



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 25: Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons	1
Agenda item 22: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued)	6

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 25

Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now begin our consideration of agenda item 25. In this connexion a draft resolution submitted by the USSR has been issued as document A/L.676.

2. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly in its plenary meetings has recently concluded its debate, and today must make a decision on an extremely important international political question, namely, the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization,¹ which was adopted, as we all know, at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly on the initiative of the Soviet Union supported by the socialist countries and the overwhelming majority of the other States Members of the United Nations. In the course of our debate on this item, in which more than 50 delegations took part, attention was focused mainly on questions relating to the elimination of the remaining strongholds of colonial domination in Africa and the liberation of the African peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Namibia and Guinea (Bissau) from the yoke of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and imperialism. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation would like first of all to offer its warm congratulations to the delegations of the African States and all their sincere friends on the successful conclusion of the debate on that item.

3. We, the Soviet people, are proud of the fact that for many years, both in the United Nations and elsewhere, the Soviet Union has firmly and consistently carried on an active campaign, side by side with the States of Africa, Asia

¹ Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)).

and Latin America, for the freedom and national liberation of the peoples of the world. This is one of those important international problems towards the solution of which the USSR and the majority of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America are working as firm, consistent and loyal friends and allies. There are a good number of other international questions on which the positions of the USSR, the other socialist countries and all peace-loving States, which form an overwhelming majority in the United Nations, fully coincide or are extremely close. Among such questions we attach primary importance to that weighty problem of our time—the strengthening of international peace and security. The peoples of all countries need peace if they are to raise their standard of living, just as man and all living creatures on earth need air. And we, the representatives of the USSR, are also proud of the fact that on this very important contemporary problem we are the friends and allies of all those countries and their peoples. That, indeed, is the reason why the USSR is devoting all its efforts, together with other countries, to the strengthening of peace. The Soviet Union has been guided by these noble and highly humanitarian principles in bringing before the United Nations the questions of the strengthening of international security, the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States, and the non-use of force and permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons.

4. Today the General Assembly is beginning its consideration of the Soviet proposal on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The very fact that the General Assembly has decided to consider this item in its plenary meetings demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations recognizes the vital significance, urgency and great importance of this item. We take this to mean that the Members of the United Nations agree that in present international circumstances this question is of outstanding importance and should occupy a central place in the work of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

5. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko, has set forth in detail the Soviet position on this item in his letter to the Secretary-General [A/8793] and in his statement in the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly [2040th meeting]. In addition, we have submitted a draft resolution on the item [A/L.676].

6. In this statement the Soviet delegation intends to put forward some additional considerations in the light of what has been said by other delegations both in the general debate and in the course of preliminary exchanges of views on the item with representatives of a wide circle of States.

7. In putting forward the question of the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government was guided by the consistent, peace-loving line it has taken in foreign policy and proceeded on the basis of the need to undertake new large-scale international action in the struggle to strengthen peace, consolidate international security and curb the imperialist aggressors. An intrinsic element of the Soviet programme of peace approved at the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is to seek to establish the renunciation of the use or threat of force as a law of international life and to achieve the permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union is implementing the programme steadfastly and consistently in its practical activities in international politics and in its bilateral relations with other States.

8. It was not by accident that the Soviet Union chose the present moment for its initiative with regard to the non-use of force and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. In the present circumstances, when the trends towards an easing of international tension are stronger than at any other time in the whole post-war period and when progress has been achieved in the limitation of the arms race, we are witnessing the development of suitable and more favourable conditions for the solution of such a large-scale world problem as the exclusion from international relations of the use of force in defiance of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

9. The period of the "cold war", which determined world development and international relations for many years, is receding into the past like a sad memory, never, we hope, to return. We can say without exaggeration that at the present time the Leninist idea of the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems has not only triumphed, but is even transforming itself into a binding international legal formula and is becoming embodied in the mutual relations between States belonging to different social systems. This applies to a wide circle of States. The principle of peaceful coexistence has become a firm foundation and an important international norm in mutual relations between the Soviet Union and France, the extremely high and successful level of which is becoming a model for the practical implementation of the principle. As a result of the Moscow summit talks between the Soviet Union and the United States, both sides agreed that the application of the principle of peaceful coexistence was the only possible basis for relations in our nuclear age. Recently this principle was reflected in the Soviet-Iranian and Soviet-Italian communiqués in connexion with the visit to our country of His Majesty the Shahansha of Iran and the Prime Minister of Italy.

10. The improvement and normalization of the situation and the establishment of good and friendly relations between States with different social systems, the elimination from those relations of everything which has darkened and complicated them over a period of many years and which, even now, is still having a harmful effect on them in a number of cases, the development of various mutually advantageous and enriching links and contacts in different fields, the inculcation of the habit of consultations between States on international political questions—consultations

instead of confrontations—all this is laying the foundation for a restructuring of international relations on a basis consonant with the interests of peace and the strengthening of international security and in accordance with the purposes, principles and ideals of the United Nations Charter and one of its most important injunctions to Member States, namely "to . . . live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

11. In Europe the process of détente has gone further and become more widespread than ever before, although even here much remains to be done. The entry into force of the treaties concluded with the Federal Republic of Germany by the USSR² and by Poland,³ the key provisions of which are the renunciation of the threat or use of force and a firm commitment to respect now and henceforth the inviolability of the present frontiers, consolidates the basis of peace not only in Europe, but throughout the world and indicates a sudden switch from tension to détente on a continent which witnessed the conflagration of the last two world wars. Preparations for an all-European conference on questions of security and co-operation have entered the practical stage. This conference is conceived as the culmination of the positive results which it has been possible to achieve in the strengthening of peace and the development of co-operation in Europe, so that we may make Europe a true continent of peace and transform relations between European States, placing them on a basis of mutual understanding and trust.

12. The idea of the need to guarantee security in Asia is also beginning to gain ground. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has put forward a proposal to ensure security in Asia on a collective basis which would meet the interests of security of all Asian States equally and would be based on such principles as the renunciation of the use of force in relations between States, respect for sovereignty and the inviolability of frontiers, non-interference in internal affairs and the broad development of economic and other forms of co-operation on the basis of full equality of rights and mutual advantage. The Soviet Union is ready to co-operate with all States in order to establish collective security in Asia.

13. These positive trends in world development are meeting with literally universal approval, as was apparent from the statements of the heads of delegations of States Members of the United Nations in the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly. With rare, one might dare to say with isolated, exceptions, the heads of virtually all delegations have welcomed the present process of relaxation of international tension and the switch from tension to détente and have underlined that this process accords with the aspirations and needs of all the peoples of the world.

14. Even this elementary improvement in the international situation could not have been achieved without a stubborn struggle and purposeful and persistent efforts on the part of the countries of the socialist community and many other peace-loving States.

² Signed at Moscow on 12 August 1970.

³ Treaty on the Bases for the Normalization of Relations, signed at Warsaw on 7 December 1970.

15. Although the easing of international tension is perceptible and real, it is clearly still in the initial stages. Much more remains to be done than has been done so far.

16. In the situation which is developing at the present time, it is becoming extremely important, firstly, to consolidate the success already achieved in the easing of international tension and, secondly, to undertake new additional measures to promote the elimination of existing acute international conflicts and to create conditions which will prevent the development of new hotbeds of tension and the outbreak of new wars. It is now particularly important to consolidate the process of détente and make it even stronger and more evident.

17. The United Nations cannot stand aside from the mainstream of the development of contemporary international relations, a development which is taking place in full recognition of the need for the renunciation of the use of force and the application of the principles of peaceful coexistence. We consider that the most important task of the United Nations and, in particular, of the General Assembly is to make its own weighty contribution towards intensifying efforts to encourage international détente, towards the general development of co-operation between States, and towards the strengthening of peace and international security. This is precisely the aim of the Soviet proposal on the renunciation of the use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

18. In putting forward the proposal on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union has not sought, and does not seek, any gain or advantage for itself. Our proposal is not directed against anyone or against anyone's interests. It is a constructive, positive initiative—an undertaking which is in keeping with the vitally important interests of all peoples, all States and the whole of mankind.

19. The adoption of a solemn declaration by all States Members of the United Nations and their acceptance of the obligation not to use force in international relations and permanently to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons will be further steps towards the goal of saving mankind from the horrors of war and the fear of a nuclear catastrophe.

20. We are not talking of a local measure, affecting only one given region of the world or one group of States, but of far-reaching, global international action embracing the whole world and requiring the participation of all States, including the nuclear Powers and other States which possess considerable military potential.

21. Of course the world is still faced with acute problems arising from the aggressive policies of certain Powers and the hostility of those forces which would like to reverse the course of history and halt the process of international détente. Accordingly, the essence of the item proposed by the Soviet Union is that the United Nations should strike an international political blow against the forces of aggression, imperialism and colonialism.

22. If we ponder the substance of any of the problems which give rise to international complications, if we focus

our attention on the direct causes of dangerous military situations and the unleashing of armed conflicts, we cannot fail to conclude that they lie in the use of force by one State against another for the purposes of territorial annexation, the subjugation and enslavement of peoples and the establishment of domination over them—in other words, for expansionist purposes. That has been true in the past and it remains true today.

23. The thrust of the Soviet proposal is directed against all forms of aggression, including nuclear aggression. That is the very core of the Soviet proposal. Consequently, no one who opposes arbitrary and aggressive acts, the use of armed force for the purposes of aggression or the forcible suppression of the struggle of peoples for their freedom and independence can fail to support this Soviet proposal.

24. Of course we do not cherish the illusion that all the General Assembly now has to do is to adopt a resolution on the renunciation of the use of force and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and all the problems existing in the world will disappear at a stroke. But it is quite clear that the consistent implementation by all States of the principle of the renunciation of the use of force, embracing all types of weapons, both nuclear and conventional, would be an effective means of helping to put an end to existing conflicts and hotbeds of war and would lead to the elimination of wars and military clashes between States.

25. Operative paragraph 1 of the Soviet draft resolution contains a solemn declaration by the General Assembly on behalf of the States Members of the Organization of their renunciation, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, of the use or threat of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. This is a concise formula for peace and security which will be clear to every inhabitant of our planet.

26. This provision derives from the fundamental principles embodied in the United Nations Charter, the main purpose of which is proclaimed as the need "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". It was to serve that noble purpose that the United Nations was founded. In accordance with the Charter, all Members of the United Nations have assumed the obligation to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations". In recent years this principle has been reaffirmed many times and established in a whole series of declarations and decisions adopted unanimously by States Members of the United Nations. In this connexion, we must mention such important documents as the recently adopted Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*] and the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [*resolution 2627 (XXV)*].

27. It is only in conditions of peace, free from the permanent threat of military conflicts and clashes and free

from the fear of a nuclear catastrophe, which hangs over the world like the sword of Damocles, that we can conceive of the prosperity and healthy economic development of States, a normal life for their inhabitants and an improvement in the well-being of all peoples. The adoption and implementation of a resolution on the renunciation of the use of force in international relations and of the use of nuclear weapons for ever would accord with the long-term interests of all peoples and States. It must also be stressed that the adoption by the General Assembly of a decision along the lines of the Soviet proposal would serve, first and foremost, the interests of the majority of States, especially small and medium-sized States which are most in need of reliable international legal guarantees to protect them against the threat or use of force by certain aggressive countries which are still trying to rely on the use of naked force in international relations. It is precisely the small and medium-sized States which stand to gain most if the General Assembly and, later, the Security Council, approve the Soviet Union's proposal.

28. The adoption by the General Assembly of the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would promote the process of introducing into relations between States the principle of the prohibition of the use of force, which is already being put into effect in the mutual relations between a number of States. It would provide a good stimulus for many other States, too. In many respects it would result in a new international situation in which relations between States with different social systems other than those based on peaceful coexistence would be excluded and even inconceivable, and in which all States would decide controversial questions only by peaceful means. There would also be a radical change for the better in the whole system of international relations, and the solution of the fundamental problems of our time would be greatly facilitated.

29. Of course the essence of the Soviet proposal is not confined simply to a reaffirmation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, although such reaffirmation, as applied to any specific situation or circumstance, often has a considerable positive effect, as experience shows, and the United Nations has frequently reaffirmed the principles of the Charter in its decisions. In this respect, it should not be forgotten that, despite the obligation of States to give effect to the United Nations Charter, the use of force in defiance of the provisions of the Charter still occurs; consequently, and as a result of the aggressive actions of certain States, for many years human blood has been shed, not only on the field of battle, but also far in the rear, and great buildings and artistic treasures, the unique achievements of human culture and civilization, created by the toil of many generations, have been destroyed.

30. The Soviet proposal gives concrete expression to the relevant Articles and provisions of the United Nations Charter in a manner applicable to the present stage of development of international relations. In addition to a general provision concerning the renunciation of the use of force in international relations, the Soviet draft resolution also contains a provision concerning the simultaneous permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We are proposing to combine, to merge, these two very

important contemporary questions: to reaffirm the general prohibition of the use of force in international relations and at the same time to adopt a firm decision, mutually binding on all States, permanently prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. The threat of nuclear war has long been recognized by practically all States and responsible political leaders. It has also been noted and recognized in United Nations documents. Convincing and scientifically based conclusions on this score are to be found in the well-known report on the consequences of the possible use of nuclear weapons,⁴ which was prepared by a group of eminent scientists from various countries and unanimously approved by the General Assembly [*resolution 2342 (XXII)*]. Only those opposed to the renunciation of the use of force in inter-State relations can deny this generally recognized truth.

31. If we compare the provision in the Soviet draft resolution on the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons with the proposal on the "renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons", which in its very substance admits the possibility of the use of that devastating weapon of mass destruction, even if only as the "second" or "third" user, then we see with even greater clarity and certainty the indisputable advantages of the Soviet approach.

32. The obligation to renounce the use of nuclear weapons for all time, permanently, within the framework of a general renunciation of the use of force in international relations would be an important step towards eliminating the threat of nuclear war and would have tremendous moral and political significance for the peoples of the whole world. It would also facilitate further efforts towards the attainment of nuclear disarmament, i.e. the cessation of the production and the total destruction of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons. As for the Soviet Union, it is common knowledge that, on the advent of nuclear weapons, it immediately took the lead in the campaign for their prohibition and destruction. The USSR has been carrying on that campaign unrelentingly and will continue to fight consistently, steadfastly and with perseverance for the curtailment of the arms race, for nuclear disarmament and for general and complete disarmament. As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, stressed in his report to the Twenty-fourth Congress of the CPSU, "the struggle for the cessation of the arms race, in both nuclear and conventional weapons, and for general and complete disarmament will continue to be one of the most important aspects of the foreign policy activities of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet State".

33. It would also be wrong to lose sight of another danger, which is connected with the development of so-called conventional types of weapon. The variety, power and deadly force of such weapons have increased many times in comparison with the period of the Second World War. In the past quarter of a century nuclear weapons have not

⁴ *Effects of the Possible Use of Nuclear Weapons and the Security and Economic Implications for States of the Acquisition and Further Development of these Weapons* (United Nations publications, Sales No. E.68.IX.1).

been used in armed conflicts. But we are all well aware of the huge loss of life and enormous destruction caused by the use of conventional types of weapon. The example of Viet-Nam is sufficiently convincing. Bombardment with contemporary, so-called conventional bombs has reached such proportions that the same standards are used to measure their destructive effect as are used in assessing the destructive power of nuclear weapons.

34. Throughout the post-war period aggression has been carried out exclusively through the use of conventional weapons. The latest victims of the use of those same conventional weapons are the peoples, including African peoples, who are fighting against colonial oppression: it is common knowledge that Israeli aggression against the Arab States and the national liberation movements of the Arab peoples is also being carried out with conventional weapons. Thus, the true state of affairs compels us to seek to resolve the question of the non-use of force in mutual relations between States and the question of the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as parts of a closely-knit, organic chain and to view those questions as a single, indissoluble whole. The universality of the Soviet approach to the solution of these enormously important contemporary problems—that is to say the prohibition at one and the same time of all means and forms of the use of force in mutual relations between States in violation of the United Nations Charter, by means of both conventional and nuclear weapons—is an essentially new and particularly important element of the Soviet proposal. It is just such an approach—the prohibition of the use of force in inter-State relations by means of any types of weapon—which places all States on an equal footing and strengthens the security of each one of them, giving no State one-sided preferential treatment or military advantages. This affects all States, regardless of their geographical location, the size of their territory and population, their military and economic power and the question whether or not they possess nuclear weapons.

35. The experience already acquired by States Members of the United Nations provides further confirmation of the need for a combined solution to the questions of the renunciation of the use of force in international relations and the non-use of nuclear weapons. More than once attempts have been made in the United Nations to solve each of those problems in isolation from the other. But so far no effective solution has been found.

36. Those who oppose the non-use of force between States and those who resist the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and support the continuation of the arms race are attempting to distort the substance of this new Soviet proposal in the United Nations. For example, it is being put about that the Soviet proposal is designed to prevent the use of force in any form. There is not a grain of truth in that interpretation. In fact, the situation is quite different.

37. The Soviet proposal is not concerned with an “all-embracing” prohibition and renunciation of the use of force. It provides for the prohibition of such use of force between States, in international relations, as is contrary to, and not in accord with, the United Nations Charter. The obligation of States to renounce the use of force in their

relations with other States in no way impairs their right of individual or collective self-defence, which is recognized and given legal force in Article 51 of the Charter. That obligation would also strengthen the right of defence against aggression and the right to use all necessary means in the fight to eliminate the consequences of aggression when it has already been committed or when the aggressor is attempting to enjoy the fruits of his aggression. The right to fight to eliminate the consequences of aggression is directly linked to the principle recognized by the United Nations that the territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force. That principle was approved by the Security Council in 1967 and adopted in an expanded form by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970 in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. Thus, no one is in a position to cast doubt on the inalienable right of States and peoples subjected to aggression to use any means necessary to repulse the aggressor. In this connexion, we have made direct reference to examples of aggression which are before our eyes: Indo-China and the Middle East.

38. Nor does the renunciation of the use of force in relations between States in any way limit the right of the peoples of Colonial countries to fight for their national freedom and independence and to restore and assert their sovereignty by the use of any means which may be needed in that fight.

39. We are all aware that the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples for their freedom and independence has been recognized and confirmed many times in decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, both in the recognition of the general, fundamental right of all colonial peoples to undertake that struggle and in the recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples of specific colonial Territories, in particular the peoples of Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, Namibia and Guinea (Bissau). In other words, these proposals of the USSR do not contradict previous United Nations decisions: they take them into account and, indeed, are based upon them.

40. That is the answer to those who try to distort the substance and content of the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union, which has only one aim—to strengthen and maintain international peace and security and to save the peoples of the world from war and from the nuclear threat.

41. Now we should like to make some points in connexion with operative paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft resolution. Since some delegations have expressed doubts about it, we should like to offer some explanation and dispel those doubts. This paragraph is designed to ensure that a General Assembly declaration on the renunciation of the use of force and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons shall have maximum world-wide and—if I may use the term—United Nations-wide effectiveness and international legal force. The Soviet Union considers it essential to make special provision in a General Assembly resolution on this question for the adoption of measures which would not allow anyone or any State to deviate from strict observance of a United Nations declaration on the non-use of force and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

42. The United Nations Charter contains provisions and procedures which enable the United Nations, by means of a special, official decision of the Security Council, speedily to invest such General Assembly declarations with binding force under Article 25 of the Charter. We all frequently talk of the still unused possibilities of the United Nations Charter. This is one of those possibilities. In actual practice this procedure has not yet been used in the United Nations. But that in no way means that it cannot be used, especially since we are dealing with the implementation and development of one of the most important and widely recognized principles of international law, one of the fundamental, crucial postulates of the United Nations Charter.

43. The procedure proposed by the Soviet Union is fully in keeping with the United Nations Charter and in no way encroaches on the prerogatives of the General Assembly. It is the General Assembly itself which is first considering this important international question and which itself would make an appropriate recommendation to the Security Council. In this case the Security Council would be acting on the basis of the opinions and wishes of all States Members of the United Nations and in accordance with its rights and prerogatives as the principal organ of the United Nations for the maintenance and preservation of peace and security.

44. It is not difficult to resolve the question of the actual form in which the Security Council would express its official decision on such an important subject, a subject which falls directly within its competence. It would be possible to hold special consultations in the Security Council on this question. In this connexion, the Soviet Union has already expressed its view that a meeting of the Security Council should be convened for that purpose at the level of members of Government or other specially authorized representatives [2040th meeting].

45. The Soviet Union will be ready to take part in the convening and work of such a meeting of the Security Council. In order to carry out such an historic international political act, we are ready to join our efforts with those of all the other States which are permanent members of the Security Council and with those of all the other members of the Security Council, on whom the Charter confers primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

46. The Soviet delegation is pleased to note that its position is shared by the countries of the socialist community which are Members of the United Nations and by the German Democratic Republic, as well as by many other States which have welcomed this new Soviet initiative directed towards the further consolidation of peace and strengthening of international security.

47. The Soviet draft resolution is set out in extremely simple, concise and concrete terms; we are firmly convinced that this has great advantages and merit, for it ensures that the meaning and significance of the resolution on this question to be adopted by the General Assembly will be clear to all States and to world public opinion. We consider that it would have been wrong to burden the preamble and operative parts of the resolution on the question under consideration with wordy formulations and provisions

which could serve only to complicate and obscure the essence of the matter.

48. The USSR delegation appeals in all sincerity and in a spirit of goodwill to the delegations of all States Members of the United Nations to continue, as attentively as possible and in full awareness of their great responsibility to their own peoples and to mankind as a whole, a careful study of this important international question raised by the Soviet Union, to consider it in depth and in all its aspects and adopt on the basis of the Soviet draft resolution a General Assembly decision which will express the firm and unwavering will of all States Members of this international Organization to put an end to the use of force in relations between States in violation of the United Nations Charter, and permanently to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, and thus make one of the most important and weighty contributions in the whole history of the United Nations to the cause of eliminating the threat of war in general and of nuclear war in particular.

49. The delegation of the USSR appeals for constructive consideration of this Soviet proposal and for such an exchange of views, in a spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding, as will lead to the adoption by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session of a decision in accordance with the interests of all States, all peoples and the whole of mankind.

AGENDA ITEM 22

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued)*

50. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now resume our consideration of agenda item 22. Representatives will recall that the debate on this item was concluded at the 2074th meeting.

51. The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions on this item: A/L.677 and Add.1, A/L.678 and Add.1 and 2, A/L.679 and Add.1-3 and A/L.680 and Add.1-3. The administrative and financial implications of the first three draft resolutions are contained in document A/8867.

52. I shall now call on those speakers who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all of the four draft resolutions before the Assembly. Representatives will of course also have an opportunity to explain their votes after the voting has taken place.

53. Mr. DIAZ-GONZALEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to express its views on the draft resolutions that are before the Assembly.

54. First of all, I should like to refer to the draft resolution which appears in document A/L.677 and Add.1, sponsored by 55 countries. In general terms we are in agreement with this draft resolution as a whole although we

* Resumed from the 2074th meeting.

have some difficulty with respect to the eighth preambular paragraph and with operative paragraphs 8 and 9.

55. With respect to the eighth preambular paragraph, my delegation cannot agree, for purely legal reasons, that representatives of national liberation movements or any other organizations of a private nature should be allowed to participate in the General Assembly's work or in that of any of its subsidiary bodies with a status in any way different from that which they have been granted heretofore in the Fourth Committee, that is to say, the status of petitioners.

56. With reference to operative paragraphs 8 and 9, my delegation also has difficulty in voting in favour of them, since we consider that these issues are clearly and precisely dealt with both in the Charter and in the other legal instruments of the Organization. The Charter has shown the path that should be followed in order to obtain such results. These provisions can be applied only to States Members of the United Nations or denied to those States which have previously been expelled from the Organization.

57. The machinery for the application of sanctions or the suspension of a State from membership in the United Nations, as well as the question of which is the appropriate body to discuss, consider and apply those measures should they become necessary, is covered in the provisions of the Charter.

58. My delegation would like to state for the record that if a separate vote is taken on the eighth paragraph of the preamble and on operative paragraphs 8 and 9, it will abstain in the vote for the reasons I have given. If, however, no separate vote is taken, my delegation would like to state for the record that it has specific reservations on those three paragraphs, although it will vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

59. With respect to draft resolution A/L.678 and Add.1-3, my delegation will be compelled, much to its regret, to abstain in the vote, for while we agree with the inalienable right of peoples under colonial régimes to express their will in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the wording of this draft resolution uses terms and concepts which, instead of facilitating the application of that resolution, would tend to introduce erroneous notions that might create dangerous precedents for the future. While my delegation agrees that the United Nations should lend its full moral support to independence movements, on the other hand, we cannot accept the idea that under the cloak of a vague title a precedent could be created for supporting other types of movements which have no relationship whatsoever with the decolonization movements.

60. With respect to draft resolution A/L.679 and Add.1-3, my delegation, obviously, will vote in favour of that text. It will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.678 and Add.1 and 2.

61. Mr. VENEGAS-TAMAYO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes, with the President's indulgence, to explain its vote on draft resolution A/L.677 and Add.1.

62. Throughout its history my country has respected legal and moral principles and has always acted in accordance with them. One such principle refers to the right to self-determination of all peoples and, therefore, their right to throw off the colonial yoke in order to guide their own destinies in independence. In the past our liberators adhered to those principles courageously and directed the management of their independence, which had the fervent support of the expectant multitudes. One hundred and sixty years later, we Colombians proudly proclaim that we maintain our faith in those principles of freedom and independence. Obviously, for those movements which are currently struggling to emancipate their peoples still living under colonial domination we wish the same glorious success as our movement won under the leadership of Bolívar and Santander.

63. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution under discussion. In so doing we shall be acting in accordance with the guiding principles of our Republic and, while we do not wish to offend any friendly country, we should like to restate our vocation of solidarity with all those who aspire to emancipate themselves and become sovereign and independent States in accordance with the oft-repeated and unequivocal anti-colonialist policy of the United Nations, worked out over many sessions of the General Assembly with the continuing support of Colombia.

64. My delegation considers it essential to observe that we understand the words "by all the necessary means at their disposal" in operative paragraph 6 to mean those means which are authorized by international law and are in accordance with the rules of our civilization.

65. My delegation also believes that the provision concerning the withholding of assistance which appears in operative paragraph 9 should be applied in accordance with the terms of resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly.

66. With those points of clarification, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

67. With regard to draft resolutions A/L.678 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.679, and Add.1-3, my delegation will fully support them.

68. Lastly, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.680 and Add.1-3.

69. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Because of circumstances beyond our control it was not possible for my delegation to be present during the debate on agenda item 22, which is coming to an end today as we proceed to vote on various draft resolutions. The fact that we did not participate in the debate and therefore were unable to sponsor any of the draft resolutions before us makes it necessary for me to explain the position of my Government on the texts that are going to be voted on today.

70. Speaking at the Fourth Committee's 1980th meeting on 11 October last, I said that my Government, from the very early days when there were very few of us who took

up the defence of the peoples under colonial domination, had always supported their right to attain a full measure of self-government in accordance with the provisions of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter. The consistent attitude of the Government which I represent in the anti-colonialist struggle is a source of particular pride; for throughout the years, ever since this problem was first raised, regardless of who was the representative of my Government, the important point is that Ecuador has adhered to—and continues to adhere to—an unswerving anti-colonialist policy. I explained in that statement that during the general debate, in the speech made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador, Mr. Antonio José Lucio-Paredes, on 25 September of this year, he had reaffirmed his faith in the successful outcome of the struggle when he said:

“My Government is convinced that the age of colonialism must once and for all be outlawed. That is why we would support any step that would lead to the political independence of the peoples of the Territories that are still under the colonial yoke and have still not been given an opportunity to express themselves freely. We recognize their right to become free and independent nations pursuant to the terms of the Charter and the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations.” [2038th meeting, para. 159.]

71. In the statement that I made in the Fourth Committee, to which I have already referred, I said that in 1953 when it fell to my lot to participate for the first time in the debates of the Fourth Committee, I interpreted the thinking of my country, just as I did later during the killings in Angola in 1961, when Ecuador had the honour of a seat in the Security Council. Ever since that time and up to the present a single course of conduct, a single and consistent will to struggle has inspired the representatives of my country, whomever they were.

72. When four years ago Ecuador had the honour of being entrusted with the task of being a member of the Special Committee charged with considering the situation concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples—the Committee on Decolonization for short—my Government considered that that honour entailed a duty energetically and consistently to maintain the principles that have always guided our course of action.

73. I had the honour to participate in the early work of the Special Committee and to serve as a member of that Committee, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Mestiri, when it visited Kinshasa, Dar-es-Salaam and Lusaka to make direct contact with the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples of Angola and Mozambique. Personally, despite all the duties borne by a chief of mission, I accepted all the responsibilities, and I think I discharged them faithfully, with dignity and with firm support for the principles which I have enunciated, because I simply interpreted the instructions of my Government and the aspirations of my people. When later, for various reasons, it was not possible for me personally to carry on, my Government continued to give its full support and hence it provided the necessary facilities for discharging an important mission of the Special Committee in respect of the Territory of Guinea (Bissau). My Government also gave its

full support as regards attending meetings of the Special Committee in Africa last April as well as the meeting of the Organization of African Unity [OAU].

74. It is natural therefore that my delegation should support draft resolution A/L.677 and Add.1, operative paragraph 3 of which approves the report of the Special Committee on its work in 1972 and the programme of work envisaged for 1973. In so doing, my Government feels that approval of the important work of the Special Committee, of which we have been a member until very recently, serves only to encourage it in its future work, but it does not pass judgement of any kind on the substance of the problems set down for future discussion.

75. Ecuador, which in the Fourth Committee, through its various representatives, has followed an unswerving course of supporting resolutions in favour of the peoples oppressed by Portuguese domination; Ecuador, which in 1953 approved the first report on *apartheid* and which year after year has supported all the resolutions against that terrible affront to human dignity; Ecuador, which protested from the first when efforts were made to impose an infamous, discriminatory, illegal and arbitrary constitution on Rhodesia—protested as I had the honour of doing in my Government's behalf in the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee; Ecuador, which, to sum up, has always maintained an anti-colonialist position, must support and thus will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.677 and Add.1.

76. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/L.677 and Add.1. This is a very comprehensive draft resolution containing a wide range of recommendations relating to the many aspects of the work of the Special Committee. There is much in this draft resolution which commends itself. Fiji, as a member of the Special Committee, has voted in favour of many of the recommendations contained therein.

77. However, there are elements in this draft resolution on which my delegation abstained or reserved its position in the Special Committee. Since operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution seeks to approve the report of the Special Committee as a whole, my delegation considers that it would be inconsistent for it to vote in favour of this draft resolution in view of some of the positions it has already taken in the Special Committee. Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution seeks to reaffirm “all other resolutions on decolonization.” This we consider to be too comprehensive a terminology and a wording which does not reflect my delegation's position accurately. For the above reasons, my delegation regrets that it will not be able to vote in favour of this draft resolution and we will, therefore, abstain in the voting.

78. Although my delegation did not intervene in the general debate on this item, its position on decolonization is well known. Indeed, the Deputy Prime Minister of Fiji, in his statement on 10 October 1972 during this Assembly's general debate [2060th meeting], expressed pleasure at the realistic, constructive and vigorous way in which the Special Committee was dealing with the question of the remaining colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories. He also expressed appreciation at the realistic approach the Special

Committee has adopted in respect of small Territories in view of their peculiar problems of size, population, geographic isolation and limited resources. My Government's position with regard to the southern African Territories of Namibia, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese Territories was categorically stated in that same statement, and I will not repeat them here.

79. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation fully agrees with what was said by the delegations of Venezuela and Colombia. We also confirm our continuing dedication to the cause of freedom and the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination. We therefore reject the continuation of any form of colonialism.

80. None the less, we consider that it would be difficult for us unreservedly to support the eighth paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A/L.677 and operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of that same document; and if these were put to the vote separately, my delegation would abstain.

81. With these reservations, which my delegation asks to have included in the record, we shall vote for draft resolutions A/L.677, A/L.678 and A/L.679. We shall also abstain on draft resolution A/L.680.

82. Mr. STEWARD (South Africa): The South African delegation will vote against the four draft resolutions which have been presented to the Assembly for consideration in documents A/L.677, A/L.678, A/L.679 and A/L.680. There is little to distinguish two of them, A/L.677 and A/L.678, from the two resolutions on this item adopted last year [*resolutions 2878 and 2879 (XXVI)*], against which South Africa also voted. As far as southern Africa is concerned, and South Africa in particular, they were unrealistic and unconstructive then, and they are no less so today.

83. The four draft resolutions before us, to the degree that they apply to South Africa, represent a link in a chain of hostile resolutions of this Organization, the product of a mounting campaign which has been waged for a number of years. They unfortunately mirror inflexible attitudes in those who inspire them, and they are predictably barren of worth-while results. The syndrome involved was accurately analysed by one perspicacious speaker in the general debate earlier in the session. He said:

“... the United Nations has tended over the years to become less and less an Organization for reconciliation and more and more an arena for staging contests. That is reflected in the style and temper of many United Nations debates and resolutions. Instead of addressing ourselves to finding practical solutions to difficult and complex problems, we give ourselves over to polemics and rhetoric.” [*2060th meeting, para. 45.*]

And later: “... the United Nations should become less of an arena for public contests and more of an Organization for smoothing out conflicts, for reconciling differences.” [*Ibid., para. 53.*]

84. In the light of this analysis, South Africa's negative vote will be readily understood. There is nothing in the

draft resolutions calculated to elicit a constructive response. Those drafts are the product of the momentum generated by a long line of predecessor resolutions, and little effort seems to have been made to relate them to the realities of the contemporary world outside these walls.

85. I shall illustrate the general point I have sought to make by reference now to one specific trait of the draft resolutions before us. It is the evidence to be found there of the steady, and apparently largely unconscious, drift of this Organization to a position of endorsing or condoning violence.

86. I wonder how many members have stopped to ponder this phenomenon deeply. I would entreat all who have not, to do so; and I refer not to those who have voiced public, if cautious, reservations, but to the many who seem eagerly to leap to the support of draft resolutions condoning the use of force. Let us not forget that this Organization is, in concept and in essence, an organization of peace. Let us stop the drift before the compass turns full circle and brings the storm of pain and suffering; and let us recognize that an organization condoning violence is to the advantage of only the few, and then only in the short term. The euphemistic use of words such as “liberation” and “necessary means at their disposal” cannot cloak the trend with legitimacy or justification. South Africa finds the thought of the resort to violence in the arrangement of international affairs and the promotion of the interests and causes of organizations dedicated to force and violence—which is sought by the draft resolutions before us—to be immoral and objectionable on constitutional grounds. The history of this year, as statements in the general debate at the outset of the session clearly demonstrated, has shown both how much can be achieved by the most bitterly divided political adversaries when they choose to resort to alternative, peaceful means of overcoming their differences and how tragic are the consequences of resorting to tactics of war, terror and so on.

87. The trend I have described would suffice to ensure South Africa's negative vote. A contributory cause, however, is the tendency—evident from the draft resolution on the dissemination of information on decolonization [*A/L.678*—of the Office of Public Information to discard objectivity and embrace propaganda in a quest for greater activism, which we feel is misplaced and wrong. We cannot endorse the proposed conference in Oslo, nor the proposed annual week of solidarity suggested in draft resolutions A/L.679 and A/L.680. Nor can we accept many of the provisions of the four draft resolutions before us.

88. I would also place on record that my delegation cannot lend its approval to the report of the Special Committee, nor to its planned programme of work for the coming year. I do not intend to go into detail now. This would be unnecessary since the draft resolutions are obviously inimical to South Africa's interest and are intended so to be. Our negative vote will be an adequate and appropriate comment.

89. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now proceed to vote on the four draft resolutions before it. In accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure, I shall put these proposals to the

vote in the order in which they have been submitted. A vote will be taken first on draft resolution A/L.677 and Add.1. The recommendations of the Fifth Committee concerning the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution appear in paragraph 14 of document A/8867. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: France, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 5, with 23 abstentions (resolution 2908 (XXVII)).⁵

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We now turn to draft resolution A/L.678 and Add.1 and 2. The recommendations of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of this draft resolution appear in paragraph 15 of document A/8867.

The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 2909 (XXVII)).

91. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.679 and Add.1-3. The recommendations of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution appear in paragraph 16 of document A/8867.

⁵ The delegation of Pakistan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 2910 (XXVII)).

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Lastly, I put to the vote draft resolution A/L.680 and Add.1-3.

The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 30 abstentions (resolution 2911 (XXVII)).

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

94. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and my own country, Sweden. The five Nordic countries abstained on draft resolution A/L.680 concerning the week of solidarity, the main reason being that we cannot reconcile some of the recommendations in operative paragraph 2 with existing legislation on the freedom of news media in our countries.

95. No doubt material of the nature asked for in this paragraph may be published or broadcast in connexion with the proposed solidarity week. As a matter of fact, our news media continuously devote considerable time and attention to the problems of southern Africa. It is not, however, within the powers of our Governments to issue directives to this effect. Our Governments do not have the right to instruct, or even to try to influence, newspapers and broadcasting corporations as to the content of their output. The news media are free to use or not to use whatever material is available to them. They have full freedom of choice without any interference from outside.

96. There is certainly no lack of solidarity in our five countries with the liberation struggle in southern Africa. Our Governments and peoples are very much alive to what is going on in that part of the world: the cruel denials of basic human rights and the suppression of the will of peoples to be free. This Assembly is surely aware of the fact that the Nordic countries have translated these feelings of solidarity into practice by giving humanitarian assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and colonial oppression.

97. The Nordic countries are also convinced of the need to maintain and increase the pressure of a well-informed international public opinion until the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa mend their ways. Thus we could not possibly have any objection to Governments and peoples all over the world manifesting their opposition to the minority régimes and their policies in that part of the African continent. Our point simply is that we cannot vote for recommendations which, for the reasons I have set out earlier, we cannot pledge ourselves to carry out.

98. Mr. BELEN (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): The Turkish delegation voted in favour of the four draft resolutions relating to the question of decolonization, one of which it had sponsored.

99. Turkey, which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution which later became the historic resolution 1514 (XV), has never hesitated to support with its affirma-

tive votes all resolutions whose purpose is to support oppressed peoples who are struggling bravely against colonialism.

100. However, my delegation finds itself compelled to make certain reservations on some of the paragraphs of resolution 2908 (XXVII) concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. With regard to paragraph 9, my delegation considers that it is important to draw a distinction between the activities of foreign economic interests favourable to the development of the indigenous population and activities that are against their interests. We also have reservations of principle with regard to paragraphs 7 and 10.

101. However, while appreciating the efforts of the Special Committee, my delegation cannot entirely agree with the views put forward in its report, and that is why the Turkish delegation would have abstained in the vote on paragraphs 7, 9 and 10 if they had been voted upon separately.

102. Mr. CUEVAS (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Guatemala, with its supporting vote, has contributed to the adoption of draft resolution A/L.680 relating to the celebrating of a week of solidarity with the colonial peoples of southern Africa, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde who are fighting for their freedom. However, the Guatemalan delegation would like to express the reservation that the national liberation movements referred to in the second preambular paragraph of this resolution are limited solely and exclusively to those liberation movements which have been described as legitimate by the United Nations since the respective administering Powers of these Territories have openly rebelled against the various resolutions approved by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

103. In matters of decolonization the delegation of Guatemala will therefore not accord this status to any movement arising in any other Territory to achieve different objectives.

104. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy): The Italian delegation wishes to reaffirm that it fully shares the objective of draft resolution A/L.677, namely, the completion of the process of decolonization through the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence by those still under colonial rule. However, my delegation had to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because it has serious reservations on a number of provisions which, in our opinion, are not consistent with the Charter, or which are not practicable and justified, or which seem to reflect political interests alien to the common cause of decolonization.

105. My delegation abstained also in the vote on draft resolution A/L.678, as it did on the similar draft resolution adopted last year, because it has reservations in certain instances, for example operative paragraph 5, on the methods suggested for the dissemination of information, which raise for us difficulties of a constitutional nature. We have reservations also on the financial implications of the draft resolution.

106. We voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.679. If properly organized and objectively conducted, the Oslo conference may prove useful. We have had some experience in this field, since my country has recently been host to a similar conference.⁶

107. Finally, we had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.680 because, in our opinion, the draft raises a number of constitutional problems. The part relating to the liberation movements, for instance, is drafted in such a way as to imply their recognition by this Organization, which is not consistent with the Charter. The recommendations addressed to Governments, failing to take into account the principle of mutual respect among States with different political systems, raise difficulties for Governments which, by virtue of their democratic constitutions, do not and cannot interfere with the activities of the press, radio and private organizations.

108. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like very briefly to explain its vote on two of the draft resolutions that have just been adopted by the Assembly.

109. With respect to draft resolution A/L.677, we have gone along with the majority in deference to the purpose and objective of this draft resolution, which my country fully supports. We have some general reservations about some of the preambular and operative paragraphs, but we feel that above and beyond this in the final analysis it is the spirit of the draft resolution which is important and for that reason we supported it.

110. I should like to emphasize, however, that operative paragraph 7, for example, which contains a condemnation of the policy of "encouraging the systematic influx of foreign immigrants while evicting, displacing and transferring the indigenous inhabitants to other areas" would appear to be incomplete in its present form. This is so because what should really be condemned is not the policy of immigration *per se* but rather an immigration policy which in the context of decolonization is designed to make illusory and inapplicable the right to self-determination provided for in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

111. With reference to draft resolution A/L.680, a different hypothesis is put forward. Generally speaking, we believe that that draft resolution could have been broader and more open, thus covering all types of colonial situations, even though they might not have the same characteristics or dimensions as those existing in the African continent. Furthermore, for practical reasons my delegation is not able to commit itself specifically to carry out the activities mentioned in operative paragraph 2.

112. For these reasons my delegation abstained on that draft resolution.

113. Mr. HOLGER (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As we said in our substantive statement in the General Assembly when agenda item 22 was under discussion [2073rd meeting], my delegation fully supports the activ-

⁶ International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Portuguese Colonies, held at Rome from 27 to 29 June 1970.

ities of the Special Committee and, consistent with this support we voted for draft resolutions A/L.677, A/L.678, A/L.679 and A/L.680, three of which we sponsored.

114. Accordingly, we regret that, according to the report of the Fifth Committee [A/8867] concerning draft resolution A/L.677, the funds which would be required by the Committee for its activities have not been provided despite the good intentions of the Secretary-General in trying to obtain additional funds for that purpose.

115. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the four draft resolutions before the General Assembly on agenda item 22. We should like to make a few comments in explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/L.672.

116. Cuba voted in favour of that draft resolution, thereby expressing its traditional support of the work of the Special Committee on decolonization and also our gratitude for the fruitful work that the Committee has done this year. We should like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to repeat our readiness to continue co-operating with the Special Committee in its work, and also to express our cordial congratulations to its Chairman, Ambassador Salim, and to the other members of this important United Nations body, a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, for the outstanding work they have done this year.

117. In voting in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation was at the same time expressing its complete solidarity with all colonial peoples, in particular those who, in Guinea (Bissau), Cape Verde, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Namibia, are fighting to win their national independence. At the same time, we should like to repeat our firm conviction that those States which are interested in putting an end to colonialism should make every effort to tackle this problem from a logical standpoint, in other words by guaranteeing to all peoples, without exception, the exercise of this right. It is for that reason that for my delegation it was a matter of special satisfaction to us to find that we were able fully to support the resolution that the Assembly has just adopted by 99 votes in favour and only 5 opposed.

118. This resolution, in our opinion, appropriately reflects the view that the struggle against colonialism is a universal struggle. In this connexion I shall refer to some of the principal provisions of the resolution. Above all, paragraph 3 endorses this year's report of the Special Committee. On this point my delegation has already had an opportunity, in the course of the general debate [2068th meeting], to state that this year the Special Committee took an historic decision concerning the colonial case of Puerto Rico. That decision appears in paragraph 85 of the report which the Assembly has just adopted by an overwhelming majority. May I quote the two fundamental paragraphs of that decision:

“Recognizing the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,

“Instructs its Working Group to submit to it at an early date in 1973 a report relating specifically to the procedure to be followed by the Special Committee for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) with respect to Puerto Rico.” [A/8723/Rev.1, chap. I, para. 85.]

119. The text that I have quoted cannot be interpreted in any way other than as a recognition that by the adoption of those paragraphs by the Special Committee and the subsequent approval of the text by the Assembly an end has been put to the North American manoeuvre which for 20 years prevented the Assembly from dealing with this matter. By the adoption of the resolution we are beginning at the international level to put an end to North American colonialism in Puerto Rico. Indeed, by recognizing the inalienable right of the Puerto Rican people to independence in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV), and in deciding to study specifically the procedure that is to be followed for the application of that resolution to the territory of Puerto Rico, the Special Committee has in fact recognized that resolution 1514 (XV) is applicable to this Territory of the Antilles. In so doing it has recognized that a Declaration which expressly calls upon the colonial Powers to guarantee to the peoples under their domination an opportunity to decide their destiny freely and to win their independence applies to that Territory.

120. However, the text that we have just approved contains other provisions that are also fundamental in nature, and my delegation trusts that they will serve as a frame of reference for the Special Committee when it begins early next year to study the situation in Puerto Rico. Paragraph 5 of the resolution “Reaffirms that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, including... activities of foreign economic and other interests which exploit colonial peoples... is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,” the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV).

121. In the case of the Territory we are dealing with, we find concentrated a volume of foreign investment which has absolutely no comparison with that in any other colonial Territory. For example, \$6,800 millions have been invested on terms granting exemptions and privileges, and in conditions in which the Puerto Rican worker has no right to the minimum social security provisions to which North American workers are entitled. This means that the people of Puerto Rico are contributing to the North American monopolies, making sacrifices and being exploited to a far greater extent than is found in most colonial Territories.

122. Paragraph 7 of the resolution refers specifically to a problem that my delegation was compelled to bring before the Assembly. That paragraph condemns “... the policies... encouraging the systematic influx of foreign immigrants while evicting, displacing and transferring the indigenous inhabitants to other areas...”. Very few colonial Territories offer a more acute example of this phenomenon than does Puerto Rico. Indeed, by a systematic policy of displacement of the indigenous inhabitants and transfer of control of the economic and social life

of the country by foreigners, one third of the population has been compelled to emigrate permanently to North American territory, and tens of thousands of workers are compelled to earn their living, on a seasonal basis, in the farming areas of the eastern portion of this country. Meanwhile, the influx of foreigners, systematically organized through the total control which the administering Power exercises in respect of all matters of immigration and emigration, already has reached such a point that tens of thousands of such foreigners control the principal sectors of the life of the Territory.

123. Paragraph 10 "Calls upon the colonial Powers to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial Territories . . .". The Territory which we are dealing with has handed over, or has been forced to give up, 13 per cent of its total area, which is occupied by a network of North American military bases, including two bases supplied with nuclear weapons. Apart from this, the population of the Island of Culebra, which is an integral part of the Territory of Puerto Rico, has been compelled to suffer through the tests and military experiments conducted in the Territory by the United States Navy.

124. Paragraphs 6 and 8 note the legitimacy of the struggle, of the colonial peoples, by all means at their disposal, and expresses the need to ensure that all States give them the moral and material support which is necessary to win their rights.

125. In this case it is well to point out, as we already had occasion to mention earlier, that the Territory to which we are now referring has fought for centuries for its national emancipation and therefore, as a reflection of the struggle, has the oldest political prisoners in the entire Western hemisphere. My delegation believes that this resolution just adopted by the General Assembly is one more appeal to all anti-colonial States, to all independent and progressive forces of the world, to fight against the oppression imposed upon the Puerto Rican people and demand the immediate release of the nine nationalists who have been in prison since 1950 for fighting for the freedom of that Territory.

126. To sum up, Puerto Rico is one of the most dramatic and reprehensible cases of contemporary colonialism. It has the largest concentration of foreign interests in its Territory; it harbours the greatest military complex existing in any colonial Territory; there we see the phenomenon of the displacement of the indigenous inhabitants, the influx of foreigners and their control over the Territory in one of its most acute forms. This Territory has struggled constantly for its independence, confronting the most brutal forms of repression, as is proved by the fact that the nine Puerto Ricans are the oldest political prisoners in this part of the world.

127. Lastly, we note with satisfaction the contents of paragraph 11, which reaffirms the fundamental principle of resolution 1514 (XV), namely, that this Assembly has committed itself to fight for the independence of all Territories that have not yet attained independence. At the same time it asks the Special Committee to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of all remaining manifestations of colonialism and to report thereon to the

General Assembly at its next session. My delegation trusts that, in accordance with paragraph 85 of the report we have approved today, the Special Committee will begin without delay to study the colonial situation of Puerto Rico, and that under paragraph 11 of the resolution it will formulate specific proposals in respect of this Territory for the elimination of colonialism there, once and for all.

128. Mr. PETROPOULOS (Greece): As Greece has always placed itself in the forefront of the countries fighting for the recognition of the right to self-determination of all peoples and since Greece shares most of the ideas and aims set forth in draft resolution A/L.677, my delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution as well as of the other just adopted by this Assembly.

129. Having done so, however, we wish to express the doubts that my delegation has as to the advisability of the inclusion in draft resolution A/L.677 of phrases implying that the status of authentic representation is granted by our Organization to entities other than sovereign States. Moreover, my delegation, attached as it is to the idea of the pursuit of the principles and objectives of the United Nations by peaceful means, cannot unreservedly subscribe to suggestions implying the use of force.

130. Lastly, the steps the specialized agencies of the United Nations are requested to take are interpreted by my delegation as excluding action not compatible with their constitutions and with their purely functional and non-political nature.

131. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/L.677, A/L.678, A/L.679 and A/L.680. We should like first of all to reaffirm our position in the debate on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

132. The historic traditions of the Haitian people have always placed it in the vanguard of those who support those who are struggling for freedom and independence. However, we should not like resolutions that were worked out with the obvious concern to aid the peoples struggling under colonial domination to be exploited by political movements which have nothing to do with the purposes for which those resolutions were adopted. My Government has always respected the juridical principles upon which the right of peoples to self-determination is based. From this rostrum my delegation has repeatedly expressed its Government's concern about what is now happening in South Africa and the Territories under Portuguese administration. Consequently, we voted in favour of the draft resolutions in documents A/L.677, A/L.678, A/L.679 and A/L.680. However, we should like to express our reservations about paragraphs 8 and 9 of the first of those texts, thus endorsing the remarks just made on this subject by the representatives of Venezuela and Colombia.

133. Miss BENNATON (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to make the following statement about the votes that have just been cast.

134. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/L.677 because the constitutional provisions

of our country lead us thoroughly to support all efforts of the colonial peoples to obtain their freedom and independence. We did so despite the doubts which some of the paragraphs of the resolution evoked in the minds of our delegation, particularly those dealing with the liberation movements in a way which in our opinion is not appropriate and which we think binds the Organization inappropriately and goes beyond the proper limits.

135. We should like particularly to emphasize that in paragraph 6 the words "by all the necessary means at their disposal", as used in a United Nations document, should be interpreted—and this is how my delegation interprets those words—as meaning by all the necessary means within the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter.

136. Honduras supported draft resolutions A/L.678 and A/L.679; and we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/L.680.

137. Mr. JAYAKUMAR (Singapore): My delegation noted that when the South African representative took the floor to explain his not surprising negative votes he saw fit to refer—completely out of context—to certain passages in the statement of the leader of the Singapore delegation, delivered to this Assembly on 10 October. My delegation's positive votes on the four draft resolutions were based on our well-known position on decolonization and racial discrimination which were clearly expressed in that very statement which, of course, the South African representative—again, deliberately—chose to ignore.

138. I should now like to read out that portion of our statement which was deliberately omitted:

"Transgressions of principles basic to our Organization, such as forcible conquest and occupation of other peoples' territories or racial segregation and oppression, must clearly be condemned; nor can there be peaceful solutions to conflicts arising from such transgressions so long as the transgressors refuse to admit that basic principles have been breached." [2060th meeting, para. 45.]

139. I think that would more than suffice to expose the blatant distortion by the South African representative.

140. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday, in the Special Political Committee, we heard voices expressing respect for the Charter and human rights, and giving their support to the countries and peoples of colonial Territories. We heard those voices which supported freedom and the struggle of oppressed men living under the yoke of colonialism.

141. The results of the vote on the various draft resolutions submitted today show us that colonialism is still supported by those who denounce it in words, but not in deeds. That is so precisely because the interests of those countries are still closely linked to colonialism in view of the material interests and the profits which they earn on their investments in those Territories.

142. My delegation, in accordance with its traditional policy of support for the right of peoples to self-deter-

mination and independence, has voted as always in favour of draft resolutions A/L.677, A/L.678, A/L.679 and A/L.680, precisely because we firmly believe in the Charter, in previous resolutions of the United Nations and in the freedom and independence of all peoples.

143. It is no coincidence that the representative of Israel, faithful to its tradition and its hypocritical policy of alleged support of decolonization, did not dare to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.680 precisely because that text represents a positive act by each Government to demonstrate its solidarity with the oppressed peoples of the Portuguese colonies—Guinea (Bissau), Cape Verde, Angola, Mozambique—as well as with the people of South Africa. That is why, as he did yesterday in the Special Political Committee, we saw him leave the room when the vote was taken on the major resolution on *apartheid*. Today, faithful to his hypocritical policy, he did the same thing; he simply voted in favour of some draft resolutions and left precisely when the vote was being taken on draft resolution A/L.680, the text of which I shall not read out, but which is in itself very illuminating.

144. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has heard all those representatives who wished to explain their vote.

145. I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of the right of reply.

146. Mr. SCHAUFELLE (United States of America): I regret that once more we have to take up the valuable time of this Assembly—very briefly, I hope—to reject once again the unfounded and obvious lies that the representative of Cuba has pronounced in regard to Puerto Rico. This emphasis on conditions in Puerto Rico tempted me to raise a point of order, because I had thought that the representative of Cuba was making an explanation of vote. It seems he was not—he was making a general-debate statement; for if in fact he was making an explanation of vote, and if he based his vote only upon conditions in Puerto Rico and not upon conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories, then I find that a rather interesting explanation of vote.

147. As we have said before from this podium, the people of Puerto Rico have the right of self-determination; they have determined and will determine what their future will be; and it is up to the people of Puerto Rico to make this decision, not up to the representative of Cuba.

148. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Cuba in exercise of the right of reply.

149. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Frankly I shall take very little of the Assembly's time, since we have not heard any reply at all from the United States representative. I think Mr. Schaufele has said almost the same thing for years and has used the simple repetition of allegations that a particular statement is a lie; but he has never been able to come here and say, and prove, the fallacious nature of any of the facts which we have presented and which the Committee will have to consider.

150. My delegation, in order to save the Assembly's time, would simply like to state for the record that we have doubts as to whether or not Mr. Schaufele, in coming up to this rostrum, was in order. First, he did not answer anything at all. Furthermore, we have some doubts about his right to come to the rostrum of the General Assembly in view of the provisions of rules 25 and 103 of the rules of procedure.

151. My delegation considers that the delegations of small countries have difficulties in working at these sessions and the least that can be asked of a powerful delegation which has hundreds of staff members is that it should abide by the same rules, as the small delegations are required to do.

152. As is well known, the two rules of the rules of procedure I have mentioned clearly state that only certain

persons members of delegations are entitled to participate in the Assembly, and advisers are certainly not entitled to do so. Mr. Schaufele, if I have not misread the relevant documents, is sixteenth in the list of advisers of the United States delegation. However, I am not going to ask that his words should be expunged from the record, because he did not say anything at all in reply.

153. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has now completed its consideration of the general aspects of the question of decolonization. It is understood that the Fourth Committee will be submitting a report on this question dealing with the chapters of the report of the Special Committee which relate to specific Territories.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.