today. Who knows who it will be tomorrow?

387. My delegation has been instructed to abstain on all the draft resolutions in this matter because we feel that there is a question mark in our minds as to whether this Organization has given itself sufficient time to take a decision on the best possible course that would be in the best interests of the greatest majority of the people concerned and by the people concerned. We regret that so long as that question mark exists in our minds we have no alternative but to abstain on the draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

388. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I should have been more gratified if at one time my good friend and colleague from Thailand had said that he would accept the amendments without the word “reluctantly”. But I presume he had to consult with the other sponsors and it is not an unusual reservation to say “reluctantly” at a certain juncture.

389. My good friend from Thailand said that they would accept my amendments. By that I understood that they would be incorporated in the draft resolution of which he is a sponsor, provided certain elucidations were made, which he read out, and which I jotted down, as to the constitution of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution of which he is a sponsor. The wording as I jotted it down—and I stand to be corrected—is:

“Decides not to press for any further action until Member States have an opportunity to examine the report of the Secretary-General.”

I thought that that wording was implied by operative paragraph 2 of my amendment [A/L.745, para. 7] which states:

“Requests the Secretary-General, after due consultation, to lend appropriate assistance to the two contending parties claiming lawful rights in Cambodia and to report on the results to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.”

But, for some reason, it seems that the representative of Thailand and the sponsors of the draft resolution in question wanted to make sure that there would not be varying interpretations of the operative paragraph 2 that I have just read.

390. My colleague from Thailand mentioned that they would meet me half-way if I would meet them half-way. I will meet them more than half-way if the purpose of my amendments—as I understand it—is incorporated now in their draft resolution, for no other reason than that I hope they may—I am not saying they will—clear the atmosphere between the two contending Governments and enable them to come to an understanding and to see that the people of Cambodia do not suffer. Therefore, my amendments having been incorporated, with my acceptance of this additional paragraph, they are now the property of the sponsors of the draft resolution in question.

391. However, I do appeal to my colleague from Mexico not to ask for separate votes. I spent so much time to try to have something of integral value. Of all people, my good friend from Mexico, no doubt for a good reason—perhaps a technical reason—for heaven's sake, although I may not be a good painter—in fact I do not paint—do not take a leg off the horse. It will limp. You are not cutting off the head of the horse. Do not even touch the ear of the horse because, it might be in pain. I do not wish to say I insist, but I appeal to everyone and more so to my colleague from Mexico, not to tamper any more with texts at this late hour. If they do, I will reopen the debate—and that is not a threat—and let us stay here until 4 o'clock in the morning until those who want to daub the painting with something will not know the difference between one colour and another.

392. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): As we have seen, the General Assembly has just decided by 58 votes to 56, with 20 abstentions, to vote as a matter of priority on draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1—disregarding the fact that the draft resolution now before the Assembly as document A/L.733 and Add.1-3 had been submitted to the Assembly at the twenty-eighth session<sup>9</sup> and, moreover, not taking into account the fact that, of the two draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Assembly this year, only draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 fully corresponds to the title of the item under discussion. In addition, no account has been taken of the fact that it is draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 which was presented by those who asked that the item be inscribed on the agenda. But we take note of the Assembly's decision on its merits

393. I should like to thank warmly all the delegations that voted against the request for priority submitted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. I thank them and I congratulate them, not just because their position was favourable to our draft

resolution, nor just because their attitude is a manifestation of authentic democracy in this house—a democracy that some would have liked to stifle through the procedural manoeuvres that have been fashionable in this Assembly for some years. But when one witnesses in the corridors of this hall, as you and I have, all the attempts at bringing pressure to bear on Members of the Organization, when one realizes the full range of means that are brought into play to impose a certain attitude on various delegations, I would say that all those which resisted those pressures today and which were courageous enough today to say what they thought deserve our thanks—and not just the thanks of the group of sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. In my opinion they deserve the thanks of all the Members of this Organization, because it is since countries like them have had the courage of their convictions, because countries like them have dared to stand up to intimidation and threats, that we have really become worthy of our independence. I reiterate my great admiration for them and my thanks to them.

394. Now let us revert to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. Of course I could simply say that we will vote against it, and no one would be surprised to hear me say so because it would be thought that, since we ourselves had put a draft resolution before the Assembly for its approval, it would be natural that we should be opposed to any other draft resolution. But that would be an oversimplification of our position. I must expand a little on our reasons. After listening to a number of statements today in which various professors of morality, themselves lacking morality, have come here to tell us the meaning of non-alignment, and to define for our benefit what a non-aligned country is, I think they would have been much better advised to have tried to define for themselves and others what an independent country is, a country which has self-respect and knows what it is saying.

395. On behalf of my delegation and on behalf of those delegations which have associated themselves with us in submitting draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, I should like to say in a little more detail why we continue to be opposed to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, although certain speakers have come here and argued that that draft resolution would save the people of Cambodia, put an end to their suffering and end their sacrifices. I would prefer not to get into this system of reasoning, which would have everyone believe that the more or less sincere protagonists of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 are the defenders of mankind, and that those opposing that draft resolution are people with diabolical ulterior motives who would disregard utterly the will and well-being of a people now writhing in a tragedy which we were the first to bring to the notice of this Assembly.

396. Where were these benefactors of mankind, who are now shedding tears over the distress of the Cambodian people, before we had the question of Cambodia inscribed on the agenda of this Assembly? Why did they not come here sooner and ask this Assembly to take into account the suffering of the Cambodian people? Why did they not come and ask all of us here to stretch out a hand of brotherhood to the people of Cambodia and to urge the rival factions to negotiate and find some arrangement that would put an end to the



misfortune of the Cambodian people? It took a very long time for their philanthropic sentiments to come to the surface, it seems to me. And when they describe the text of their draft resolution as being capable of replacing the language of confrontation by that of fraternity in Cambodia, we cannot believe them, because their draft resolution, both in its substance and in its form, means one thing and one thing only: maintaining the present state of affairs in Cambodia exactly as it is for at least one year. But the present state of affairs in Cambodia is precisely what they themselves call a state of misfortune for the people of Cambodia.

397. Their draft resolution does not say what it really means. It is lacking in frankness, and that is one of the main reasons why we continue to oppose it. I realize that their text has been improved by Mr. Baroody's amendments. It will not be easy for me to speak about Mr. Baroody's amendments, but I am sure he will not hold it against me if, on behalf of all the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, I make some brief, very simple comments.

398. This morning Mr. Baroody did me the honour of calling me a Roman emperor—I think that was the expression he used—and a professor. I am very much flattered—although one might think, if one did not know Mr. Baroody, that these were rather dangerous compliments. Of course, I cannot and do not want to lay claim to either the power of an emperor or the venerability of a professor. But I would not mind being regarded as having a little of the wisdom of both.

399. I should like simply to say that in my opinion the amendments presented by Mr. Baroody are lacking in logic; indeed, the same can be said of his attitude. Mr. Baroody has told us—and I believe him—that he has done all this work so that the two groups of sponsors could meet on common ground. So I was surprised to see him voting affirmatively on granting priority to a draft resolution which he has favoured more than he should have. His attempt at rapprochement did not require the granting of priority to the second draft resolution. But I must say at once that I am not criticizing him for that vote; I do not hold it against him. However, I am not sure that it tallied exactly with his logic. I do not wish to delay the Assembly too long; it is already quite late, and I do not think that my comments are that interesting. Hence, I shall limit myself to the fourth of the amendments submitted by Saudi Arabia to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. It reads:

*“Considering that the lawful rights of the two Governments are only valid if it is determined that these rights emanate from the sovereign people of Cambodia as a whole.” [A/L.745.]*

400. I am not saying that that is lacking in logic, but one must follow logic right to the end. If I have understood Mr. Baroody aright, neither of the two Governments can for the time being claim that its rights emanate from the sovereign people of Cambodia as a whole. And, to the extent that I have been able to understand the two opposing arguments here, neither of the two Governments has claimed that its rights emanate from the sovereign people of Cambodia as a whole. But I think that when one of those two Governments comes to this Assembly to represent its people while the other is treated as a government-in-exile,

the balance in this proposed paragraph of the preamble is upset.

401. I think, therefore, that this text is lacking in logic. I hope that my friend Mr. Baroody will not hold it against me that I have pointed this out to him. It is perhaps the professional idiosyncrasy of a professor that has led me to make these remarks. In any event, for the reasons I have explained, we shall vote against Mr. Baroody's amendments.

402. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My Government recognizes the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, headed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk. I have followed very attentively and with great interest all the pros and cons expressed during the debate on the question of Cambodia.

403. Mauritius, a loyal member of the non-aligned group, has for its own reasons not sponsored draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3. However, as the representative of Mauritius, I have searched not only my conscience but my soul as to how to act in this Assembly today. I have come to the conclusion that, since my Government recognized the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, I cannot honourably do otherwise than to vote, consistently, all the way, in favour of that Government during the painful exercise now in progress.

404. For this reason, and for this reason alone, while appreciating and respecting the position of the delegation of Nigeria as expressed by my beloved brother Mr. Ogbu, my delegation regrets that it cannot vote affirmatively on draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, as amended, except perhaps in a separate vote, as already requested by the delegation of Mexico, regarding the amendment contained in paragraph 4 of document A/L.745, as submitted by my distinguished elder brother and colleague, Mr. Baroody of Saudi Arabia.

405. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We have just heard the last speaker before we proceed to the vote. We shall vote first on the amendments that have been proposed in document A/L.745. These are amendments to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev. 1.

406. I call on the representative of Thailand on a point of order.

407. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): Mr. President, I hope you will forgive me for interrupting you. I do so not out of disrespect, but rather out of a desire to be quite clear in my own mind as to what we are voting upon. We have had a very long afternoon session and I myself find it difficult to follow every aspect of the debate and the rules of procedure that have been invoked.

408. As my delegation understands it, when the representative of Saudi Arabia submitted his amendments, as contained in document A/L.745, he then asked the views of the two groups of sponsors, and I, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, expressed our agreement to those amendments. But in addition to our expression of agreement to those amendments, I ventured also to make a suggestion to the representative of Saudi Arabia and pleaded with him to accept that suggestion. Later on the representative of Saudi Arabia came up to this rostrum and said in effect that he would consider my sugges-

tion favourably and would also agree to incorporate my subamendment into his amendments as contained in document A/L.745.

409. Now, as I understand it, the moment that my suggestion for his amendments was accepted and he agreed to incorporate them, there no longer were subamendments to his amendments. So in fact, document A/L.745 would then have the addition of a new operative paragraph, which would become operative paragraph 3.

410. Having made that point clear, it is also the understanding of my delegation that since the representative of Saudi Arabia had accepted my proposal by incorporating it into his amendments, we, on our part, as sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, have also agreed to incorporate all the amendments proposed by the delegation of Saudi Arabia, with the addition of the new operative paragraph 3.

411. So as the matter stands now, there are no amendments or subamendments; there is just a draft resolution which was originally A/L.737/Rev.1 but which will be a revised draft resolution of the same number which includes all the amendments and also the addition of the new operative paragraph 3.

412. I hope, Mr. President, that my understanding is correct. If such is the case, then I would of course assume that the revised version of document A/L.737 will be put to a vote as a whole. Of course, we bear in mind the request made by the representative of Mexico; but as far as the sponsors are concerned, we would very much hope that the revised version of document A/L.737, that is the second revision, will be voted on as a whole. We, of course, respect the wish of the representative of Mexico, and should like to express our hope that he will perhaps reconsider his position.

413. This, Mr. President, is why I asked you to allow me to come here on a point of order.

414. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I assume that, in accordance with rule 89 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Mexico has asked the Assembly to take a separate vote on certain paragraphs. Furthermore, it has not been my impression that the Assembly has raised any specific objection to the proposal of the representative of Mexico.

415. I would add that, in my desire for co-operation and tolerance I have, contrary to rule 88 of the rules of procedure, allowed the authors of draft resolutions and amendments to explain the meaning of their votes, and even to go beyond an explanation of the meaning of their votes and go into the substance of the item we are considering.

416. My third remark relates to the fact that the Assembly must pronounce itself on the initial draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1, whereas, in accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the Assembly, it should have voted on the amendment proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia [A/L.745].

417. Moreover, a further amendment has been proposed by the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1, and I should like to have a clear idea of the number of delegations which know exactly what they must vote on or not vote on.

418. All these amendments have been proposed in the course of the debate and I fear that the Assembly might take a stand which is not in accord with what it would have wished to do, taking into account that it is formally seized of a draft resolution and a series of amendments which should have been considered before the draft resolution, and an additional amendment which, this time, has been submitted by the group sponsoring that draft resolution.

419. If at this late hour our minds are sufficiently alert to make the appropriate distinction and arrive at a resolution that can be presented as a whole for approval by the Assembly, I have no objection to our doing so. If not, we shall have to find a rational working method that will enable each delegation to state its position as its conscience dictates and on the instructions that flow from the policy of each Government.

420. I call upon the representative of the Ivory Coast, who can perhaps assist us in finding a proper method of working.

421. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): I thought that after the statement made by the representative of Thailand the situation was sufficiently clear for us to proceed to a vote. It is almost 11 o'clock and the General Assembly has been sitting since 3 o'clock this afternoon. I shall not go into the substance of the problem but adhere strictly to procedure.

422. The General Assembly has before it two draft resolutions, in documents A/L.733 and Add.1-3 and A/L.737/Rev.1. To those two draft resolutions the delegation of Saudi Arabia has submitted amendments [A/L.744 and A/L.745 respectively]. Then, in accordance with the request of the delegation of Thailand, the General Assembly has decided, on the basis of its own rules of procedure, which we may use in order to have our points of view prevail, to give priority to the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1.

423. Therefore, before the General Assembly takes a decision on that revised text, it must vote on the amendments to it. But, since the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 and the author of the amendments agree, the Assembly is now only seized of a revised draft resolution, A/L.737/Rev.2. Hence, in accordance with the decision we have taken—under rule 91 of the rules of procedure—we must vote on draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2. This draft resolution should therefore be put to the vote first, and if the delegation of Mexico still wishes to have a separate vote on the two paragraphs on which it requested separate votes, we should proceed accordingly.

424. After this vote or votes, we should vote on draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2. If the Assembly wishes to vote then on draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, we should at that time first vote on the amendments proposed by Mr. Baroody [A/L.744].

425. The situation is thus very clear: we must, at this stage, vote on draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2, bearing in mind the proposal of the delegation of Mexico in accordance with rule 89 of the rules of procedure, requesting a separate vote.

426. I do not believe there is any point in prolonging the discussion. I propose that we proceed to the vote and conclude our consideration of this question tonight.

427. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I fully realize that the hour is late, one hour before midnight, and that is all the more reason why we should get our minds clear, because we are somewhat befogged, I think, by all the proposals before us.

428. When we came today we had two main draft resolutions, in documents A/L.733 and Add.1-3 and A/L.737/Rev.1. The delegation of Thailand, I believe, asked for priority to be given to its draft resolution, in document A/L.737/Rev.1, and that proposal was adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 58 to 56, with 20 abstentions. What the Assembly decided was to give priority to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 and not draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 as amended by the representative of Saudi Arabia. If the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1 accept the amendments moved by the representative of Saudi Arabia with a new operative paragraph 3, then the Assembly is faced with an entirely different situation. It must decide whether or not it is going to give priority to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2, which has not yet appeared on the scene but exists only in our imagination. With all respect, I suggest that before we can go on to a vote we must first decide whether we are going to give priority to a draft resolution which has not yet appeared in print but which we have to work out by reading Mr. Baroody's amendments with draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1. I am sorry if this will involve you in more labour, Mr. President, but that is the correct procedure, I respectfully submit.

429. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I urgently appeal to the Assembly to continue our work in an atmosphere of calm, which will be beneficial to all. I shall now call again on the representative of the Ivory Coast.

430. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, you said that in our debate we should evince serenity. I would say to you, using an English expression, that we have to ensure fair play.

431. I regret to have to say to the representative of Sri Lanka, Mr. Amerasinghe, that I do not believe that, when the sponsors of a draft resolution accept amendments to their text and when the General Assembly has decided to give priority consideration to that text, it is necessary to have a new vote on whether priority has to be given to that text.

432. As everybody knows, the vote on priority was the most important vote in this debate and would determine the fate of the two draft resolutions. So if this priority has been given to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1—and I am speaking not of the substance but of the procedure—and if the sponsors of this draft resolution have accepted the proposal, I think that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the President of the General Assembly must put to the vote the draft resolution to which the Assembly has voted to give priority; for if the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 had not accepted the amendments of Mr. Baroody we should have voted first on those amendments. But as his amendments have been accepted by the sponsors, why should we vote again on priority?

433. Mr. President, I believe that at this stage you must accept the responsibility of telling us what must

be done. Therefore, I should like to try to facilitate your task and appeal to the representative of Sri Lanka. We know that all the cards have been played. Let us vote and go home. Some of us have other commitments. Therefore I believe, Mr. President, you must appeal to us to show our good sense and vote.

434. If at this hour no vote can be taken, then let us postpone it to a meeting on Friday, or tomorrow. We could perhaps meet tomorrow at 11 a.m. to vote. But I beseech you to take pity on those who have been sitting here since 3 o'clock this afternoon—I need say no more. I count on the wisdom and objectivity that you have displayed throughout this session to guide us, because the President must guide us on the method of voting. For myself, I should say that we must vote on draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 with the amendments of Mr. Baroody which have been incorporated in the text; this is not new. We have former presidents here, and I believe I can say that the representative of Sri Lanka is no novice.

435. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I know that it is getting very late and that some of our colleagues have other commitments. But we should not overlook the fact that we are discussing a particularly important problem—a problem in which every day, every hour, perhaps even every minute, someone, man, woman or child, is dying. I believe that since this is a matter of such importance, it is worth sacrificing a few moments to clarify the situation and see exactly where we stand.

436. The representative of Sri Lanka put the problem quite correctly; and I would invite those who would call into question his objectivity to reread the letter in document A/9875 which the representative of Thailand addressed to the President of the General Assembly on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, calling for a priority vote on that draft. That document did not contain the amendments of Mr. Baroody; it is that document on whose priority the Assembly voted.

437. If we are to maintain the priority agreed to by the Assembly by its vote, we must vote exclusively on document A/L.737/Rev.1; but if, as the speaker stated a moment ago, there is another document—A/L.737/Rev.2—then we have another document before us on which the Assembly must pronounce itself, because we refuse to give priority to that document.

438. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It is high time that these tactics were stopped. Everyone present here knows how he is going to vote. The question is being confused by invoking shadows of rules of procedure. When we were asked here to vote on the matter of priority, we had not yet pronounced ourselves on the draft resolutions and the amendments thereto. Therefore, some of us could not have intervened on the substance during the voting. Remember that the vote on priority is only procedural and does not touch upon the substance. Where is my friend from Sri Lanka? He should know that; he has presided over many committees. We have not touched on the substance.

439. Now, you might say: "Give us 24 hours to consider this". You had better not say it, because then I will tell you many things. How many times have you

appealed, as Chairman—perhaps of the sea-bed committee—to us to expedite our work and everybody has obliged? You are a venerable gentleman of integrity. I realize that it does not sit with you that my amendments had been submitted yesterday and were on the table this morning—and this gentleman from the Ivory Coast dispassionately told you the situation as it really obtains—remember, he voted, I think, against giving priority; I do not know how he voted, but everything he said was logical, in spite of that professor who says I am illogical. It is no wonder that a good part of the Assembly's time is wasted in futile procedural debate, which costs money. And this Organization, because of inflation and other factors, is on the verge of bankruptcy. You are rendering it more bankrupt by prolonging the debates. Everyone here, I maintain, knows how he is going to vote. Ah, some are toying with the idea: "Why not postpone the vote and let us study the text of the amendments?" They are no longer amendments: they are part of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2.

440. "We need time for instructions from our Governments"? Do not sell me that idea. Everyone already has instructions; you know how you want to vote: either for peace or for war. It is your privilege.

441. I appeal to you, Mr. President, not to make a ruling, because you will get into trouble, but with the authority of the presidency to appeal to us all to proceed to the vote after that bulwark of strength, Bradford Morse, our beloved Under-Secretary-General, word for word reads out draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2, serenely, calmly, while each one, if he is in doubt, listens attentively and then we proceed to a vote. I warn you: Baroody does not threaten. If you want to altercate on procedure, I am ready. I have no guests waiting for me. And if there were guests waiting for me, the United Nations would come first. We will not adjourn, I hope, until we have proceeded to the vote and finished, once and for all. Fair warning.

442. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Sri Lanka has asked for the floor. If it is a right of reply, I believe the rules of procedure determine the exact circumstances in which rights of reply can be exercised. If it is a contribution to a better understanding of the situation, I call on the representative of Sri Lanka.

443. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): Like Mr. Baroody, I have no guests waiting for me. I only differ from him in one respect: I disposed of them before coming here. He said I was wasting the time of this Assembly by speaking here, and increasing the degree of its bankruptcy. If you will make a comparison between the amount of time I took at this rostrum and the amount of time taken by my good friend, Mr. Baroody, for whom I have the greatest respect, you will be able to decide who contributed more to the bankruptcy of this Organization, he or I.

444. I asked a very simple question, I set a very simple proposition: I stated that when we took a vote on which draft resolution should be given priority, draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3 or draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, we were thinking of the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1 and not of the non-existent and yet-to-be-published draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.2. That should be plain as a

pikestaff to anybody, even at this late hour of the night.

445. If you ask for priority for a particular draft resolution, by examining that draft on its merits—but we were not examining the draft on its merits, because we had not been informed then, at that stage, by the representative of Thailand whether or not he was accepting those amendments—you have therefore one of two courses to adopt, Mr. President, and I say this with all respect. You can either ask the Assembly to decide whether they are going to give priority to the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.2, or whether you will put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1 with the amendments moved by Mr. Baroody and which I think appear—he has presented so many amendments that I have lost count of them—in document A/L.745.

446. The material factor is not whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 accept the amendments; that is not material. We have decided to give priority to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, and I abide by that decision. In that case, the amendments moved by Mr. Baroody to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 must be put to the vote, and if anybody chooses to ask for separate votes on any of them—and if they are moved separately of course we have to vote on them separately—we cannot vote on them as a whole.

447. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I think we can clarify the situation as follows: first of all, the problem raised by the representative of Sri Lanka is not an imaginary problem. It is not an imaginary problem for the reasons which I shall explain. Although draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1 and the amendments submitted by Saudi Arabia in document A/L.745 are before the Assembly, it is none the less true that the representative of Thailand tonight has added a new amendment which was not duly considered by the General Assembly in advance and which might have called for a different interpretation on the priority.

448. However, the proposal of the representative of Mexico, supplemented by the proposal of the representative of Sri Lanka, and further supplemented by the proposal of Saudi Arabia, will enable the General Assembly to pronounce itself correctly and in an informed way.

449. We shall first vote separately on paragraph 4 of the amendments, which I shall ask Mr. Morse to read out. We shall vote separately on another amendment, in accordance with the wishes of the delegation of Mexico. We shall give an opportunity to Mr. Morse to read out the text as amended, and in the same way as we took account of the proposal of Mexico, we could deal with the proposal of the representative of Sri Lanka as regards a separate vote on the various paragraphs. I shall therefore ask Mr. Morse to read the text of the paragraph on which the Assembly will pronounce itself first.

450. Mr. MORSE (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs): The first separate vote has been requested on what appeared in document A/L.745 as numbered paragraph 4, and the text reads as follows:

"Considering that the lawful rights of the two Governments are only valid if it is determined that



these rights emanate from the sovereign people of Cambodia as a whole.”

451. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): A separate vote has been requested on the paragraph Mr. Morse has just read to the General Assembly.

*There were 51 votes in favour, 51 against and 31 abstentions.*

*The paragraph was not adopted.*

452. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Rule 95 of the rules of procedure provides that:

“If a vote is equally divided on matters other than elections, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting which shall be held within forty-eight hours of the first vote, and it shall be expressly mentioned in the agenda that a second vote will be taken on the matter in question. If this vote also results in equality, the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.”

Rule 95 will be applied literally to the paragraph on which we have just voted.

453. I shall now ask Mr. Morse to read out, in accordance with the wishes expressed by the delegation of Mexico, the subamendment submitted by the representative of Thailand.

454. Mr. MORSE (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs): The following language was offered by the representative of Thailand and accepted by the sponsor of the amendment, the representative of Saudi Arabia. It would be operative paragraph 3 in a revision of document A/L.737/Rev.1.

“Decides not to press for any further action until Member States have an opportunity to examine the report of the Secretary-General.”

455. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now put to the vote the paragraph that Mr. Morse has just read out.

*The paragraph was adopted by 54 votes to 53, with 27 abstentions.*

456. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now request Mr. Morse to read out the draft resolution as revised by the inclusion of the amendments contained in document A/L.745, with the exception of the amendment proposed in paragraph 4 thereof, and by the addition of the new operative paragraph 3 proposed by the representative of Thailand.

457. Mr. MORSE (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs):

“The General Assembly,

“Recalling the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

“Recognizing that the situation in Cambodia is of concern to all Member States and especially to the countries situated close to the area,

“Taking into account that, while the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, presided over by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, exercises authority over a segment of Cambodia, the Government of the Khmer Republic still has control over a preponderant number of the Cambodian people,

“Believing that the Cambodian people themselves should be allowed to solve their own political problems peacefully, free from outside interference,

“Believing also that such political settlement should be reached by the indigenous parties concerned, without external influence,

“1. Calls upon all the Powers which have been influencing the two parties to the conflict to use their good offices for conciliation between these two parties with a view to restoring peace in Cambodia;

“2. Requests the Secretary-General, after due consultation, to lend appropriate assistance to the two contending parties claiming lawful rights in Cambodia and to report on the results to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session;

“3. Decides not to press for any further action until Member States have an opportunity to examine the report of the Secretary-General.”

458. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has before it a request by the delegation of Sri Lanka to have a separate vote on the text. I should like to ask the delegation of Sri Lanka whether it makes a formal request for a separate vote, in which case the delegation of Senegal would ask for a recorded vote.

459. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I really do not know what is going on. Perhaps it is the lateness of the hour that numbs my mental faculties. The Under-Secretary-General read out to us a series of amendments and he read out the additional amendment proposed by the representative of Thailand [*see para. 454 above*] to the long list of amendments proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia in document A/L.745, which would appear as a new operative paragraph 3 to draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2, as we shall notionally call it. But that operative paragraph has already been adopted by a vote of 54 to 53, with 27 abstentions [*see para. 455 above*]. Now why was that amendment mentioned?

460. We cannot proceed to a vote on the whole draft until 48 hours from now because of the deadlock that occurred in the vote on paragraph 4 of the amendments submitted by Mr. Baroody in document A/L.745. Therefore, what we have to do is to vote on the other amendments, excluding the amendment that will constitute operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

461. Therefore, Mr. President, if you omit that from the vote, I have no objection to a vote being taken on all the other amendments as a whole. But we are not voting on the amended draft resolution as a whole because we still do not have a decision on the preambular paragraph proposed in paragraph 4 of the amendments submitted by Mr. Baroody in document A/L.745. It now sounds like the American Constitution. Until we obtain a final decision on that amendment, in accordance with rule 95, we cannot proceed to a decision in regard to the amended draft resolution as a whole. But I have no objection whatsoever to putting to the vote the other amendments proposed by Mr. Baroody, excluding the additional amendment suggested by the representative of Thailand and accepted by the representative of Saudi Arabia, on which a decision has been taken and which has been adopted [*ibid.*].

462. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): My question was a very simple one. I had understood that the representative of Sri Lanka had asked for a separate vote on the different paragraphs of the draft resolution as amended, taking into account the fact that paragraph 4 of the amendments in document A/L.745 is left pending, in accordance with rule 95 of the rules of procedure. If his request for a separate vote is a formal request, then the delegation of Senegal would request a recorded vote on each paragraph. Am I to understand that this is a formal proposal by the representative of Sri Lanka?

463. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do sincerely hope, Mr. President, that I shall make it easy for you and for my very good friend Mr. Amerasinghe to get out of a difficulty which is really artificial. It is true that the rules of procedure state that if there is a tied vote, another vote will be taken within 48 hours. If we vote now on the draft resolution as a whole, it is with the understanding that there is a reservation regarding that particular paragraph which received a tied vote, whether it is incorporated in the vote of tonight on the draft resolution as a whole or not.

464. This is a simple matter. Incidentally, rule 95 of the rules of procedure does not in any way tell us what we should do with regard to the vote on the draft resolution as a whole; and we are the masters of our own procedures in this house. Why reopen the debate within 48 hours from now? Let us vote on the draft resolution as a whole, with this proviso: that if anybody presses the Assembly to vote on the paragraph on which there was a tied vote, we will do so. If I were now the sponsor or one of the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration, I would tell them to forget about this paragraph and make it easy, so that we may not be further entangled with considerations of procedure within the next 48 hours.

465. Let us, therefore, proceed to the vote now on the draft resolution as a whole, with this slight reservation, taking it into account that the paragraph that received a tied vote is a preambular paragraph, and it is not essential as it would be were it an operative paragraph.

466. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Although rule 95 does not tell us what we should do about the incorporation of the paragraph on which there was a tied vote, it does say something else. It says clearly that we cannot take a second vote at the same meeting. The 48-hour deadline is a maximum, it is true. But if there is a tied vote, if the vote is on matters other than elections, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting. Therefore, we cannot vote on this part of the text at this meeting. Either we postpone the adoption of the whole of the text, or we adopt the text with the exclusion of this paragraph on which there was a tied vote.

467. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It is perfectly clear that as concerns the paragraph on which there was a tied vote, rule 95 will be faithfully applied. This is my understanding of the situation.

468. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): The hour is late. Since paragraph 4 in document A/L.745, the vote that resulted in a tie, has created some difficulties, and since Thailand and the other sponsors have already adopted the amendments of the Saudi Arabian delega-

tion, on behalf of the sponsors, and in order to save time and money, we would forgo the pleasure of another vote on this paragraph.

469. As I understand it, the originator of the paragraph, the representative of Saudi Arabia, has already concurred in the move that I suggested. So I make that a formal proposal.

470. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The situation is now clear. There is no longer any question of the Assembly applying rule 95 to this famous paragraph 4, read out a moment ago by Mr. Morse.

471. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation fully appreciates the difficulties facing you at this complicated meeting—I would say intentionally complicated; on the part of some delegations—but my delegation has nowhere found in any of the documents governing our work, the Charter, the rules of procedure, the practice of the Organization, that proposals belong to one delegation or another, however closely related they are to a given international problem.

472. Our proposal has been put to a sovereign Assembly, which has taken a decision, in this specific case resulting in a tie. A tie is covered by one of the rules of procedure which cannot be altered arbitrarily or by agreements reached between two neighbouring delegations. They are very close, and can consult each other, but once an amendment has been submitted to the Assembly, it no longer belongs to the distinguished representative of Saudi Arabia or to the equally distinguished representative of Thailand. Otherwise they would not have submitted it here.

473. My delegation believes that since the General Assembly has acted—although in this case, unfortunately, this action did not produce a decision, it is covered by the rules of procedure, which require that within 48 hours there should be a second vote. Nowhere in the rules of procedure is there any provision saying that it is up to the representative of Saudi Arabia, or the representative of Thailand, or both of them jointly, to amend rule 95.

474. So my delegation considers it absolutely impossible to do anything other than take a vote on the rest of the draft resolution. The Assembly cannot vote on that paragraph, or on the draft resolution as a whole, except in accordance with the terms of rule 95, unless the General Assembly agrees to alter its own rules of procedure and to confer on two representatives the right to interpret the rules as our work proceeds.

475. At the same time, I take this opportunity to point out that in our view the procedure is becoming rather frivolous, although it has served one purpose: it has shown the meaning of the proposals for priority, the amendments and the draft resolutions other than draft resolution A/L.733 and Add.1-3, which is the only draft resolution really before the General Assembly.

476. An amendment is agreed upon; first it is accepted; then it is not accepted; and when it cannot be adopted, the sponsor himself says "Forget about it". The Assembly is invited to pronounce on various paragraphs, without knowing which of them the author is likely to discard half an hour from now, or which

are serious or less serious. We are playing around with the fate of a people and with the fundamental principles of the Charter.

477. I should like, at least, to record my protest at the manner in which some delegations are not just attempting to manipulate the Assembly and disregarding the rules of procedure, but are lacking in respect for all of us.

478. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I apologize first of all to you and to my colleagues present here if I take the liberty of getting involved in procedural questions. I am not fond of procedural debates myself, but I am fond of logic, reason and clarity.

479. Let me comment on the remarks of the representative of Cuba a moment ago. What was paragraph 4 of the Saudi Arabian amendments, on which the Assembly has taken a vote but not a decision, is no longer the property of Saudi Arabia and, accordingly, cannot be withdrawn from a vote. If the vote had not begun on that paragraph, the author or authors of the amendment would have been empowered to withdraw it. Once it had been put to the vote, however, no one any longer had that power and the Assembly is obliged to take a decision on this paragraph 4 at its next meeting, within 48 hours at the latest.

480. However, this has certain implications, which are that what is now being described as draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.2 is not complete any longer. One of the paragraphs of this draft resolution, which should have been paragraph 4 of the Saudi Arabian amendments, to which I have just referred, does not appear in this text.

481. You can invite us to take a decision on what is left of the draft resolution, and it could be identified in a vote on each part separately; we shall have voted on a part of the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.2. At our next meeting we shall adopt or reject what is now paragraph 4 of the Saudi Arabian amendments. Eventually, since we shall have taken a vote on two separate parts of the draft resolution, we shall obviously have to take a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

482. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The proposal to the Assembly of the representative of Thailand, working in close co-operation with the representative of Saudi Arabia on the problem of amendments, would have seemed perfectly logical were it not for rule 80 of the rules of procedure, which clearly says that:

“A motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has commenced, provided that the motion has not been amended. A motion thus withdrawn may be reintroduced by any member.”

Since a vote was taken on the text and the result was a tie, it seems to me that rule 95 is the only rule applicable to paragraph 4 of document A/L.745 as read out by Mr. Morse a short while ago.

483. It now remains to be seen whether the Assembly wishes to take a decision immediately on the draft resolution, minus the famous paragraph 4, or whether the Assembly wishes to take a decision on a more complete, final draft resolution, one which would not hold

any surprises in store for the Assembly, which it certainly does not need.

484. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): With all due respect to previous speakers, my delegation still feels very confused and unable to follow what we are supposed to do and to accomplish during the rest of this meeting. We do not have a full text of a draft resolution before us as yet; one has certainly not been distributed in the working languages of the United Nations.

485. Secondly, we are being called upon to vote on a resolution part of which is still in doubt and, therefore, we do not have it in final form. The logical thing would be to apply the rules of procedure. In this case, I feel that the only way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves is for my delegation formally to move the adjournment of this meeting for 48 hours.

486. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Iraq has just moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 76.

487. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): We seem to be getting ourselves into a state of considerable confusion. May I, with great respect, suggest to the representative of Iraq that he has now moved under rule 76 the adjournment of this meeting for 48 hours, when under rule 95 the Assembly must meet within 48 hours in order to consider the paragraph 4 on which there was a tied vote.

488. It would seem to me, therefore, with great respect to the representative of Iraq, that since under rule 95 we are obliged to meet within 48 hours, it is not possible for him to move an adjournment for precisely that same period of time.

489. Secondly, may I suggest that we have sat here for a very long time today. You, Mr. President, have been sitting in that seat for many hours. It would seem to me that we are on the verge of taking a decision on all the issues which it is possible for us to decide under the rules of procedure this evening. And I entirely accept—we all entirely accept—your rulings on the effect of rule 95, namely, that paragraph 4 and whether that should be incorporated in the draft resolution will, of course, have to be held over.

490. But, Mr. President, as you have pointed out on a number of occasions to this Assembly tonight, there are a number of other paragraphs to this draft resolution other than the paragraph 4 which must be held over. With great respect, I would suggest that the feeling of the Assembly this evening—despite some of the strong words that have been spoken, perhaps on both sides, despite some of the strong rules of procedure that have been invoked on both sides, and despite perhaps some of the weaker arguments on rules of procedure that have been invoked on both sides—is that it would be in the interests of us all, and, may I suggest, of the United Nations as a whole, were we now to move to a decision on the remainder of that draft resolution.

491. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Iraq has invoked rule 76 on the adjournment of the meeting. Rule 76 reads:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote.

The President may limit the time to be allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the meeting."

492. Mr. HARMON (Liberia): Mr. President, I had held up my hand long before the representative of the United Kingdom did, but he has practically covered what I wanted to say.

493. I strongly oppose the motion put forward by our colleague from Iraq. But what I want to bring to the attention of this body is that we are sitting here in general assembly with sovereign States. In any parliamentary body we can, if that becomes necessary, suspend the rules. So this question of trying to delay the decision on this vote is, I think, an effort to use some tactics. This is what I wanted to bring to representatives' attention: we are sitting as sovereign representatives in a general assembly and any rule can be suspended so that we can proceed with our business.

494. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the objectivity you are anxious to demonstrate is leading us to an excess of an opposite kind. You read out rule 76, the adjournment has been moved, and rule 76 requires that such motions shall be immediately put to the vote. The Assembly is sovereign: it can accept the adjournment or reject it. But you are not allowed by that rule to call on speakers wishing to explain their votes on that motion. You must immediately put to the vote the motion for adjournment made by the representative of Iraq.

495. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I am sure that the representative of Senegal will not hold it against me if I call on the representative of Iraq once more.

496. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): I wish to express my thanks to the representative of the United Kingdom for correcting my proposal. What I had intended to propose was that this meeting should be adjourned and reconvened within a period of 48 hours instead of after 48 hours.

497. Secondly, Mr. President, I am sure you agreed with the representative of Senegal, who pointed out that the motion I have proposed is not to be debated. And, notwithstanding what the representative of Liberia has stated, I believe this motion takes precedence over everything else. Therefore, I request you to put it to the vote.

498. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): We were in the process of voting. In fact, we had voted on paragraph 4 and we were starting to vote on other provisions.

499. If the representative of Iraq really wishes to invoke the rules of procedure, I would refer him to rule 88, on the conduct of the voting. That rule states:

"After the President has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. . . ."

500. Has rule 88 been forgotten? Anyone who felt that things were going against him during the voting could say, "Let us adjourn". The *raison d'être* of rule 88 is precisely to avoid such a situation. If the rule did not exist, there would be nothing to prevent anyone from saying, during the course of the voting, "Let us adjourn; let us not continue voting".

501. We have been told that a motion for adjournment cannot be debated. I am not debating the motion for adjournment. The point is: Was the motion for adjournment in order, since the voting was in progress?

502. I leave it to your good judgement, Mr. President, and to the good sense of this Assembly to decide.

503. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Actually, in this Assembly everybody is right. That is how the rules of procedure would have it.

504. We had in fact voted on paragraph 4 of the Saudi Arabian amendments. Paragraph 4 will be dealt with in accordance with rule 95 of the rules of procedure. We have voted also on another operative paragraph, which arbitrarily bore the number 3 in the proposed amendments. That paragraph was adopted. The Assembly then began to discuss whether it was proper to adopt a draft resolution from which a paragraph that it regarded as important to the general structure of the text had been amputated, or whether we should await the completed text in order to be able to take an informed decision on the exact text.

505. Thus, we were not in the process of voting. It was within that specific framework that the representative of Iraq proposed the adjournment of the meeting, under rule 76 of the rules of procedure.

506. The representative of Senegal made an important contribution to our understanding of the position by returning to the Assembly its full sovereignty. The General Assembly remains fully sovereign; it can reject or adopt the proposal for the adjournment of the meeting made by the representative of Iraq.

507. I now put to the vote the motion for adjournment made by the representative of Iraq, under rule 76 of the rules of procedure.

*The motion for adjournment was rejected by 58 votes to 54, with 21 abstentions.*

508. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the text read out earlier by the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs [*para. 457 above*], that is to say, the draft resolution in document A/L.737/Rev.1, as revised by the inclusion of the amendments contained in document A/L.745, with the exception of the amendment proposed in paragraph 4 thereof—on which a decision will be taken in accordance with rule 95 of the rules of procedure—and by the addition of the new operative paragraph 3 proposed by the representative of Thailand [*see para. 455 above*].

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia,



Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany (Federal Republic of).

*Against:* Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic.

*Abstaining:* Iceland, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burma, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece.

*The text read out by the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs\* was adopted by 56 votes to 54, with 24 abstentions.*

509. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on the delegations that wish to explain their votes after the vote.

510. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation deems it necessary to point out that what has just happened is a shame to the United Nations. People can see that it was only because of the procedural manoeuvre played out in such an unseemly way by a super-Power and its followers, who tried to impose their will on others, that their incomplete draft just barely managed to get a majority of two votes. This draft resolution has seriously distorted the objective facts. It can be seen clearly that the purpose of this draft resolution is not only to cover up the aggression and intervention which the United States is still carrying on in Cambodia, but also to ask the United Nations to interfere in the internal affairs of Cambodia and prolong the illegal usurpation of the lawful seat of the Kingdom of Cambodia in the United Nations by the traitorous Lon Nol clique. This runs diametrically counter to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter as well as to the will of the entire Cambodian people. This so-called draft resolution, concocted by a super-Power and some of its followers, is bound to be severely condemned by all peoples who uphold justice, truly defend the principles of the United Nations Charter and oppose imperialist aggression.

511. The head of State of Cambodia, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, and the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Khieu Samphan, of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia have repeatedly exposed, on behalf of the National United Front of Cambodia, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia and the People's Armed Forces of National Libera-

tion, that the draft resolution sponsored by Japan and other countries is a new scheme master-minded by the United States. They have solemnly declared their categorical refusal to hold any negotiations or have any compromise with the traitorous Lon Nol clique and their determination to carry on a resolute struggle until the traitorous clique in Phnom Penh has been completely wiped out and the foreign aggressors have been driven out so that Cambodia may obtain genuine independence, peace, neutrality, sovereignty and democracy on the basis of territorial integrity.

512. Those are facts known to all; hence, the so-called draft resolution is but a scrap of paper, both to Cambodia and to all countries and peoples that uphold justice. It is utterly null and void and meaningless.

513. A review of the world situation indicates that things are developing more and more favourably to the Cambodian people and unfavourably to imperialism and its agents in Phnom Penh. Even if the traitorous Lon Nol clique could hang on in the United Nations for a few more days, how can it escape from its inevitable collapse by means of a draft resolution concocted by a super-Power here? Eventually, the Cambodian people are sure to wipe out completely the traitorous clique entrenched in Phnom Penh and a few isolated strongholds. The lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations are certain to be restored and the traitorous Lon Nol clique is bound to be expelled from the seat it now occupies.

514. Did a super-Power not try to obstruct the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations over a long period in the past? But what came of it? Who was it that suffered a defeat? Today on the question of Cambodian representation it has reverted to the tactics that went bankrupt long ago on the question of China and the result will be the same. Such a manoeuvre on its part cannot do the slightest harm to the heroic Cambodian people but will only further expose before the people of the world the policies of aggression and intervention against Cambodia obdurately pursued by that super-Power and further worsen the predicament in which it finds itself.

515. Cambodia belongs to the Cambodian people. It can be said with certainty that, with the support of the people of the world, the Cambodian people, with total victory in their just struggle, will declare the utter bankruptcy of the imperialist policies of aggression and intervention and the complete doom of the traitorous Lon Nol clique.

516. Mr. ZAINI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.737/Rev.1, as revised. I should like now to explain briefly my delegation's vote.

517. After the coup d'état fostered in Phnom Penh against the Royal Government of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Morocco continued to recognize the Royal Government, for the simple reason that that Government continued, and continues, to control the major part of Cambodian territory. However, while we are prolonging our discussions here the Cambodian people,

\* See para. 457 above.

for their part, are apparently enduring endless sufferings. The victims of this pointless war are increasing in number minute by minute. I would agree with the representative of Senegal, in saying that every day, every hour and every minute men, women and children are dying in that country. The conflict, in other words, has gone on too long already.

518. Morocco, in keeping with its noble traditions, advocates as a constant factor in its policy recourse to a peaceful settlement. We have always urged dialogue, and that is the course we have always followed, even in all pending matters of concern to us. Accordingly, we feel that the text of the draft resolution upon which we have just voted proceeded in that same direction; that is why we supported it. We did so in the interests of the long-suffering Cambodian people and out of respect for its sovereign will, which in our opinion transcends all other considerations.

519. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I think I can now safely say that we are about to finish our consideration of item 25. I say "about to finish" because there are certain pending issues still left,

which we shall deal with at the morning meeting on Friday, 29 November.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 a.m. on  
Thursday, 28 November 1974*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet Nam, signed in Paris on 27 January 1973 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 935, No. 13295, p. 149).

<sup>2</sup> Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Cambodia, signed at Geneva on 20 July 1954 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 935, No. 13295, p. 185).

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2189th meeting, paras. 61-89.

<sup>4</sup> A/9330 and Corr.1, pp. 25 and 26.

<sup>5</sup> Bandung Conference of African-Asian Nations, held from 18-24 April 1955.

<sup>6</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2191st meeting, paras. 45-66.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Annexes, agenda item 106, "Action taken by the General Assembly".

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Session, *Plenary Meetings*, 1976th meeting.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/L.714.