

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records*



UN LIBRARY

JAN 3 1985

FIRST COMMITTEE
62nd meeting
held on
Friday, 7 December 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 62nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 67: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 68: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 69: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 143: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF STATE TERRORISM AND ANY ACTIONS BY STATES AIMED AT UNDERMINING THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM IN OTHER SOVEREIGN STATES (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC-2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/39/PV.62
26 December 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 67 TO 69 AND 143 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions on international security agenda items, in the following order, which was announced to the Committee at previous meetings: A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2; L.85/Rev.1; L.86/Rev.1; L.87; L.88/Rev.1; L.89 and L.90/Rev.1.

I shall call first on the representative of Uganda for an explanation of vote before the voting. I shall then begin the process of taking decisions on the draft resolutions in the order that I have stated, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2.

Mr. AMOKO (Uganda): The delegation of Uganda wishes to intervene at this juncture to reiterate its general position with regard to the question of international peace and security and the relevant draft resolutions.

As a non-aligned country, Uganda is extremely disturbed by the increasing tendency of some Member States to disregard the basic principles upon which our Charter was founded, particularly the principles relating to the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force in the resolution of international conflicts. The naked interference and intervention in the affairs of States, in flagrant violation of the Charter and the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation between States, must be universally denounced.

(Mr. Amoko, Uganda)

We must rededicate ourselves to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly in 1970. Member States must equally commit themselves to the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is sad to note that there is a growing propensity among some Member States to bypass the United Nations in tackling issues central to it. Pertinent in this regard is the obduracy of racist South Africa, supported by a reputable Member of this Organization, in highjacking the question of Namibian independence from this Organization and giving it an East-West twist. Africa and the entire international community cannot be deceived by these manoeuvres. Namibian independence is and must remain a central responsibility of the United Nations.

As we deliberate here, the peoples of Namibia and South Africa are burying their fallen heroes. Racist South African aggression against independent African countries has intensified. Southern Angola is under the siege of apartheid forces. Namibia is a huge military fortress established by South African colonial occupation forces. Terrorist gangs trained, financed, armed and commandeered by racist South Africa roam the frontiers of the front-line States.

The apartheid war machine, which has been perfected through the collaboration of South Africa's Western allies, including Israel, poses a serious danger to international peace and security. The blanket veto of some permanent members of the Security Council provides an air-tight cover for the racist régime to flout with utter impunity the basic norms of international law. How can confidence-building measures be promoted in a region bedevilled by racism, colonialism and naked aggression perpetrated by a régime whose crimes and atrocities are only paralleled by those of Nazi Germany.

Apartheid feeds on terror, which maintains its life. Terror and apartheid are indeed two sides of the same coin. State terrorism is a declared policy of the racist Pretoria régime. This terrorism has assumed various forms. The violence, repression and brutal exploitation inflicted by the racist régime of South Africa against the majority population is well known to the international community. The international community must not relent in its efforts aimed at dislodging the terrorists in Pretoria so as to bring about the attainment of self-determination for the people of South Africa and Namibia.

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize to the representative of Uganda for interrupting him, but we have now concluded the general debate on all security items, and I would request delegations to address the specific draft resolutions on the table so that we can proceed in an orderly manner and finish our business this afternoon. Therefore, if the representative of Uganda wants to finish his speech, I hope he can address specific resolutions.

Mr. AMOKO (Uganda): The delegation of Uganda is addressing itself to matters of peace and security. Uganda is strongly opposed to policies of blackmail and destabilization aimed at undermining the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries. It therefore follows from this principled stand that we cannot remain indifferent to the serious situation obtaining in Central America and other parts of the world. The activities of externally financed and supported dissidents and mercenaries pose a serious threat to the security and independence of the non-aligned countries in this region. We call for the peaceful resolution of the problems of the region without outside interference.

In conclusion, international peace and security will remain a distant dream if no concrete results are achieved towards disarmament. The arms race must be curbed and eliminated so that resources thus released can be channelled towards the social and economic welfare of peoples. The prevailing unequal economic relations between nations must be abolished. Peoples and nations must exercise permanent sovereignty over their natural resources. Colonialism and racism must end. Every country must be left free to determine its own destiny. Economic independence must be realized in concrete terms.

It is therefore in this light that Uganda supports the various draft resolutions upon which the Committee is about to take action.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. The Committee has before it three documents concerning this question: A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2, L.91 Rev.1 and L.92. I shall call on the sponsors of those three draft resolutions in that order to ask them to inform the Committee how each of those documents stands, as some of the amendments proposed have been incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. I shall first ask the representative of the Soviet Union to inform the Committee as to how draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 now stands.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has not asked to speak, but since the Chairman has been kind enough to call upon it, I should like to say a few words. There can only be one document in question, and that is the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. In so far as concerns the substance of this document, it was presented yesterday by the Permanent Representative of the USSR, Ambassador Troyanovsky, and I think at this stage we have nothing to add to what he said then.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the representative of the Soviet Union that I have received a request from the Soviet delegation to introduce a small revision to the fifth preambular paragraph. I should like him to confirm that I am correct in that.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I regret that there seems to be some kind of misunderstanding, and it is certainly not the fault of the Soviet delegation. Something may be amiss in the work of the Secretariat, which is regrettable, but if the point is that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 is being revised, then indeed there is a slight revision.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

It relates only to the English text, not to the Russian. The revision would read, in English, as follows - I am quoting from the text of document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2, in English, at the very end of the first line on page 2, after the comma, the following words should be added:

(spoke in English)

"non-intervention and". So the whole first line on page 2 should read, in English: "against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, non-intervention and ..."

Then the text continues as it is contained in the document I have quoted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now ask one of the sponsors of the draft amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 what the position of those amendments is now.

Mr. MUTZELBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): I am grateful to you, Sir, for allowing me to explain the position of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1.

On behalf of the sponsors I should like to express our qualified satisfaction that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2 has agreed to accept, in the second rather comprehensive revision of its draft resolution, a number of the amendments proposed by us. We welcome in particular two important changes which indeed reorient the nature and purpose of the original draft resolution to a large extent, thus bringing it more into conformity with generally recognized principles of international law, in particular, the United Nations Charter.

First, we appreciate that the use of the words "regardless of ideologies" in the new fifth preambular paragraph makes it clear beyond doubt that relations between all States, including those of the same or similar ideologies, must be based on the strict observance of international law and the United Nations Charter in particular.

Secondly, we welcome the fact that the new operative paragraph 2 now expressly condemns military intervention and occupation and demands the cessation forthwith of any such action already in progress. Thus the point has been made that it is not possible to concentrate on less grave forms of interference while omitting the most serious violations of the principles of self-determination and non-intervention, namely, military intervention and occupation.

(Mr. Mutzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

It is our fervent expectation that all States will in future live up to the obligations implied in these two important changes to the original draft resolution, and it is a ray of hope for us too to see that the sponsor of the draft resolution subscribes to these demands of international law.

Furthermore, we note with satisfaction that in operative paragraph 1 the unclear and controversial notion of State terrorism has been replaced by reference to "policies and practices of terrorism in relations between States".

Unfortunately, no consequential changes have been made in the title of the draft resolution or in its second preambular paragraph. However, this is not the only flaw remaining in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. In particular, we note that some of the questions which we and others have asked as to the ramifications of the concept of "undermining the socio-political system of States" have not found satisfactory answers. This concept is still retained and we still do not know who determines what undermining is, whether it is also prohibited forcibly to intervene not with a view to undermine but perhaps with a view purportedly to maintain a socio-political system.

Maintaining a concept which is not agreed upon, which is not contained in the United Nations Charter or the friendly relations Declaration and which is vague and subject to interpretation according to the interests of the interpreter are not conducive to the fostering of the rule of law in international relations.

Other flaws remain in the fifth preambular paragraph of the revised version. One of the flaws which we wanted to address has just been remedied by the representative of the Soviet Union, but there still remain two others which we regret. As to the notion of the permanent sovereignty of States and peoples over their natural resources, we fail to recognize the necessity for the inclusion of this notion in this particular context and in any case we hold that the sovereignty of States over their natural resources is only acceptable if and when in accordance with the rules of international law. We also deplore the selective way in which the principle of self-determination is described in this preambular paragraph. Of course, the three specific cases mentioned there are important cases in which that principle applies; yet in our view language ought to have been found which underlines that the principle applies to all peoples in all circumstances.

(Mr. Mutzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Given the rather extensive reformulation of the original draft resolution, it seems obvious that the sponsor has not seen fit to accommodate these other concerns which we had. We regret this fact. However, in view of representations made to us by a number of non-aligned States, we shall not press for a vote on our amendments which still remain. However, in view of the shortcomings of the revised version, A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2, some of which are of a rather serious nature, we shall abstain when the decision is taken on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the draft amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 are no longer to be put to a decision.

I now wish to ask the same question of one of the sponsors of the draft amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92. What is the position of this document at present?

Mr. KAUSIKAN (Singapore): My delegation has asked to speak in order to withdraw the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92. Those amendments have been incorporated in toto in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2.

The text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 is not perfect, but no text is ever perfect. My delegation - and I am confident I speak also for the other sponsors - wishes to express our gratitude to the Soviet delegation for taking into consideration the interests and concerns of small third world countries like my own.

In our statement before this Committee on 5 December, my delegation emphasized that the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1, now A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2, that is, the principle of self-determination, was central to the security concerns of small third world countries. Particularly vital was the principle of non-intervention. Military intervention and occupation, whatever its source or motivation, is the most central threat to the security of all small third world countries. Military occupation and military intervention is the most blatant denial of the right to self-determination.

In draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 the question of motivation has now been addressed in, among other places, the sixth preambular paragraph. The question of military occupation and intervention has been directly addressed in operative paragraph 2.

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

The United Nations has also expressed its categorical rejection of military intervention and occupation in many other resolutions which deal with specific cases in various regions of the world. These resolutions enjoy overwhelming support and I am sure that all members of this Committee are familiar with them. If agenda item 143 is raised again at the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly, we could perhaps consider strengthening the text of next year's resolution by incorporating specific references to these particular cases of military intervention and occupation as the most blatant form of State terrorism. This is just a suggestion which members of this Committee may wish to consider in the months ahead until we meet again next fall.

In conclusion, may I once again take this opportunity to thank all those concerned for their co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92 are no longer before us for a decision.

We shall now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 as orally revised by the delegation of the Soviet Union in its fifth preambular paragraph.

I shall now call on those representatives which wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Miss PERSAUD (Guyana): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2.

The Committee's consideration of this item took place against the background of a growing tendency by States to resort to force in seeking to settle disputes or conflicts. Deliberate strategies of intervention, interference and destabilization are increasingly being implemented, as are threats to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of small States. My delegation is therefore grateful for this most timely consideration by this Assembly of the item of State terrorism.

The General Assembly has consistently upheld the sovereign right of States freely to determine their own political, economic, cultural and social systems, to develop their international relations and to exercise permanent sovereignty over their natural resources in accordance with the will of their peoples, without outside intervention, interference, subversion, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever.

Likewise, the Assembly has long outlawed strategies of intervention or destabilization and all acts aimed at undermining the stability of a State or of its institutions. In the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and

(Miss Persaud, Guyana)

Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted in 1981, the Assembly clearly reaffirmed the duty of a State to refrain from using terrorist practices as State policy against another State or against peoples. Such practices, in addition to threatening the independence and sovereignty of the State or States concerned, seek to maintain and promote inequality among States and create tension, distrust and insecurity. States have a right to determine their own form of government and to choose their own political, economic and social systems free from outside interference.

Guyana, therefore, rejects all attempts to undermine the socio-political systems of States or to impose ideological conformity. We believe that relations between States must be maintained on the basis of strict respect for the United Nations Charter and for the principles contained in the relevant declarations which the international community has adopted to govern the conduct of inter-State relations. Guyana has consistently defended these principles and we reiterate our commitment to them.

My delegation will, accordingly, vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. When discussing terrorism it is first necessary to seek the specific cause of the phenomenon referred to. The word terrorism acquires a particular meaning depending on its scope and nuance and depending on those who deal with it on a continual basis and who suffer from it. So one might say that terrorism is a tool at the service of subversion. This is the opposite of the concept of terrorism as an end in itself. Political science, like all other sciences, has a specialized terminology and uses the term terrorism to denote violence, acts which seek to paralyse, undermine, destabilize, threaten, intimidate and produce terror. Individuals who attack embassies with weapons and take people hostage are exercising an act of violence according to the general definition in a dictionary. But such an act, which has no definition in the field of international law and escapes its terminology, is a terrorist act in the political context.

We are therefore discussing a question which has not yet been defined. Is it State terrorism or not if it is directly or indirectly practised? Is it more or less violent to murder when one murders an individual or a group of diplomats or ordinary peasants? We are treading on dangerous ground when we attempt to discuss

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano,
Colombia)

State terrorism or ordinary terrorism without defining such ambiguous terms, especially if we do not take into account the various modalities of the phenomenon in various countries and circumstances.

In the situation which can be observed throughout the world today there is no instance of declared war. Rather, there are hotbeds of violence in various places, a violence which is motivated by the wish to change a particular political situation by means of arms. Terrorism is an integral part of that internal violence, and, obviously, foreign interference in the countries affected must be considered a special type of terrorism. In other words, in State terrorism two factors should be mentioned: a direct factor and an indirect factor. It is direct when it is exercised by the means referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 and indirect when it is carried out by means of material, ideological or any other support to internal groups or through mercenaries or indirect intervention, which takes many forms. If we try to agree on future conventions or resolutions with regard to this delicate matter in terms of a definition to encompass the terrorist phenomenon, we shall have to take account of these two elements. Direct terrorism is exercised through action by the organs of a foreign State or is practised by promoting internal violence, obviously violating the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of the States concerned. However, the elements of the definition in question as well as the definition itself would be and would continue to be a matter for the Sixth Committee. Terrorism is undue foreign interference, incitement to use arms and encouragement of any violent action aimed at undermining the free self-determination of peoples and their sovereignty over their own future.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

Terrorism is practised by those President Belisario Betancur Cuartas at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly described as "sowers of death":

"volunteers or mercenary troops and the private corporations of the big States, which from their bases in the producing countries work to refine their diabolical inventions and build their power on their destructive capability."

(A/38/PV.19, p. 12)

Combating violence in all its forms, pointing it out, denouncing it, fighting against it from the need for pacification and disarmament, working for the restoration of humanitarian and civilized values and for changes in economic and social phenomena that can contribute to promoting those values - that is the task to which the United Nations has been committed for 40 years. But as long as the daily lives of our peoples continue to be subject to the dangers created by the state of tension and insecurity that prevails in the international sphere, the efforts of the majority on behalf of peace will continue to be fruitless.

My delegation considers that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2 (and the amendments to it), which condemns State terrorism as a means of dealing with other States and other peoples, should condemn all direct and indirect forms of the tragic use of terrorism that is being endured in so many regions of the world where violent means are being employed to undermine political institutions and replace electoral processes, where, in addition to attempts to thwart the sovereign freedom of peoples, individual freedoms are also being violated, where attempts are being made to fish in the troubled waters of our fragile economies and where tricks are employed to shelter violence, where it is alleged that certain crimes are committed in response to other crimes and where an effort is made to justify direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs of other States.

My delegation condemns all violent actions for these purposes regardless of the political characteristics of either victim or perpetrator, and since that is not reflected either in the draft resolution or in the amendments - and I am referring to the true aspects of the phenomenon of terrorism and of a clear definition encompassing them - my delegation, to its regret, will not be able to support the draft resolution or the amendments to it.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. My delegation once again regrets that the super-Powers and their allies continue to introduce in the First Committee initiatives that are clearly aimed at increasing confrontation, without any regard for the need for constructive approaches and dispassionate discussion.

In the case of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2 the subsequent revised versions did correct some of the distortions of the original text, but Revision 2, in our opinion, still falls short of providing any useful definition of the suggested concept of State terrorism.

The amendments originally presented had the apparent objective of bringing the text closer to the wording of the Charter of the United Nations; however, they did not solve the juridical problems raised by the concept of State terrorism. Their partial incorporation in the text of A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 therefore was not sufficient to allay the doubts of my delegation.

By abstaining in the voting on the present text, as it would have done on the amendments presented to it, my delegation wishes to signify its disagreement with the constant attempts to utilize the United Nations as an arena for rivalry and confrontation between the two main military alliances. Such attempts seem to have no other objective than to provide justification for the continuation of the nuclear arms race in which the two super-Powers are engaged and which generated the current unbridled proliferation of their nuclear arsenals.

Furthermore, those trends work to the detriment of the more serious activities in which the multilateral organs on disarmament should be engaged.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. In so doing I should like, in the light of some of the comments that have been made, to clarify a few points.

First of all, my delegation rejects the attempts that have been made to equate the struggle against apartheid with attempts to undermine the socio-political system of a given State. Apartheid is itself a crime against humanity, and it is State terrorism against other States and peoples.

My delegation also opposes those arguments that are aimed at condemning any mention in a draft resolution on State terrorism of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources or the right of States freely to choose their

(Mr. Nufez Mosquera, Cuba)

socio-political system on the pretext that those concepts are not contained in the United Nations Charter. I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States there is explicit recognition that States have the duty not to use terrorist practices as State policy in their relations with other States and peoples. The third preambular paragraph of the Declaration recognizes the right of States to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources, and the fifth preambular paragraph recognizes the right of States freely to determine their social, economic and political systems without foreign interference.

Of course it could be alleged that the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1, which has been withdrawn, or of the amendments in A/C.1/39/L.92, did not vote in favour of that Declaration. However, paragraph 12 of the Final Document of the 1978 tenth special session, which was adopted by consensus, recognizes the right of peoples freely to determine their systems of social and economic development. Thus my delegation rejects the attempts that have been made here to sow confusion in the Committee.

Mr. SIMPSON (Ghana): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. My delegation had difficulty with the original version of the draft resolution owing to its lack of a definition of the concept of State terrorism. However, in the light of subsequent revisions my delegation is now prepared to support the draft resolution on the understanding that the concept will be further defined and refined.

(Mr. Simpson, Ghana)

We are doing this because we believe that State terrorism is a new and dangerous concept that threatens the independence of many small countries. We in Africa are particularly aware of this kind of offence, and therefore we should like to give support to the definition of this concept.

We were a little surprised to find that some countries had difficulty in accepting the concept at all. We have said that it is not clearly defined, but no one can deny that State terrorism is a reality. In fact the United States, for example, has often pointed an accusing finger at some countries concerning some incidents in Lebanon, stating that behind them is some kind of State terrorism. We are also surprised that some countries which claim to have suffered from some form of State terrorism are unable even to accept the concept. Even now, in the incident of the hijacking of a Saudi Arabian airliner, the mass media are giving us to understand that somehow there is some activity of State terrorism behind it. While we may not necessarily agree with that, since it has not been substantiated, we believe that the phenomenon is dangerous enough for all of us to be concerned about it, that the United Nations should take it seriously and that we should move forward to study it, refine it and define it more clearly.

I have mentioned Africa before in connection with State terrorism. Our part of the world has seen it in its most blatant form. The most blatant form of State terrorism, as we are all aware, is practised by apartheid racist South Africa, in its acts of aggression, coercion and blackmail against its neighbours. For this particular reason we are prepared to support the draft resolution, in the hope that the concept will in future be more clearly defined and refined.

Mr. SYLLA (Senegal) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to state very briefly its reservations of principle concerning the appropriateness of the examination by the First Committee of the question of State terrorism, which is only one aspect of the broader notion of terrorism. This notion of terrorism, although it was examined by the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly about 10 years ago, has still not been the subject of any clear and precise definition acceptable to everyone. Therefore we should have preferred that the First Committee not have to deal with this question at this stage of the evolution of the concept of terrorism.

(Mr. Sylla, Senegal)

Without prejudice to these reservations of principle, and to the extent that the First Committee has found it necessary to make State terrorism the subject of a particularly animated debate, the delegation of Senegal will take a position on this text on its merits. We shall vote in favour of it.

Mr. OYARCE (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has followed closely the process leading to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. It reflects a series of principles to which the international community attaches special priority, and perhaps the most important among them, that of self-determination, is involved in all its aspects directly or indirectly. The main objective in this draft resolution is to condemn a certain type of terrorism which is affecting various parts of the world in various ways.

In this context, I wish to state that at the international level my country has supported conventional measures adopted in the United Nations with a view to increasing international co-operation to prevent and punish terrorism in all its forms. In this context, the conventions on international terrorism prepared under the auspices of the Organization, specifically in the Sixth Committee, are valuable and effective instruments intended to put an end to such a despicable phenomenon. The conventions of Tokyo, The Hague, Montreal and New York cover various aspects of the question. Nevertheless, this draft resolution presents a basic conceptual difficulty. What is understood by State terrorism? There are many technical, ideological and political interpretations which inevitably engage different concepts of international structures and the role of specific political forces in them. The presentation and treatment of this question shows that we are faced rather with a political than with a technical or legal exercise, and, unfortunately, elements of confrontation, either legitimate or otherwise, are involved between the nuclear Powers and their alliances.

As far as my delegation is concerned, any initiative seeking to condemn this phenomenon, which jeopardizes generally accepted principles and norms of international law, must begin with an organic process of defining actions regardless of political or ideological connotations. Otherwise we would be playing a political and procedural game which would once again contribute to emphasizing a strong and critical trend which has been emerging in public opinion with regard to certain related questions.

Therefore my delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece): Greece will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. Yesterday the representative of Ireland, on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community, stated the views of the Ten, to which we fully subscribe. However, since the new draft resolution, in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 which had not been circulated at the time of that statement, has incorporated quite a number of the positive amendments included in draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 and L.92, my delegation considers that the improvements make it worthy of a favourable vote, while there is no doubt that the definition of State terrorism is still a problem which remains unsolved from a legal point of view.

In this context, I should like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the explanations given by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and Singapore when they withdrew their amendments. More specifically, I should like to associate myself with the wish expressed by the representative of Singapore that before the fortieth session of the General Assembly we shall have the opportunity for more study and be able to elaborate a more concise resolution.

Finally, I wish to emphasize the importance of the new wording of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2, which reads as follows:

"Demands that all States take no actions aimed at military intervention and occupation, forcible change in or undermining of the socio-political system of States, the destabilization and overthrow of their Governments and, in particular, initiate no military action to that end under any pretext whatsoever, and cease forthwith any such action already in progress".

To that my country, Greece, attaches the highest importance.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2, as orally revised was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan): In its statement in the Committee yesterday, my delegation commented, inter alia, on the draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States.

(Mr. Husain, Pakistan)

We appreciate that the Soviet delegation, in further consideration of the matter, took into account many of the matters put forward in our statement and also those comments conveyed separately to the Soviet delegation later. My delegation therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

However, we should like to place on record our understanding of the draft resolution, which is that it condemns and prohibits foreign intervention and interference in any form whatsoever in the internal and external affairs of States. It was on the basis of that understanding that my delegation found it possible to vote for the draft resolution, despite the fact that it still suffers from a number of lacunae and shortcomings.

Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, because it strongly supports all the principles embodied in the draft, namely:

"the obligation of all States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State as well as the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their own form of government and to choose their own economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion and constraint of any kind whatsoever" (first preambular para.)

The draft resolution:

"Demands that all States take no actions aimed at military intervention and occupation, forcible change in or undermining of the socio-political system of States, the destabilization and overthrow of their Governments and, in particular, initiate no military action to that end under any pretext whatsoever, and cease forthwith any such action already in progress". (para. 2)

In fact, that is the *raison d'être* of the struggle now being waged by the Kampuchean people and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea.

However, it is regrettable to note that the sponsor of the draft resolution has abetted, and continues to abet in all fields - military, financial, economic, political and diplomatic - the aggressors in their war of aggression and occupation against my country, Kampuchea, in violation of the sacred principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, undermining the socio-political system of the State of Democratic Kampuchea and depriving the Kampuchean people of their inalienable right

(Mr. Thach Siray, Democratic
Kampuchea)

to self-determination - and that notwithstanding the insistent demands of the international community.

Furthermore, everyone knows that had the country that sponsored the draft resolution withdrawn its backing, the invaders of my country would have met with unsustainable difficulties in keeping their armed forces in Kampuchea. The Kampuchean people would long ago have enjoyed freedom and independence, and the region would have benefited from peace and stability.

Having said that, my delegation has doubts about the sponsor's purpose - whether it sincerely intends to preserve concord and harmony in international relations between States, in compliance with the principles that inspired it, or whether it is trying to create a new artifice aimed at forcing the international community to accept its military intervention and that of its allies as a fait accompli, for during the past few years the world has witnessed with bitterness a widening gap between deeds and words and a proliferation of sweet words and hypocrisy.

My delegation, therefore, would like to express its serious reservations in this connection, and would be grateful to have them included in the Committee's records.

Mr. KEISALO (Finland): We believe that terrorism in all its manifestations is a detestable phenomenon that should be outlawed by a common effort of the United Nations as a whole. In that sense, we understand the motives of the Soviet Union in introducing the agenda item.

(Mr. Keisalo, Finland)

Finland supports these efforts and has become a party to the most important international agreements regarding the question of terrorism. For the time being the First Committee has not been able to arrive at an agreed conclusion with regard to the contents of the draft resolution on State terrorism. Unfortunately, the Committee could not settle the political and controversial elements involved. We believe that in order to reach a political solution we need first to have a legal framework within which to work, which we do not yet have. These reasons led us, much to our regret, to abstain in the vote just taken.

Mr. DANIELSSON (Sweden): I have asked to speak to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. Sweden abstained in the voting on this draft resolution. This should, however, not be regarded as indifference with regard to terrorism. On the contrary, we condemn terrorist acts, whether performed by States or by individuals.

As was rightly pointed out in the debate, we have to give careful consideration to a new item inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly. We must also be conscious of the fact that we are engaged in a continuous process of defining international norms. The central concept of the new item 143 is that of State terrorism. The main reason that prompted my delegation to abstain in the vote just taken is the fact that there is no generally accepted definition of that concept. The Sixth Committee has been struggling for many years with this issue without being able to find an acceptable definition. The lack of clarity in this respect even raises the question as to what the General Assembly has been asked to condemn. We appreciate that efforts have been made to improve the text. However, those efforts have not been sufficient to remove the basic difficulty just mentioned. In the opinion of my delegation, the problem re-emerges even in the amended formulation of operative paragraph 1. Furthermore, it is our conviction that whatever may be understood by the concept of State terrorism, there can be little doubt that the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations exclude any practices that may come to mind.

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.2/Rev.2. We did so because we find the concept of State terrorism unclear and we cannot see any satisfactory attempt at defining it in the text. Although the Norwegian delegation interprets the draft resolution as rejecting any form of intervention in the internal and external affairs of other

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

countries, we would have liked to have seen the comprehensive nature of the principle of non-intervention underlined in the text.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. However, we have several reservations with regard to the phrase "State terrorism". The phrase is ambiguous in its definition and whatever phrase is adopted it has to be arrived at by in-depth legal studies, which can produce a scientific and accurate definition.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 because the Chinese Government has always stood for normal and healthy international relations. We have always held the view that no matter what the socio-political systems of States may be, they should base their relations on a strict observance of the Charter of the United Nations and accept the norms of international relations. The affairs of each State should be managed by the people of that State and the socio-political system should be chosen and decided upon by the people of that State.

In international relations no State should practice terrorism and should refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or interfere in the internal or external affairs of another State.

In order to ensure international peace and security, all States in the world must coexist peacefully, whether they have the same socio-political system or not. There is no other way. States which are engaged in armed aggression or military occupation must immediately stop their operations. All foreign occupation forces must be immediately withdrawn.

In this regard, we particularly hope that the sponsors of the draft resolution will match their words with their deeds and set an example by their actions.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): Turkey abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2 submitted by the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics on the subject of State terrorism. Turkey's views concerning the subject of terrorism, and its continued efforts to put this subject before the international community, are well known. They were once more placed on record the day before yesterday in this very Committee. Turkey abstained because the said draft resolution dealt only with one aspect of the scourge of terrorism, which, in the opinion of my Government, must be dealt with as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote at this time, we have concluded action upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.2. We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 52nd meeting, on 4 December.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I wish to bring to the attention of the Committee certain secondary revisions in the second preambular paragraph in the second line after "circumstances", where the words "tensions and conflicts" should replace the words "undeclared wars". The second preambular paragraph would thus read as follows:

"Profoundly concerned over today's situation of the international community in circumstances of tensions and conflicts long continuing between nations and denoting a marked decline in the respect for the Charter and the basic elements of international law".

Then in the sixth preambular paragraph, in the third line, the word "restore" should be replaced by the word "enhance". The paragraph now reads:

"Taking due regard of the need that on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations specific endeavours should be devoted by the international community to enhance the United Nations effectiveness as required for it by the Charter".

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Then in operative paragraph 1, instead of "requests", the word "recommends" should be substituted, making the paragraph read as follows:

"Recommends to the Security Council to give priority consideration to the need for strengthening the system of collective security provided for in the Charter of the United Nations".

These are the slight revisions I wished to point out.

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it that the Committee has no objection to including those oral revisions in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1?

That appears to be the case. There appear to be no delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote on that draft resolution. I have received a request that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1 be adopted without a vote. If I hear nothing to the contrary I shall declare draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1, as orally amended, adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations that wish to explain their positions.

Mr. AKKERMAN (Netherlands): My delegation did not wish to stand in the way of the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1, as orally revised by the representative of Cyprus just now. However, I wish to recall that, under the Charter, Member States have conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on the Security Council. My delegation continues to be of the opinion that the Security Council, in its consideration of possibilities to strengthen the system of collective security provided for in the Charter, should do nothing which might detract from the Council's duties and responsibilities under the Charter.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): The Turkish delegation wishes to place on record that we would not have participated had the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1 been put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare that we have concluded action upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1, as orally revised.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 61st meeting of the Committee, on 6 December, and is sponsored by Algeria, Cameroon, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mali, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and

(The Chairman)

Zambia. The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/39/L.93.

Before I call on delegations to explain their vote before the vote, I call on the representative of Sierra Leone to make a statement concerning draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): My delegation has studied the programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 and I should like to say that we do not view this document with equanimity.

We are of the view that the costs of the meeting of the Committee should be considerably reduced where possible and if possible. We have in mind, for example, the following.

On page 2 we have noticed that the pre-session documentation will amount to a sum of \$107,400. At the same time we have noted that we have in-session documentation costing \$109,200. It is not easy for us to discern the difference between these two sets of documentation. We believe that one set of documents could be used in the next budgetary year. We therefore invite the responsible body, the Committee on Conferences, to study this matter with a view to making the necessary reduction in costs.

On the whole, we are of the view that this estimate is on the high side and it should be reduced considerably. We also want to enter an appeal, but every effort should be made to minimize the costs of the meeting as much as possible. As I say, we are just as concerned as other delegations that the costs of this all-important Committee should be considerably reduced.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations that wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): As it did last year in the case of resolution 38/191 establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the French delegation will have to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1.

This draft resolution is aimed at setting up that Committee, which has not been set up because of differences that appeared with regard to its composition after consultations undertaken by the President of the General Assembly. We regret

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not proceed to consultations on their intentions and in particular on the composition of the Committee.

We have therefore noted, not without some surprise, that in accordance with this draft resolution France would be a member of the Committee, when the French delegation was not consulted in advance, as is customary. We must therefore express reservations on the question of our possible participation in this Committee, if it is set up.

But that is not the main reason for our objections. As we stated last year, we did not oppose a study on the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. But assuming such a study were justified, the establishment of a new committee just for that would seem inappropriate to us. The Committee could only have a partial view of the problem. In our view, it would have been preferable to bring the question before the Security Council itself or before the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization. That Committee alone has the necessary overall view to deal with the implementation of provisions of the Charter that are so closely interrelated. Its mandate, which has just been renewed by the Sixth Committee through a draft resolution adopted without a vote, attaches priority to the question of the maintenance of international peace and security in all its aspects with a view to strengthening the role of the United Nations, particularly that of the Security Council.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

It is clear in those circumstances that the Committee which is envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 would encroach upon the mandate of the Charter committee. Furthermore, draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.85/Rev.1 and L.88/Rev.1 also call upon the Security Council to consider the same questions. If draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 is adopted, there would thus be a proliferation of organs asked to consider the same question or related matters.

The Egyptian delegation in its statement in the Sixth Committee on the report of the Special Committee on the Charter has already stressed the serious difficulties such fragmentation would present. We share their view and we therefore invite delegations interested in the effectiveness of our Organization to take the same position as we do with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to speak at this time, we shall now take action upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 61st meeting, on 6 December 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Cameroon, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mali, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Zambia.

The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/39/L.93.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 was adopted by 93 votes to 22, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 because we consider that the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee envisaged in it would entail duplication with the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations, which, under resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, has been asked to accord priority by devoting more time to the question of the maintenance of international peace and security in all its aspects in order to strengthen the role of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, and to enable it to discharge fully its responsibilities under the Charter.

Miss BOYD (Australia): Australia's positive vote on this resolution should be taken as an indication of our strong support for the collective security provisions of the Charter and our wish to support all efforts to enhance those provisions.

However, we are concerned at the provision in this resolution that the Committee should comprise 54 members. We regard this size of the Committee as somewhat large, and we also share the concerns reflecting the somewhat excessive assessments of the probable cost of this Committee which have already been expressed by the principal sponsor, the Ambassador of Sierra Leone.

The CHAIRMAN: If no delegation wishes to speak at this time, we shall now take action upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.87, which was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 59th meeting, on 5 December 1984, and is

(The Chairman)

sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.87 was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: If no delegation wishes to speak at this time, we have concluded our consideration of this draft resolution.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.88/Rev.1. I call upon the representative of Malta who wishes to introduce the draft resolution.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.88/Rev.1. The main considerations prompting the need for this draft resolution were given detailed expression in my statement in the Committee last Tuesday.

With so many draft resolutions on strengthening international security having already been submitted to the Committee for its attention, one might legitimately wonder whether one more was really necessary. I believe it is.

In the first place the number of draft resolutions presented is an accurate barometer of the concern most of us feel at the present precarious situation. The traditional draft resolution submitted to this Committee is declaratory in character, and, though a valid reminder of our obligations, its impact has been dulled by constant repetition. This is one characteristic in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.88/Rev.1 that is different. However, there are several other features in the draft resolution.

In the first place, it introduces the new concept of common security. As I indicated in my statement, this is a feature of modern times which deserves to be stressed now and which will assume even more importance in future.

Two, the draft resolution, while expressing concern, also extends a message of conviction that, together, we can overcome the dangers posed by massive armaments and avoid their use through concerted action to resolve and prevent conflict.

Three, it recognizes that, quietly but consistently, the Security Council has already been engaged in consultations for strengthening even further the potential capacity of the Council for safeguarding peace and security. It notes with appreciation the information conveyed and welcomes the important considerations advanced. This valuable exercise has intrinsic value and of itself generates a measure of confidence and mutual understanding.

Four, the draft resolution reaffirms strongly that the prerequisite for peace is founded in the Charter, in strict compliance with its provisions, which retain their vitality and validity.

Five, it notes that consideration of the issues involved has proceeded from the general to the specific and that conscious efforts are being made to seek areas likely to produce agreement.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Six, it creates no new body, thus implicitly recognizing the primary role of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security and also that, for procedural and practical reasons, agreement in the Council by all members is a necessary forerunner to effective action.

Seven, it eschews direct or indirect criticism. On the contrary, it stresses the common interest as well as the common responsibility to act in concert and unanimity.

Eight, it suggests no simple solutions nor does it set any arbitrary deadline, thus implicitly recognizing that what is at issue is a matter of extreme complexity, a thankless task requiring time, effort, patience, determination and undisturbed good will. The objectives could not be more noble or more inspiring.

Nine, it appreciates that the Council has to set its own priorities and merely asks for continued and, if possible, more systematic efforts to produce agreement.

Finally, it leaves it up to the Council members to determine when they might convey additional information to all Members on developments as they occur, thus evidencing abiding faith that further progress will eventually be achieved, again to the common benefit of all.

I had asked for suggestions from all interested parties to improve the text of the draft resolution. In the course of my consultations a few suggestions have been made. I welcome those suggestions and bow to the wisdom of those who made them since it is always possible for an original text to be improved upon.

Accordingly, the following revisions, which simplify the language of the draft resolution but leave its thrust unchanged, have been agreed to. I had earlier agreed to some changes in the first and second preambular paragraphs and these changes appear in document A/C.1/39/L.88/Rev.1. However, subsequent consultations have indicated a preference for the deletion of those two preambular paragraphs. I do not think the substance of the draft resolution would thereby be altered, and it would thus become even more concise. The third preambular paragraph will therefore become the first, and the word "therefore" in that paragraph would be deleted. In the same preambular paragraph, the word "devising" is replaced by "promoting" and the word "alternative" is deleted.

In operative paragraph 2 the word "welcomes" replaces the word "endorses".

Operative paragraph 4 has been simplified to read: "aware of the respective functions and specific powers of the Council", and continuing as in the existing text.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

In operative paragraph 7 the word "special" is replaced by the word "primary".

As I said in my statement earlier, all members have a vested interest in progress by the Council, however slow and limited that may be. I therefore trust that this common interest and unity will be demonstrated by the draft resolution's adoption, as orally revised, without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.88/Rev.1, which has just been introduced by the representative of Malta and which is sponsored by the Bahamas, Ecuador, Ghana, Malta, Sierra Leone, Singapore and Uruguay.

A request has been made that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that request.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.88/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89, which was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 61st meeting, on 6 December, and is sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Benin, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uruguay, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. I call on the representative of Brazil for an explanation of vote.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): In 1978 my delegation voted in favour of resolution 33/73 and in 1981 it also supported resolution 36/104, which dealt respectively with the adoption of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace and with its implementation.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89 seems to have been prompted by the report of the Secretary-General on this item, contained in document A/39/143. The report simply reproduces the replies given by Member States to a request by the Secretary-General. One should note that, out of the 159 Member States, only 19 replied to the Secretary-General and that, out of those 19, 12 belong to the same regional group of States. Given the little interest aroused in the vast majority of the international community, there seems to be little justification for anything but a short procedural resolution on the question. One would believe that all that could possibly be said on the substance of the matter is already incorporated in the Declaration itself.

However, the draft introduces some dangerous substantive elements into the principles adopted in 1978 in the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. For instance, operative paragraph 2 would have Governments and non-governmental organizations "incorporate active promotion of the ideas of the preparation of societies for life in peace in their programmes". Governments would thus direct the action that private organizations should accomplish. Given the obscure meaning of the expression "promotion of the ideas of the preparation of societies for life in peace", it would be entirely at the discretion of Governments to interpret the ideological directions they would give to private, non-governmental institutions in their countries.

My Government, for one, has strong doubts about this, for it would amount to condoning State direction that might entail curtailment of the freedom of expression and the right of private organizations to pursue their own objectives within the sole limits of national lawful processes without interference. The element of totalitarianism contained in the prescription for State direction of their activities is, in our view, incompatible with the notion of respect for individual liberties.

For this reason, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/39/L.89.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89 was adopted by 105 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. AKKERMAN (Netherlands): My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89.

The Netherlands holds the strong view that the concept of life in peace should be applicable first and foremost to the life of each and every individual citizen. For life in peace to have a practical meaning for individuals, it should be inextricably linked with human rights. These, for the individual, mean freedom of expression and freedom of conscience, religion and belief, as well as freedom from

(Mr. Akkerman, Netherlands)

war, want and fear. International security cannot be strengthened in the world community if all those freedoms are not guaranteed in toto. The Netherlands has the duty, inter alia, through international obligations, to guarantee the free exercise of those freedoms to its citizens.

We maintain more specifically our reservations expressed on the occasion of the adoption of resolution 36/104, with respect to the notion contained therein pertaining to the "positive moulding of human consciousness". In our view, such a notion could prejudice the exercise of the said freedoms by individual citizens.

Finally, my delegation strongly supports the important point just made by the representative of Brazil in explaining the vote of his delegation before the vote.

For the reasons just set out, in view of the selective treatment of life in peace in resolution A/C.1/39/L.89 and our reservations concerning the predecessor resolutions, we do not consider the convening of a panel of peace research experts on the implementation of the Declaration opportune.

The Netherlands, therefore, abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89.

Mr. LOEHR (Federal Republic of Germany): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.89, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.

My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89. It did so reluctantly, because the preservation and strengthening of peace have been a constant and paramount tenet of the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany, and therefore it has endorsed the basic thrust of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace by voting in favour of resolution 33/73 despite some reservations regarding the language of that resolution.

However, my delegation did not feel in a position to support the rather one-sided concept that seems to be at the root of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89. In particular, my delegation regrets the apparent absence of any meaningful incorporation of the concept of human rights into the framework of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89.

Furthermore, I wish to draw attention to the second preambular paragraph, which refers to the paramount value of "positive moulding of human consciousness". As delegations will be aware, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany

(Mr. Loehr, Federal
Republic of Germany)

rejects the concept of controlled information. My delegation considers that unimpeded access for all sectors of the public to a broad range of information and opinion on questions concerning the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations is a prerequisite for the formation of a public well informed on these matters. My delegation would also like to concur with the thrust of the important statement just made by the representative of Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89.

The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malta at the 59th meeting, on 5 November, and is sponsored by Algeria, Cyprus, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Romania, Tunisia and Yugoslavia.

I call on the representative of Malta, who wishes to make a statement concerning draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): In the past few days we have had very intensive consultations with interested countries, particularly those of the Mediterranean, concerning the draft resolution originally submitted by my delegation and those of Algeria, Cyprus, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Romania, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. Those consultations were carried out in a frank and friendly manner, which the sponsors highly appreciated. We made every effort we considered reasonable and fair to accommodate the points of view that were advanced. The result of that exercise is contained in the revised draft resolution.

The sponsors remain anxious for further progress, which we hope will come soon. For instance, we look forward, in due course, to communications, particularly from Mediterranean countries, announcing further progress, and eventually to an updated report from the Secretary-General at some convenient time in the future. But for today we are grateful for the result of our combined efforts, and we trust that, as a fitting outcome of those efforts, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1 will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon any delegations that wish to explain their positions before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1 on the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, but we very much hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

The French delegation notes that the terms of the draft resolution before the Committee are in keeping with the positions and objectives of its Government on this question. We very much appreciated the spirit of conciliation manifested by the sponsors of the draft resolution in consultations that led to a generally accepted text which takes account of the diversity of situations but at the same time very clearly manifests a will to achieve common objectives of great importance for all the States of the region.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

The French delegation hopes that the adoption of this draft resolution will mark a new stage on the road towards the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. We would stress that the authority of this resolution will depend upon its receiving unanimous support from all coastal States. We would recall that the maintenance and strengthening of security in the Mediterranean are inseparable from respect for the security requirements of each of the coastal States. The French delegation wishes to stress France's great interest in the development of co-operation in the Mediterranean region and its willingness fully to participate in efforts undertaken with that end in view.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegation wish to speak before the Committee takes a decision? It appears not.

The Committee has heard the representative of Malta request that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1 be adopted by consensus. May I take it that the First Committee wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations that wish to explain their positions.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): The Turkish delegation did not oppose the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1, even though as submitted and adopted the text lacks basic balance. It refers to documents with which Turkey cannot politically associate itself, and it does not make an objective assessment of the existing situation in the Mediterranean region.

Turkey, historically a Mediterranean country, with one of the longest coastlines in that vitally important area, and with one of its largest populations, regrets that its views were not adequately taken into consideration by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

The maintenance of peace and harmony in that vitally important area has always been one of the main principles of Turkish foreign policy. Turkey has always been a firm believer in, and has always adhered to, initiated and supported all efforts at co-operation among Mediterranean States. That is why a few moments ago we did not oppose a consensus, even though in our judgement the ideas that make up the draft resolution emanate from a single source and consequently its text lacks an objective assessment of the existing realities in our part of the globe.

(Mr. Sibay, Turkey)

We hope that the drafters of future resolutions on this subject will bear it in mind that the Mediterranean, the cradle of all civilization and democracy, has always harboured, allowed and welcomed diverse opinions, and its peoples have largely benefited from this tolerant attitude.

Mr. ALEXANDROV (Bulgaria): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1.

The discussion on the issue of strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean during the current session and previous sessions testifies to the importance of the problem in the broad spectrum of international affairs. The Helsinki Final Act and other significant international documents rightly emphasized the considerable impact of the Mediterranean situation in the wider context of European and world security. The resolution addresses that important issue. Its chief merit, in my delegation's view, is the emphasis on the urgent necessity of reducing tensions, curbing armaments and strictly observing the principles of non-intervention and the non-use of force or the threat of force, security, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Those priorities, embodied in paragraph 1, correctly reflect the basic reasons behind the mounting confrontation in the area, which could easily start a chain reaction of crisis, with unpredictable consequences in the area itself as well as in the adjacent regions.

My delegation fully shares the views of those representatives who identified the sources of tension in the Mediterranean as the military build-up in the area, Israeli expansionism and aggression, the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles, neo-colonialist pressures and attacks on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Alarmed by all those destabilizing developments, my country, together with other socialist States, strongly advocates steps to reverse those dangerous trends. Its position is reflected in the Secretary-General's report (A/39/517).

We have also unreservedly joined the efforts of the world community aimed at achieving a just, peaceful and comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. My country, as a Black Sea Power, is directly connected with the Mediterranean and security in that region is of immediate concern to it. The Mediterranean is our sole water route for communication with other continents. Therefore, Bulgaria is deeply interested in the transformation of the Mediterranean from a region of conflict and tension into a zone of peace, security and co-operation.

It is our understanding of the resolution that it could not be interpreted, and no attempt should be made to interpret it, in a manner detrimental to the specific and at the same time fully legitimate interests of my country and other parties in the same position.

(Mr. Alexandrov, Bulgaria)

In the light of those considerations, my delegation will continue to monitor closely the evolution of the subject and participate constructively in the respective deliberations. My delegation would have appreciated it if the resolution had contained the position set forth in General Assembly resolution 37/118 concerning the interdependence between security in the Mediterranean and the security of the adjacent regions. Such a provision would have enriched the document and would have clarified and streamlined it, both as a concept and as a political instrument. We would also have preferred a clearer delineation of the harmful effects of the arms race on the security climate in the Mediterranean. However, since we found the basic thrust and provisions of the resolution in general agreement with our views on the situation, my delegation decided to support it unhesitatingly.

Mr. LEIBOWITZ (United States of America): My delegation would like to explain its votes on several draft resolutions that the Committee has just adopted.

As it did last year on a similar draft resolution, the United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 on the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. That draft resolution again proposes to establish a committee to perform activities provided for in the mandate of the Special Committee on the United Nations Charter and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, the proper United Nations forum for the investigation of these important matters. The issues involved are complex and contentious; progress will not be served by institutional duplication and can only be dangerously complicated by such duplication. We have not had sufficient time to consider the issue this year and firmly believe that the expenditure of funds for this purpose is unnecessary and unwise.

The United States abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.87 on the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. While these issues are important ones worthy of consideration, my delegation believes this text strays at points into contentious issues of regional problems and economics, with partisan views that tend to prejudice the outcome of negotiations and thus mar the balance of the draft resolution. Moreover, the draft resolution places blame for the deterioration of the international security climate exclusively on the super-Powers, ignoring other sources of conflict that have in the past few decades produced much human

(Mr. Leibowitz, United States)

I should now like to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.89 on the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. As we have said when this subject was discussed in the past, the United States supports the moving spirit and intent of this initiative. But defects that we have found in this resolution in the past have not disappeared, and new ones have been added. We cannot support a reference to "positive moulding of human consciousness". In a free society like ours the consciousness of each citizen moulds the State and not vice versa.

This year the resolution contains some additional flaws that cause us concern. We do not support the invitation in paragraph 2 to the United Nations and related bodies to

"incorporate active promotion of the ideas of the preparation of societies for life in peace in their programmes".

No matter how moderately expressed, this is another effort to politicize United Nations bodies and involve them in activities in which they have no competence. The United States also sees no value in convening a panel of peace research experts, called for in paragraph 7. The First Committee has already decided to conduct numerous studies; it must make some choices between those that may make a real contribution and others.

Finally, I should like to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.90/Rev.1 on the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. The United States joined the consensus on this draft resolution, despite some reservations, for example, on language in paragraph 1 (c), which refers to previous United Nations resolutions on the area. We remind the Committee that the United States does not support all United Nations resolutions that have been adopted concerning the Mediterranean region. We have acted, however, in the spirit of compromise and with the understanding and belief that this resolution will complement efforts in other forums to enhance the security of the States of that region. My delegation also wishes to make it perfectly clear that our action on this resolution in no way implies any support for the Valletta Declaration, which we consider totally unacceptable.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I should like to thank all those who contributed to the adoption by consensus of the resolution on the Mediterranean, including, of course, our dear friend and colleague from Turkey. We do not disagree with his views. The Maltese people are a mixture of many civilizations, and our ties of history with the other Mediterranean countries are of long standing. Adversary relationships of the past - for instance, with Turkey in 1565 - have today been changed into the friendliest co-operation. That is what we wish for the entire Mediterranean region, and it is the kind of progress we heartily solicit.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote we have concluded consideration of and action upon all agenda items concerning security, which are items 67, 68, 69 and 143.

I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): In accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, by which the Secretary-General shall keep all Committees informed of the detailed estimated costs of all resolutions which have been recommended by the Committees for approval by the General Assembly, I should like to inform delegations of the following resolutions which the First Committee has recommended for approval by the General Assembly and which have programme budget implications. I shall read out the symbol numbers of the respective draft resolutions and the corresponding document numbers containing the detailed estimated costs: A/C.1/39/L.13 in document A/C.1/39/L.73; L.23 in document L.74; L.30/Rev.1 in document L.82; L.38 in document L.76; L.45/Rev.1 in document L.84; L.72/Rev.1 in document L.79; L.62 in document L.77; and the draft resolution contained in report A/39/29, with the programme budget implications in L.81; and L.86/Rev.1 in document L.93.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded all our business concerning the items on the agenda of the First Committee.

The spokesmen of the regional groups have inscribed their names on the list of speakers. At this time I shall call on the representative of the Congo, who will speak on behalf of the African Group of States.

Mr. MANDA-LOUNDHET (Congo) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, it was about two months ago that the First Committee, under your leadership, continued its discussion on problems of disarmament and international security. In the course of this discussion - which sometimes assumed an aspect of polemic - we all learned to appreciate two things properly: first of all, the desire of everyone to express his ideas on the subject and that very differing ideas need to be harmonized and co-ordinated in order the better to serve our future. We entertain ideas, of course, but the domain of ideas is not a fact in itself. It is just a stage. The most difficult task remains to be accomplished and we believe that the various declarations and statements heard here will serve as a basis for making our planet one of peace and happiness.

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

Speaking for the first time in this Committee on 29 October last, Sir, the Congo delegation indicated that it was convinced that you would successfully conduct the delicate proceedings of this Committee. Today, at a time when the work of the First Committee is coming to a close, we note that we were not mistaken. That is why, on behalf of the African Group, we extend to you our warm congratulations on the exceptional qualities you have manifested in the discharge of your functions. We would like to express our profound gratitude and thanks.

Thanks go also to our two Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Wegener, of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Mr. Vejvoda, of Czechoslovakia, and to Mr. Kessely, of Chad, our Rapporteur. Mr. Kheradi, the Secretary of our Committee, who was unstinting in his efforts to co-ordinate our meetings, and his team, will find here a mark of our gratitude. To all those who through their daily contributions have helped in one way or another to bring the proceedings of this Committee to a successful conclusion, we would like to express our gratitude.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Jordan, who will speak on behalf of the Asian Group of States.

Mr. SHUGUM (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, it is a great honour, as we approach the conclusion of the work of the First Committee, to speak on behalf of the Asian Group of States and to convey to you our congratulations and gratitude for your wisdom and patience and the excellent manner in which you have conducted our work. Thanks to you, Sir, the Committee has been able to tackle an overloaded agenda successfully and to consider the items on it systematically. Your dedication and wisdom have helped us to arrive at a successful conclusion. Many views have been expressed during the course of our deliberations, and your wisdom helped this Committee to overcome all the obstacles that we faced in our work.

Allow me also to express the appreciation of the Asian Group of States to the officers of the Committee, who have helped greatly in the conduct of our work and discussions, to the Vice-Chairmen, Ambassador Vejvoda, from Czechoslovakia, and Ambassador Wegener, from the Federal Republic of Germany, and also to Mr. Kessely, our Rapporteur, from Chad.

(Mr. Shugum, Jordan)

I should also like to express the gratitude of the Group for the excellent manner in which the Secretary of the Committee conducted his work. Our thanks also go to the interpreters, translators, conference and documents officers, and everyone who has contributed to the successful conclusion of the work of this Committee, which, under your leadership, Sir, has contributed greatly to international peace and security.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Romania who will speak on behalf of the Eastern European Group of States.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Eastern European States, I have the great privilege and honour to extend to you our most sincere and heartfelt congratulations on the successful conclusion of the work of the First Committee. Owing to your skilful guidance and sustained endeavours to conduct our proceedings in an efficient manner, we have managed to deal efficiently and in timely fashion with a very heavy agenda containing items having a direct bearing on the most vital problems of the present day, namely, disarmament and international security.

The debates and the great number of draft resolutions we have acted upon express in the most explicit way the profound concern of our countries and peoples with regard to saving mankind from a nuclear disaster. We may differ as to the method and scope of our action but not with respect to the recognition of the imperative need to eliminate the risk of a nuclear war, drastically to reduce nuclear weapons, to prevent the militarization of outer space, to halt and reverse the arms race and to reduce military expenditure.

As our deliberations made clear again this year, the policy of disarmament, peaceful coexistence, détente and co-operation, based on strict observance of the principles of international law, is the only alternative we have today for a more stable and secure world.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Certainly this is neither the time nor the place to make a detailed assessment of our work, but I can hardly resist the temptation to mention that seen against the background of the ever worsening international situation not all the draft resolutions already adopted entirely meet our expectations.

However, we consider it extremely important that the majority of the draft resolutions decided upon emphasize the urgent need to start or continue serious negotiations on various substantive disarmament items with a view to reaching concrete agreements and ensuring the right of all States to undiminished security and a balance of forces at the lowest possible level of armaments.

As we conclude this session of the First Committee today, the Eastern European countries are fully aware that the most difficult part of our work is still ahead, that is, the implementation of what the Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption.

We express the hope that all States will do their utmost, showing political will, constructiveness and flexibility, to pursue serious and meaningful negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and in other bilateral or multilateral forums to enhance the role of the United Nations in safeguarding peace and strengthening international security and to relaunch the policy of détente and co-operation.

I do not wish to conclude without tendering our congratulations to the two Vice-Chairmen and to the Rapporteur of our Committee.

At the same time we extend our appreciation to Mr. Ustinov and Mr. Martenson for the contribution they have made to the work of the Committee.

We are grateful also to the members of the Secretariat, in particular to Mr. Kheradi and his colleagues at every level, who, by their dedication and solicitude, contributed greatly to the accomplishment of the highly complex tasks entrusted to the Committee.

Some of us present here are about to rejoin their families and we wish them a happy return home. Others who will remain are prepared to resume their work. We wish each and every one success and prosperity for a New Year full of hope and aspirations for peace.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Suriname, who will speak on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group of States.

Mr. DORN (Suriname): Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of our work in the First Committee at the current session of the General Assembly, I should like to express to you, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group of States, our sincere congratulations and gratitude for the skilful and able manner in which you guided the proceedings of our Committee. It is a special honour to extend these congratulations to you, Sir, since you are the representative of a Member State of our Group. It is a well-known fact that presiding over the Committee that deals with political and security measures is not an easy task. Thanks to your skill, ability and impartial approach, however, the Committee has been able to conclude its work successfully.

Let me also take the opportunity to express our gratitude to the two Vice-Chairmen, Ambassador Henning von Wegener, of the Federal Republic of Germany and Ambassador Milos Vejvoda, of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as well as to the Rapporteur of the Committee, Mr. Ngaré Kessely, of Chad, for the important duties they have performed.

Finally, I should like to extend our sincere thanks to Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, the Secretary of the Committee, and to his staff for the efficient manner in which they assisted in the work of our Committee. We wish him every success in his new position.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, I consider it a happy coincidence that I am called upon to express to you the gratitude of the Group of Western European and Other States for your outstanding service, while I am still a member of your Bureau. I do not have to resort to the formal expressions of thanks that we often hear on such occasions; I can speak out of conviction, having worked with you over the past two months and having witnessed the qualities which you have brought to our work. Indeed, you have guided our work with impartiality and authority, your thoroughly professional attitude and experience have enabled us to work in a business-like atmosphere. The time, a precious commodity, was used always in the most economical manner and we may have had a record attendance and a record number of speakers, well accommodated in an advantageously structured debate.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

I would also like to express the thanks of my group of countries to the other officers of the Committee, Ambassador Vejvoda and our Rapporteur, Mr. Kessely. Our gratitude equally goes to the Secretariat staff, who have often taken time out from their leisure to assist us in our endeavour. We should like to thank Mr. Kheradi, Mr. Sattar, Miss Patil, Mr. Zaleski and the many others who have been with us during these months. We hope to see this very efficient équipe with us again next year. We would also like to thank the interpreters, realizing that in the difficult field of our work they have a challenging terminological task which they have mastered to our admiration.

We have dealt with a large number of subjects and draft resolutions and we have worked in a very important field - security. We deal with the security of our countries; we deal with issues of survival. These subjects call for serious, responsible debate, but they also call for mutual respect, for tolerance and for a sober sense of realism. We should, in this ongoing debate, all be watchful that these qualities are increasingly brought to our work over the coming years.

May I again, Sir, express to you our gratitude on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Oman, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

Mr. AL-HAJIRI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues, the representatives of the Arab States in the First Committee, it gives me pleasure to express to you our deep thanks for the excellent manner in which you have conducted the work of this Committee, which was undoubtedly an important element in concluding the work of the First Committee successfully and within the time frame allotted it. I believe you will agree with me that the efforts made by your Vice-Chairmen, the Rapporteur of the Committee, the Secretary of the Committee and the conference officers have helped us and you greatly in achieving the agreements we have reached.

We started our work with an overloaded agenda; this is nothing to wonder at in view of the great importance the world attaches to the issue of disarmament. The Committee, for its part, discharged its duties in an excellent manner by adopting the appropriate resolutions regarding the issues before it.

(Mr. Al-Hajiri, Oman)

We hope that those States which bear the major responsibility for disarmament will find the necessary political will so that the resolutions we have adopted do not become dead letters.

You, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee have discharged your duties in an excellent manner. You have volunteered to carry the burdens of this important Committee patiently and most willingly.

I cannot fail on this occasion to commend the staff of the Secretariat and the conference officers. I congratulate you all on your commendable efforts to lead our work to a successful conclusion. I wish you all happiness and prosperity and a very Happy New Year.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our consideration of and action on the items allocated to the First Committee. Concern has been expressed over the growing number of resolutions adopted on the items before this Committee. This year, we will be recommending 72 resolutions to the General Assembly versus 67 resolutions recommended last year.

This trend should not, however, be looked upon in isolation from its root causes. In my opinion, the number of resolutions is in itself neither positive nor negative. It merely reflects the complete absence of progress in disarmament and in the strengthening of international security. If and when concrete negotiations are engaged in at the appropriate forums, the number of resolutions in this Committee will most probably decrease.

Meanwhile, it would certainly be better for the more efficient conduct of our proceedings if delegations would not overburden the already heavy schedule of the First Committee by utilizing the time allotted to security items as a pretext for the endless repetition of points made in the general debate. My predecessor, Ambassador Tom Vraalsen, made the same observation in his closing remarks last year. This year there was a definite trend towards a larger number of general statements in the discussion of the security items on our agenda. This shows, in my view, that delegations lend less weight to the consideration of specific questions of international security than they do to the debate on general aspects of the matter. It is certainly regrettable that the potential importance of each specific item becomes thus diluted in the reiteration of general positions already presented in the initial phase of our work.

Before closing the current session, I wish now to report to you on the only pending matter before us, that is, the status of the issue concerning improvement of the working methods of our Committee.

(The Chairman)

Pursuant to my statement at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November, I consulted with the other officers of the Committee and with individual delegations on the restructuring of the annual agenda. As a result of those consultations, the Vice-Chairmen of the Committee presented to me their written contributions on the matter. Through the Rapporteur, I also received a Paper from Ambassador Dubey of India, co-ordinator of the group of non-aligned and other countries of the First Committee.

It is my considered opinion that any rearrangement of the Committee's agenda should aim at providing a more clear organization and presentation of the issues to be considered by the Committee, without prejudging their substance.

Such a rearrangement is necessarily conditioned by two factors which lie beyond the purview of the Committee: previous decisions of the General Assembly to inscribe individual items on the agenda and the right of every delegation to request the inclusion of new items.

Since the agenda is adopted by the Assembly and items from it allocated to the Main Committees, it is obvious that no Committee can itself reformulate the wording of individual items. They may, however, and I believe the First Committee should, suggest to the Assembly a more rational structure than the present one, according to which the agenda may be rearranged. In that manner, the Assembly would allocate to the First Committee items already organized under a new structure. This would, in turn, facilitate the organization of work by the Committee at the start of each session.

The paper that I am circulating today (A/C.1/39/9) is the result of my endeavours, as Chairman of the First Committee at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, to present to the Committee my own ideas and suggestions on this question, under the foregoing two basic criteria: organizational clarity and absence of prejudgement of the substance of the issues.

I suggest that document A/C.1/39/9 be transmitted to capitals with the comments of delegations and that the Committee take up the matter at the fortieth session with a view to reaching appropriate decisions.

In closing the session of the First Committee at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, I would like to express my gratitude to all delegations for their co-operation in the work of the Committee. I also thank the Vice-Chairmen,

(The Chairman)

Ambassadors Milos Vejvoda and Henning Wegener, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Ngaré Kessely, for their collaboration, as well as the members of the Secretariat for their efforts in fulfilling their task.

I wish you all a pleasant holiday and a Happy New Year.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.