



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 106: Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations (<i>con- cluded</i>)	1

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 106

**Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of
National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations (*con-
cluded*)**

1. Mr. SEPETU (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation welcomes the decision of the General Assembly to include this item in the agenda.

2. As a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.714, the Tanzanian delegation believes that its adoption will eliminate the injustice done to the Cambodian people through the imposition of an illegal régime whose continued shaky and precarious survival is dependent solely on the massive support that it receives from outside forces. The restoration of the lawful rights of the Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations will not only erase the anachronism of having in our midst a delegation of a régime which purports to represent the Cambodian people, over which we all know it exercises no control. This will also do credit to our Organization by scrupulously upholding the principle of legitimacy and of constitutional authority over the forces of the usurpers, whose very existence depends on foreign assistance. Such a move by the General Assembly will also confirm United Nations support for the respect of the freedom, independence, territorial integrity and neutrality of Cambodia.

3. On 28 September 1973, addressing this same body, the Chairman of the Tanzanian delegation, the Foreign Minister of Tanzania, the Honourable John Malecela, said:

“There are still very many places in the world where justice is flagrantly flouted and injustice venerated. In Indo-China, despite recent developments towards peace there, the aggressors still support the puppet régimes in Cambodia and Viet-Nam against the forces of liberation.” [2133rd meeting, para. 38.]

He went on to say:

“It is regrettable that the lessons of Viet-Nam have not been fully comprehended in relation to Cambodia. There

the United States continues to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Cambodian people by propping up the puppet régime of Lon Nol. While bowing to the legitimate demands of the American people and the international community to put an end to the barbarous bombing, the United States continues to bolster the economic and military capacity of that besieged régime, desperately trying to give reality to its pretences. It is our hope that, instead of proceeding on this misguided course, the objective realities of Cambodia will be realized and the international community as a whole will accord recognition to the only legitimate and rightful Government of Cambodia, under the leadership of the head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk.” [*Ibid.*, para.47.]

4. Let us look at the realities of the Cambodian situation.

5. First, as we have pointed out, the so-called Khmer Republic is nothing but an illegal puppet régime, created and molded by the United States, which has continued to support it financially and militarily. It is a régime which was imposed by force on the Cambodian people. Its precarious existence has been possible only because of the massive support of its benefactors, and, in turn, it faithfully plays the tune.

6. Secondly, the peoples of Cambodia have never accepted this régime. That is why so many of them accepted quite readily the call by the head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to oppose the aggression by the United States and to rise up in arms against the puppet régime in order to liberate their motherland.

7. That Sihanouk and his supporters control over 90 per cent of Cambodian territory and over 80 per cent of the population is an incontestable fact. Even Western newspaper commentators—by no means spokesmen of the revolutionary forces of Cambodia—concede that, had it not been for United States support, even the capital city of Phnom Penh would by now be in the hands of the rightful government of Cambodia. *Time* magazine of 27 August 1973 had this to say:

“Insurgents now control 80 per cent of Cambodia and many of the roads leading to its capital.

“Without the U.S. air support, President Lon Nol is vulnerable. His army of 180,000 is undertrained and undermotivated.”

Time magazine goes on to admit that the Cambodia of 1970—that is, before Prince Sihanouk’s overthrow—was placid and that Prince Sihanouk himself was a “dedicated neutralist”.

8. That brings me to my third point. If Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the head of State of Cambodia, is accepted even

by the Americans to be a neutralist, then why all the intrigues, machinations and subversion, including American-inspired and aided armed rebellion against his legal authority? Is it not obvious that the treachery against the lawful Government of Cambodia was intended to stifle the very neutralist and non-aligned position of Prince Sihanouk's Government? Was it not the uncompromising position of that Government in refusing to capitulate to the United States demands for the former's collaboration in the misadventure in Viet-Nam that made the non-aligned Government of Sihanouk unacceptable to the United States strategic interests in Indo-China?

9. Thus the conspiracy against Prince Sihanouk was a conspiracy against Cambodia's freedom, independence and non-alignment.

10. The legal Government of Cambodia has been subjected to imperialist subterfuge because it refused to be a partner, overt or covert, in the butchery of the Viet-Nameese people. The creation of the puppet régime of Lon Nol must be understood in this context—no more, no less.

11. Evidences of United States involvement in the internal affairs of Cambodia are too numerous and too obvious to be recounted here. Soon after the 18 March 1970 coup d'état, which occurred while the head of State, Prince Sihanouk, was away on a State visit, the United States hurriedly moved to consolidate the illegal authority. And it topped this act by sending large military forces. According to the same *Time* magazine quoted earlier:

“... the United States ‘dumped more than 245,000 tons of bombs on Cambodia. This deluge totalled 50 per cent more than all the conventional bombs the United States rained upon Japan in World War II.’”

12. Fourthly, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, led by the head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, has been recognized by many non-aligned nations, as well as other progressive nations, as the only legal Government representing Cambodia. At the Georgetown Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries in August 1972, the Conference passed a resolution which stated, *inter alia*:

“The Conference demands that the Government of the United States put an immediate end to its armed intervention and all other forms of intervention in Cambodia, especially the bombing of Cambodian Territory and effect a total withdrawal of its forces, and those of Saigon;

“The Cambodian problem should be solved on the basis of the five-point Proclamation made by Chief of State, Norodom Sihanouk, on 23 March 1970 and of the political programme of the National United Front of Cambodia...”¹

13. At the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in September in Algeria, and in the deliberations of which Prince Sihanouk took full part, the Heads of State and Government adopted a resolution whose operative paragraphs were worded as follows:

“1. Demands that the United States Government desist from all acts of aggression against Cambodia and interference in its internal affairs, and in particular stop all aid to the Phnom Penh régime, and that its military personnel and the foreign armed forces it has engaged in Cambodia be withdrawn;

“2. Calls upon all peace-and justice-loving countries to give official recognition to the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia as the sole legal Government of Cambodia;

“3. Reaffirms its solidarity with the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in its struggle at the international level and its unwavering support within the United Nations and other international organizations.” [A/9330, p. 48.]

14. The determination of the people of Cambodia, led by their lawful Government under the dynamic leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, is manifested with daily victories over the forces of reaction, treachery and imperialism. That the Cambodian people will finally emerge victorious by completely eradicating from their territory all vestiges of imperialist aggression is an inevitable development. Already, those who have debased themselves by being willing servants of imperialist aggression and *diktat* are trembling at the overwhelming successes scored by the revolutionary forces. The debate is no longer whether Lon Nol can sustain his illegal authority within the perimeters of Phnom Penh but rather how fast will he flee to seek refuge in the country of his benefactors.

15. The struggle of the Cambodian people is a common struggle of all those who seek to preserve their independence and security, free from the subversion and dictation of imperialistic Powers. The struggle of the Cambodian people is a struggle for the maintenance and preservation of their non-alignment. It is above all the struggle of a heroic people who, despite the formidable power and viciousness of those who wish to impose their will on small sovereign nations, are determined to safeguard jealously their freedom and their way of life no matter how costly the sacrifice. It is a struggle which should command the respect and admiration of all those who uphold the principles of freedom and justice, so eloquently enshrined in the Charter of our Organization. That is why the non-aligned Conference at Algiers lent its support to this struggle. And this is precisely the reason why the United Nations cannot afford to falter or hesitate in its position. It is our confidence in the principles of this Organization which lead us to believe that the United Nations will vindicate the legitimate rights of the Cambodian people, by restoring the representation of its lawful Government and rejecting the fictitious claims of the foreign-inspired, foreign-supported, foreign-maintained and foreign-sustained usurpers.

16. Mrs. Jeanne Martin CISSÉ (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): On 8 October 1973, the delegations of 33 Member States of the United Nations, including my own, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General [A/9195 and *Add.1*], and on the orders of their respective Governments,

¹ See *The Georgetown Declaration, the Action Programme for Economic Co-operation and Related Documents* issued by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, Georgetown, Guyana, 8-12 August 1972, p. 44.

called for the inclusion of a new item in the agenda of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly entitled, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations".

17. In the explanatory memorandum, these Powers emphasized their concern over the need to remedy, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, the abnormal situation created in the United Nations by the representation of Cambodia and felt that the recognition of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia constituted an urgent question.

18. The signatories of that document further stressed that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia is the only legitimate Government of Cambodia and that consequently it alone must represent the State and the people of Cambodia in international relations, and in particular in the United Nations.

19. In agreeing, by 69 votes, that this item be debated in the General Assembly, the international community recognized the validity of the request of the 33 nations which are sponsors of document A/9195 and Add.1. Indeed, Cambodia has been a Member of the United Nations since 1955. Thus, in this capacity it has always held a seat in this Organization. Its representatives have always been appointed by the person who was elected by universal suffrage, in accordance with the Constitution, Chief of the State of Cambodia, namely Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

20. From the moment it recovered its national independence, Cambodia, led by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, followed a policy of national independence, peace, neutrality and non-alignment. Cambodia's policy of neutrality took the form of the refusal by Prince Sihanouk to adhere to the military and ideological blocs that were dividing the world among themselves, and to collaborate with the régime of Ngo Dinh Diem which American imperialism had imposed upon the Saigon people. Thus, in spite of all types of pressures, he refused to participate in the plot hatched against the people of Viet-Nam. His resolution to side with the Indo-Chinese people and against American aggression was to win him the hatred of international imperialism, which only wanted to destroy him and his work.

21. Thus, while he was on an official visit in Europe, a group of outlaws and corrupt lieutenants, aided by foreign mercenaries and agents of the "international intelligence service", plotted a coup d'état against him and deprived him of the authority with which he was constitutionally invested by the people. On 18 March 1970, realizing the ambitions that they had long dreamed of, that group of traitors took command and, with the complicity of a despicable parliament, proclaimed Lon Nol, who had until then been little known on the international scene, as head of the Government of Cambodia. In violating the principles of neutrality which had governed the destiny of the country for more than 20 years, Lon Nol and his clique handed Cambodian soil over to foreign troops, which invaded it and used it to launch criminal operations against the people of Viet-Nam.

22. Indignant at those criminal acts, the Cambodian people rejected the Lon Nol régime, vehemently condemned the ignoble coup d'état and called for the return of Prince

Sihanouk, the sole authentic Chief of State of Cambodia. Under the direction of the United National Front of Cambodia, presided over by the Prince, the people immediately undertook with all the patriots a fierce struggle against the enemy, to expel the usurper and safeguard the independence and freedom of the country.

Mr. Martínez Ordóñez (Honduras), Vice-President, took the Chair.

23. The Indo-Chinese peninsula, which for 25 years was the theatre of the Viet-Nameese tragedy, thus saw another part of it become plunged in a blood bath. Cannons fired and bombers again unleashed thousands of tons of missiles on cities and hamlets, leaving a trail of death and desolation.

24. During those years of struggle, the Cambodian people were able to realize the facts. They realized where the bombs came from and who was trying to destroy their country. Popular resistance thus became more effective and the situation of the Cambodia of Lon Nol continued to deteriorate. In order to maintain itself, the puppet régime had to resort to terror and repression. In the United Nations that régime continued unlawfully to occupy the seat of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia.

25. As a matter of fact, in a declaration published on 22 November 1973, the Chief of State of Cambodia, Prince Sihanouk, stigmatized the decadence of the Lon Nol régime in the following terms:

"At the present time, more than 90 per cent of the national territory together with more than 80 per cent of the population are already liberated and under the direct administration of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, all of whose ministers . . . have been functioning within Cambodia since 9 November 1973. The group of traitors has only temporary control over the city of Phnom Penh and certain centres which our People's Armed Forces of National Liberation continue daily to attack and assault from all sides. Our national liberation struggle is in its last decisive and irreversible phase and is today drawing near to its victorious end."
[See A/9344, annex I.]

26. Contrary to the allegations of the usual supporters of international imperialism and of the usurpers of the legal and legitimate authority in Cambodia, the majority of the members of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia are within the liberated territory and are organizing the military struggle and the administration of those zones. In that vast liberated territory a new life—healthy, active, filled with freedom and fraternal feelings—has been established. Production is constantly on the increase and, in some regions, it has exceeded by two or three times that which existed before the coup d'état. Thanks to those laborious efforts, the Cambodian people is largely self-sufficient. The surpluses of its production are even exported to neighbouring countries. With respect to the Lon Nol clique, it survives as a result of the assistance that it receives from abroad, particularly from the United States of America. In Phnom Penh and in the few provincial cities where this clique is still confined, life is one of indignity, servile submission, mistrust and corruption.

27. Yesterday, as was bound to happen, the representatives of Lon Nol and other Member States, in their interventions in this Assembly, accused the 33 Member States that are sponsors of the draft resolution which calls for the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations, of interference in Cambodia's internal affairs. They concluded that this course could set a precedent that could threaten the very existence of the United Nations.

28. As my country is one of the sponsors of that draft resolution, my delegation feels entitled to say a few words concerning those allegations.

29. For our part, we consider that the real interference in the internal affairs of Cambodia, which some countries are unwilling wittingly or unwittingly to recognize, was perpetrated on 18 March 1970 by the American aggression against the Cambodian people and the Government of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, who conducted and continues to conduct a policy of national independence, peace, neutrality and non-alignment. The coup d'état which brought Lon Nol and his clique to power is in itself nothing but the corollary of this perfidious aggression.

30. Like any Government that is the result of foreign intervention, the Lon Nol régime could not and cannot have as its base the people, who have denounced and condemned it on the occasion of numerous manifestations which have been brutally repressed.

31. The principle which we are defending here is a principle that is universally recognized: namely the necessary foundation for power is the will of the people and that all power that does not take root in the people must be condemned and rejected.

32. My country claims to be non-aligned and, in this respect, contrary to the allegations of the representative of Barbados [2189th meeting], it has neither the intention of claiming to impose any ethic or morality on the community, nor to arrogate to itself the power of justifying or imposing any government. What it claims to do is to denounce what appears to it to be unlawful, unjust and contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

33. That is why my delegation believes that the restoration of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia to its lawful rights in the United Nations and the rejection of the representatives of Lon Nol, who represent no one but themselves, would contribute to avoiding a dangerous precedent for the United Nations. That is why my Government has, from the very outset, recognized the Government of Prince Sihanouk and has given it its unqualified support. That is why, lastly, my Government has denounced and continues to denounce the Lon Nol clique which, installed and supported as it is by international imperialism, is waging, against the will of the people, a war of colonial reconquest with its massacres and its injustices.

34. The recognition of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia by 50 States, largely African and Asian, is precious support for the freedom fight of the Cambodian people.

35. The Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in Algiers from 5 to 9 September last, in one of its resolutions [A/9330, p. 48] reaffirmed its total support for Prince Norodom Sihanouk and supported his five-point declaration of 23 March 1970. It also called upon all peace-loving and justice-loving States to extend their official recognition to the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia as the only legal Government of Cambodia. My Government, which has firmly supported and subscribed to that resolution, considers that the United Nations is in duty bound to restore the legitimate rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia by returning it to its seat in our Organization, which has been usurped for four years. In acting in this fashion, the international Organization will correct an injustice in accordance with the purposes and objectives of the Charter.

36. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Yesterday, we heard a pronouncement in the General Assembly claiming that the debate on the representation of Cambodia in the United Nations is unconstitutional and therefore taboo.

37. By invoking Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations, the draft resolution sponsored by 33 States [A/L.714] was also tagged as unconstitutional. Before I delve into the subject-matter, allow me to question this subjective contention.

38. In essence, what the Assembly is discussing squarely is the question of the representation of Cambodia in the United Nations. As such, it is absolutely within the jurisdiction of the General Assembly to discuss this agenda item and to take the appropriate action. But the issue of representation cannot be discussed in a vacuum. It should of necessity be related to the political entity the representation of which is under consideration. In other words, one cannot discuss the dispute over the legality of representation of a State in the United Nations without alluding to the conditions and prerequisites for proper and legal representation.

39. But what are these prerequisites of legality if they are not essentially political? How can one deal with the question of representation in the United Nations if one does not analyse and explain the political facts as they are and the political reality? The General Assembly could have hardly discussed the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations without inevitably discussing the political facts in China. The General Assembly is not telling the Cambodian people what to do, or what Government or régime to have. It is rather seeing to it that the legal and representative Government is seated in the United Nations.

40. My delegation submits that the head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, has the allegiance of the Cambodian people and that his Government, which is recognized by 50 States and which is endorsed by the Fourth Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, is a *de facto* Government which has to be reinstated in the United Nations. Before 18 March 1970, Cambodia was a peace-loving and peaceful neutral State. In order to maintain its neutrality and preserve its independence, the Government of Cambodia, at that time, strongly resisted in acquiescing to United States pressure and power politics aimed at using the territory of Cambodia

as a springboard for its genocidal war against the Viet-Nameese people.

41. Bedevilled by the valiant resistance of the Viet-Nameese people and their national liberation front, the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA] managed a coup d'état against the head of State of Cambodia, Prince Sihanouk, and installed in his place the subservient Lon Nol clique. Whether that coup d'état was embellished by an illusory election is beside the point. The complicity of the Lon Nol clique with United States imperialists, at the expense of the Cambodian people, was soon to be evidenced.

42. While the United States Air Force ferociously bombarded the villages and towns of Cambodia, the Lon Nol clique was receiving substantive American financial and military aid, second in magnitude only to that given Israel. Under the pretext of fighting the Viet Cong, American planes rained bombs on the Cambodian peasants who revolted against the Lon Nol clique. But the terror of imperialism and its lackeys has neither broken the will nor stifled the aspirations of the Cambodian people to liberate their country and rid themselves of the Lon Nol clique. The people of Cambodia are now, more than ever, resolutely fighting to regain their freedom, independence and national rights under the National United Front of Cambodia.

43. It is indeed a political irony that the United States Forces, instead of using Cambodia as a base for aggression against the heroic peoples of Viet-Nam and Laos, found themselves entangled in a bitter war against the Cambodian people in order to defend the besieged city of Phnom Penh. Before the illegal American bombing of Cambodia was halted by the Congress of the United States and by the moral weight of world public opinion, the last American troops were scrambling out of Phnom Penh for safety. The CIA-instigated coup of 18 March 1970 only stiffened the struggle against imperialism and its local chieftains in the whole of Indo-China. Now that the very palace of Lon Nol is no longer immune from attacks by the National United Front of Cambodia, and the capital city of Phnom Penh is struggling on in isolation, the days of the Lon Nol group are numbered.

44. This Assembly would do well to recognize these hard facts and restore the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations. Such an action would certainly help to stop bloodshed and allow the majority of the population of Cambodia to run its own affairs by itself.

45. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): My delegation has studied with care draft resolution A/L.714 and the accompanying memorandum [A/9195 and Add. I] in explanation of it. We have listened also with great attention to the statements made by the sponsors in justification of their initiative.

46. The memorandum submitted with the draft resolution and the explanations given by the sponsors in their statements in support of it does not, in the view of my delegation, reflect adequately what has really happened and is happening in the Khmer Republic. It is the intention of my delegation to present the Assembly with facts which we hope will

enable members to get as balanced a view as possible of developments and realities in Cambodia.

47. In paragraph 2 of the memorandum it is contended by the sponsors, that

“In March 1970, under the instigation of foreign forces, the Lon Nol group staged a coup d'état by rebellion, which deprived the lawful Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia, in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, of its inalienable right to represent the State of Cambodia in the United Nations.”

My delegation would now like to consider this contention more closely, as it is basic and most important for the motivation of the draft resolution.

48. What we know of what was happening in Cambodia in March 1970 leads us to a different presentation of the facts. What actually happened in Cambodia was that the same two Houses of the Cambodian Parliament which had appointed Prince Sihanouk 10 years earlier as head of State—the Senate and the National Assembly—decided unanimously in a joint session on 18 March 1970, on the authority given to them by the Cambodian Constitution, to depose Prince Sihanouk as head of State. This constitutional act by the Cambodian Parliament is attributed by the sponsors to instigation by foreign forces. My delegation really wonders whether that act can be presented in such a simple manner. It is an established fact that the decision of both Houses of Parliament to depose Prince Sihanouk as head of State was taken unanimously. To give more belief to this fact, my delegation would like to point out, that there existed at that time a one-party system in Cambodia. The only party in existence was the Sangkum, with Prince Sihanouk as its supreme leader; and all members of Parliament belonged to that party. If, therefore, there was really an instigation by foreign forces, then their efforts must indeed have been 100 per cent effective in convincing all members of them members of Prince Sihanouk's party—to vote for the deposition of the supreme leader.

49. In the same sentence the memorandum contended that the lawful Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia was deprived of its inalienable right to represent the State of Cambodia in the United Nations. The facts as we know indicate, however, a different state of affairs. The Government at the time of the deposition of Prince Sihanouk was the Government led by Prime Minister Lon Nol and this Government remained in office, only change being that a new head of State replaced Prince Sihanouk in the person of Mr. Cheng Heng, President of the National Assembly. The lawful Government of Cambodia has therefore never been deprived of its right to represent Cambodia in this Organization.

50. My delegation is at a loss to know what to say with regard to the assertion in the memorandum “in contravention of the provisions of the Charter”. It is not clear to us how to interpret it. It has always been the understanding of my delegation that the Charter does not contain provisions that give the United Nations the right to choose which Government should represent a particular country. We think that it is the sovereign right of a people to choose the

Government it wants to represent its country and itself, as also in the United Nations. The contention of a coup d'état by rebellion cannot of course be taken seriously. We all know that the majority, if not practically all, of the Governments represented here in this Assembly, can trace their origin at some stage or other to rebellion or coup d'état, whether against a colonial Power or against an existing government. It is therefore clear that the contention in the memorandum, which I have quoted earlier and which appears to be the basic motivation of the draft resolution, is not substantiated by facts.

51. Based on these facts, facts which can be verified, Indonesia has continued to recognize the Lon Nol Government, which, as I said earlier, remained in power after the deposition of Prince Sihanouk as head of State. As everybody knows, recognition does not have to mean agreement with, or approval of, the policies of the Government concerned.

52. Further down in paragraph 2 of the memorandum it is stated:

“The Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia exercises control over nine-tenths of the national territory and enjoys the support of the Cambodian people. In the liberated areas of Cambodia, comprising over 80 per cent of the population of the country, the lawful power of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has now been established at all administrative levels, from the villages to the provinces, on the basis of free and democratic elections.”

53. This claim has been made for more than a year now. The fact remains, however, that Prince Sihanouk still lives in exile. Although it has been announced that his ministers are now inside Cambodia—perhaps in view of the present debate in the General Assembly—my delegation wonders whether the real seat of his government has not remained in the capital of a foreign country. If the claim of the people's support and the control over 90 per cent of the territory with 80 per cent of the population were correct, Prince Sihanouk would not have to remain in exile; he would merely have to return to his country; he would be acclaimed by the people and his government installed in the capital of Cambodia. There would certainly be no need then for this Assembly to try to solve the question of contending national leaderships in Cambodia by a resolution. Therefore, there must be something wrong with the claim of support by the people and control of 90 per cent of the territory with 80 per cent of the population. But the fact remains that Prince Sihanouk continues to reside in the capital of a foreign country, whereas President Lon Nol and his Government are in the capital of their country.

54. I have just mentioned certain facts which already throw some light on the contention of paragraph 4 of the memorandum, which states:

“The Lon Nol group, which maintains only a tiny portion of the country thanks to the foreign intervention, has illegally occupied the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations.”

It is not my delegation's intention to deny that there has been foreign intervention; both sides are assisted by foreign

Powers. It is indeed undeniable that there is and has been foreign intervention, but on both sides.

55. Nobody can acclaim the American military intervention and bombardment of Cambodia; but they ended on 15 August 1973. We all remember the prediction that, left on its own, the Khmer Republic would cave in, and that the forces of Prince Sihanouk would walk over it and occupy Phnom Penh. Instead of collapsing, however, the forces of the Phnom Penh Government proved able to hold their own, without American support. In fact, Prince Sihanouk in an interview with T. D. Allman which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* of 18 September 1973 admitted frankly:

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

He emphasized: “At the moment we cannot take any major town, I must be frank.” The Assembly should be able to draw its own conclusions.

56. Reference has been made in this Assembly to decisions made by the Conference of the non-aligned countries in Algiers on the Cambodian question. I should like to state in this connexion that Indonesia, together with Malaysia and Singapore, reserved its position in a formal note concerning the relevant resolutions on Cambodia that were adopted by that Conference. In doing so, Indonesia has dissociated itself from whatever pledge that might have been intended by the resolution. At that time several other participants also expressed their reservations on the resolution. Indonesia's position on Algiers was, as it is today, that the question of national leadership in Cambodia is one solely for the Khmer people to decide and that no solution by resolution can be imposed upon them. Of course, this does not in any way affect Indonesia's total commitment to the policy of non-alignment, of which one of the basic principles is non-interference in the internal affairs of others.

57. Having said that, my delegation would like to make it very clear that Indonesia has nothing against Prince Sihanouk or his group. We respect Prince Sihanouk for his role in the struggle of the Khmer people against France for complete independence and sovereignty; but the Parliament representing the Cambodian people deposed him. The moment he is back in Cambodia and the Khmer people indeed clearly express their decision to accept him again as their leader, as their head of State, head of government or whatever title he may assume with their agreement, Indonesia will certainly not hesitate to recognize him as such. However, as long as Prince Sihanouk is making his claim as an exile from the capital of a foreign country, while in the capital of his own country there is a head of State, with a Government in power, accepted by a Parliament elected by the Khmer people on the basis of their constitution, Indonesia is not in a position to recognize Prince Sihanouk as head of State and his government as the legal Government of Cambodia. Such recognition would be tantamount to interfering in the internal affairs of Cambodia and rejecting the will of its people, which would be contrary to the principles of the Charter and of non-alignment. To do what the sponsors want will create a dangerous precedent, not only in our region of South-East Asia, but also in other regions of the world.

58. A comparison has been made with the question of the representation of China in the United Nations; such a comparison is certainly not valid. The realities surrounding the Khmer question are entirely different from those that surround the question of China's representation. The Government of the People's Republic of China was firmly established in Peking, the capital of China; they were undeniably in control of the country, while those of the Chiang Kai-shek group found themselves as refugees in Taiwan, exiled from their capital. If any comparison can be made, it is clear which similarity is obvious.

59. It is my delegation's considered view that any action by the United Nations should be directed towards ending the tragic fighting in Cambodia between Khmers. The General Assembly cannot take it upon itself to impose the leadership of a person in exile upon the Khmer people by a resolution—however much some of us may like it—or of a group in exile—however attractive ideologically it may be to some. Nobody in this Assembly seriously believes that by adopting the draft resolution, as proposed by its sponsors, the fighting in the Khmer Republic will end. On the contrary, the adoption of the draft resolution by the Assembly may well have the effect of intensifying the fighting and prolonging the suffering of the Khmer people, and surely the Assembly cannot take that responsibility since that is clearly against the aims and principles of the United Nations.

60. If the Assembly really wants to take action in line with the provisions of the Charter, then it must call on both parties to stop the fighting and to start negotiations forthwith with a view to finding a peaceful solution acceptable to the Khmer people. The Assembly should at the same time demand that all—I repeat, *all*—foreign forces cease immediately all kinds of intervention, leaving it to the Khmer people themselves to solve their problems, without outside pressure and interference. In the view of my delegation, the Assembly should do the following: first, try to stop the fighting between Khmers; secondly, call on all foreign forces to cease all kinds of interference and pressure; and thirdly, give the Khmer people the chance to choose their own leadership and government in peaceful consultation among themselves.

Mr. Benites (Ecuador) resumed the Chair.

61. Before concluding, my delegation would like to express our sincere gratitude to all those delegations which, during this debate or on previous occasions, have expressed their agreement—even though some did it with certain qualifications—with that basic concept that the solution of the problems of a region should primarily be the concern of the countries of that region. We would like to add that Indonesia, and with us many Asian countries, have always tried to respect that basic concept of allowing our views and actions on problems of other regions to be guided by the views, wishes and decisions—when there are decisions—of the countries of the region concerned. Our continued support for Arab and African causes provides ample testimony to that stand.

62. The view of countries of South-East Asia and the Pacific region with regard to the question of the representation of Cambodia is quite clear from the joint statement in

document A/9254, issued by the permanent representatives of Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Indonesia on behalf of their respective Governments, and from their statements during this debate. My delegation hopes that their views will be taken seriously into consideration by our friends, as those views are based upon a dispassionate evaluation of the facts and the realities in Cambodia, and with the interest of the Khmer people and those of the region in a peaceful solution of the problem in mind.

63. It has been contended that the Khmer Republic's neighbours have forfeited the right to claim primacy of interest in the solution of the Khmer problem because, allegedly, they have taken sides. As far as Indonesia is concerned, I have tried to explain why we continue to recognize the Government of Phnom Penh. In fact, we are not choosing sides in the sense implied by some of the sponsors. We are choosing the side of peaceful solution through direct negotiations between the two indigenous parties. We want peace to return to Cambodia, in order that the killings among the Khmers may stop. Whether President Lon Nol or Prince Sihanouk, or somebody else, emerges as the leader of Cambodia is immaterial to us, provided he is clearly accepted by the Khmer people through the free and peaceful expression of their choice.

64. If Cambodia's neighbours are accused of doing wrong by, allegedly, choosing sides, I think it would be equally wrong for others, outside the region, to choose sides, thereby only prolonging the agony and intensifying the suffering of the Khmer people. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.714 should really study more closely the words of Prince Sihanouk himself, many of which have been cited recently in prestigious newspapers and publications.

65. I hope that my statement may help Members to formulate as objective an evaluation as possible, and that the Assembly will not adopt a draft resolution which in reality could only mean the imposition of a government formed by a constitutionally deposed Head of State in exile upon a country which has its legitimate head of State and a Government in power in its own capital, accepted by its constitutionally elected Parliament.

66. Finally, allow me to express my conviction that in making their decisions all Members will be guided by their commitment and deep sense of responsibility towards the purposes and principles of the Charter.

67. Mr. SIKIVOU (Fiji): My delegation opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the item now before the General Assembly at the 212th meeting of the General Committee. In briefly explaining our objection, we said we thought an affirmative vote would imply approval of the substantive proposal, which sought the expulsion of the delegation of a Member State and its replacement by another. If we must discuss the Cambodian question during this session, we would prefer a resolution for United Nations action couched in neutral and constructive terms, based realistically upon Cambodian circumstances as they exist today, which could lead to a negotiated peaceful settlement. We said in the General Committee that the situation in Cambodia was fluid and unsettled and that the action proposed in

the draft resolution was premature. We maintained that in any case it was a matter for the Cambodians themselves to decide what form of government they wanted and who they wanted to form that Government. We said we would accept whatever Government the Cambodians themselves chose. We also stressed that our position was consistent with the principle embodied in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations, which calls for non-interference in the internal matters of any State.

68. Since that Committee meeting was held on 16 October, we have considered very carefully all we have heard, including what we have heard here, in statements by delegations, and elsewhere and what we have read for or against the draft resolution. We have not changed our view that the present Khmer Government is the lawful and proper Government of Khmer. We are convinced of the correctness of our position and we are also convinced that if the Assembly were to pass and implement the draft resolution we could be doing the people of Cambodia a grave injustice and a great disservice.

69. It is the firm view of my delegation that at the present time the Khmer Government is the legitimate Government of Cambodia. The Foreign Minister of the Khmer Republic [2188th meeting] and the Permanent Representative of Barbados [2189th meeting] have provided us with historical and legal facts relating to the draft resolution which have strengthened us in maintaining the constitutionality and acceptability of the Khmer Government to the Khmer people.

70. Without going far back in history, we ourselves would like to recall some historical facts relating to that country.

71. Cambodia's frontiers were guaranteed by the Geneva Agreement of 1954.² In March 1955 King Sihanouk abdicated and his father, King Norodom Suramarit, became king. After the election of 1955, Prince Sihanouk became Prime Minister, and he took steps to break away from the French Union, of which Cambodia was a part, in order to make Cambodia fully independent. He became head of State—but not king, because he had promised on abdicating in 1955 never to become king again—when his father died in April 1960. In 1966 General Lon Nol was chosen by the National Assembly as Prime Minister, with Prince Sihanouk's approval. Prime Minister Lon Nol, dissatisfied with interference in the government of the country by the head of State, offered his resignation in November 1966, but the Prince persuaded him to stay on. He did resign, however, in April 1967. Lon Nol was again persuaded to become Premier in August 1969, and Prince Sihanouk, who had himself tendered his resignation as Chief of State, also withdrew it. Because of the Prince's continued interference in Government matters, however, he was removed in accordance with the Constitution by a unanimous decision of a joint meeting of the Royal Council and the National Assembly while he was on a visit to Moscow in March 1970 and Cheng Heng replaced him. Later, Lon Nol replaced Cheng Heng.

72. After Prince Sihanouk's removal from office, the new Government, in response to the Khmer people's popular

demand, drew up a Constitution which abolished the monarchy and provided for a republican form of government. In May this year Marshall Lon Nol recalled the event as follows. This was after the removal of Prince Sihanouk.

“We therefore spared no physical or mental effort to draft a republican constitution that would be a new bond for the ruling of our national society in the sense that all powers emanate from the people and not from the king as was stipulated under the former régime.”

He continued:

“We drew up a draft constitution which stipulated that the Khmer Republic would not follow a régime that mobilized all State powers into the hands of any one organization nor a régime that entrusted dictatorial powers to any individual or group of individuals.”

73. The draft constitution was submitted to the people in a referendum on 30 April 1970 and was overwhelmingly accepted by them. That constitution is the Constitution on which the present Government is based and run. That is why and how my delegation calls the present Government the legitimate Government of Khmer. The Khmer leaders themselves drew up their Constitution and the people itself has accepted it.

74. In opposing the draft resolution before the General Assembly, my delegation would like to make it perfectly clear that we bear no grudge against Prince Sihanouk. If Prince Sihanouk returns to Cambodia and it is the wish of the majority of the Cambodian people that he should form a government under the Constitution of Khmer to replace the present Government, we would of course accept and respect such an act of the Khmer people. But the situation is fluid, with the war continuing and with the conflicting claims of the Khmer Government and Prince Sihanouk's government in exile in regard to the part of Khmer each effectively controls. The Prince's own declaration of not wishing to return further complicates matters. But whatever is the true position, it is for the Khmer people itself to decide. Our delegation believes that not only the United States of America and South Viet-Nam but also North Viet-Nam and its supporters have also interfered in the internal affairs of the Khmer Republic. We would join with other delegations in pleading for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and for letting the Khmer people itself decide.

75. In saying that we bear no grudge against Prince Sihanouk and royalty in general, my delegation would wish to point out that our country and our people have a monarch for whom we have deep affection and devotion just as some delegations here with monarchies have for their monarchs. An essential feature of the relationship is that the feeling of affection and devotion binding the people and the monarch together is spontaneous; it is cherished; it is mutual. It is, in that way only, that the relationship can be lasting and meaningful. In the absence of these deeper human qualities, monarchies, or attempts to perpetuate them, cannot succeed; they cannot last long.

76. Some delegations present here are from countries which have histories, ancient and recent, of overthrowing monarchies. History tells us that when monarchies are no longer a help but have become a hindrance to the welfare of

² Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Indo-China, signed at Geneva on 20 July 1954.

their people, they are removed peacefully or forcibly as each relevant situation warrants. We consider it somewhat ironical that this restoration move is championed by delegations of some countries which themselves ousted their royalities from power in years gone by in order to establish a form of government acceptable to their people. One wonders whether this restoration move is an outcome of the new international détente, which we applaud and welcome, and if it is the beginning of a new restoration movement to be strengthened and spread by those of us who have overthrown their monarchs. Today it is Prince Sihanouk. What other royalities do they have on their list for restoration, we ask? What other leaders will they want to restore against the wish of their respective people?

77. Much has been said about the change in Khmer Government in 1970. Some delegations have stressed the point that the coup d'état took place while Prince Sihanouk was away in Moscow. My delegation has studied the various accounts carefully, and we accept the indisputable historical facts that he was constitutionally removed. But, supposing it was a coup d'état, let us face it; a coup d'état is a coup d'état and it does not matter whether the overthrown leader was absent from or present in the country, or what he was doing at the time. And that coup d'état—if it was a coup d'état—was not the first one in history nor is it likely to be the last. Coups d'état, as we shall all agree, have become frequent and are not confined to any particular part of the world. Neither does a certain type of political ideology have the monopoly of organizing coups d'état. Some delegations may be complaining that the coup d'état was done without their instigation and their hallmark. My delegation is of the view that, whether it was a coup d'état, or a change carried out in a manner that accords with the country's Constitution at the time, the matter was, and is, properly the business of the Cambodian people and not that of the United Nations, or of the sponsors of the draft resolution, or other delegations such as ours.

78. My delegation would also warn against support of this draft resolution as it would create a precedent. Those of us who have likened the proposed move to the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations do that great nation an injustice. There is absolutely no comparison. The differences are so obvious that we shall not take up the time of the Assembly to enumerate them all. Let us mention but a few. The People's Republic of China assumed power and came here by virtue of its own strength. It was in effective control before it came here and remains even more so today. Prince Sihanouk relies not on Cambodians but on others to work for him, and if this draft resolution is adopted he will, we presume, continue to rely on them to go and fight his battles for him ever after. He has said that he will not return to Cambodia. Presumably, he will rule *in absentia*.

79. In advocating this draft resolution, several delegations have mentioned the support of Prince Sihanouk expressed by the non-aligned countries when they recently met in Algiers. My delegation would appeal to the non-aligned countries to give serious consideration to the joint views on the Khmer situation issued by our colleagues from South-East Asia and the Pacific, with which my delegation would like now to associate itself entirely. As those joint views are

so absolutely relevant, we take this opportunity also of quoting them:

“Joint views on the Khmer situation

“Since the Khmer problem is of vital importance to the countries in the region, it is strongly felt that the views of countries situated closely to the area should be taken into full consideration, and these views are:

“1. The Khmer people themselves should be allowed to solve their own political problems peacefully, free from outside interference in whatever form.

“2. Such political settlement should be reached by the indigenous parties concerned.

“3. The United Nations should not take any action which may prejudge the decision of the Khmer people themselves and which may prolong the tragic suffering and the loss of lives and property in the Khmer republic.”
[A/9254.]

The document was signed by Ambassadors C. A. Sani of Indonesia, Shizuo Saito of Japan, H. M. A. Zakaria of Malaysia, M. J. C. Templeton of New Zealand, N. G. Reyes of the Philippines, S. Jayakumar of Singapore, and A. Panyarachun of Thailand.

80. Briefly, the joint views expand Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Paragraph 1 of the “Joint Views” uses the words “should be allowed”. In actual fact, that is redundant, because the Charter already allows the Khmer people themselves to decide how to solve their problems.

81. In dealing with world problems, this world Organization has in the past respected the views of the region concerned. We have done so in Africa and elsewhere. We appeal to the non-aligned who are aligned in this draft resolution with the super-Power of our region, the People's Republic of China, to consider favourably my delegation's plea and the plea from South-East Asia and the Pacific that there be no interference in the internal affairs of the Khmer people.

82. We would also appeal to the delegation of the People's Republic of China to join with the other delegations from South-East Asia and the Pacific in helping reduce tension and restore peace to the peace-loving peoples of our region that have suffered for so long and now yearn for peace, which continues to evade them.

83. We consider that adoption of this draft resolution would worsen, and not improve, the prospects for the coming of peace to the region. It should therefore be rejected.

84. Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): My intervention in this historic debate devoted to agenda item 106, will be brief because, as you know, on the one hand, the point of view of the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo on this question has been stated unequivocally before the General Committee of the Assembly and, moreover and above all, my country feels entirely at one with the friendly delegations whose representatives in this debate supported with exceptional brilliance the just cause of the Cambodian people, which is a victim of American aggression. My purpose, therefore, will be limited to recalling certain main points around which this case revolves.

85. First of all, may I be permitted, at the start, to recall the words of Demosthenes, who, in his third philippic, was rightly castigating those who attempt to please instead of giving the best advice:

“You have expelled frankness from the rostrum. And with what result? In the assemblies you are pleased at being flattered by speeches designed only to please you; but subsequently, when the events take place, your very safety is endangered”.

86. Our Organization, which has long been languishing in a state of defeatist lethargy, must now bend every effort towards the attainment of the objectives enshrined in the Charter.

87. Our Organization must be capable of feeling and grasping the spirit of the times and of turning its back upon old prejudices which have engendered so many conflicts that have caused and still cause so much suffering to so many thousands of people throughout the world.

88. For some days now, fantastic rumours, the product of fertile but fanciful imaginations, have been circulating in the halls and corridors of this building. The non-aligned countries in general, and the African countries in particular, are criticized for their alleged interference in a matter that is of no concern to them whatsoever, closely or remotely. Moreover, even before the opening of this debate, an attempt was made—underestimating the force of character of delegations—to convince us that the item before us would be postponed without debate to the twenty-ninth session. In brief, we are witnessing a situation brought about by the moral disarray of those who continue to defend the Lon Nol case—talented advocates, no doubt, but in the present instance, advocates of an indefensible cause which is already lost.

89. Without entering into any sterile polemics, which are out of place here, I should like to say that my delegation, lest it be accused of changing its mind, wishes to affirm that it cannot go along with the dangerous game of futile temporizing and compromising complacency vis-à-vis the vassal régime which has taken temporary refuge in Phnom Penh and which stems from foreign domination and the betrayal of the fundamental interests of the people of Cambodia—a régime which, moreover, because it is in the exclusive service of the alleged security of the dominant Power, constitutes, in our view, by the normal process of repetition, a genuine and serious threat to the still fragile independence and peace of small countries such as ours.

90. One cannot reproach the newly independent countries for preserving most vigilantly their independence, that precious status that they have been deprived of during the long colonial night, and the price of which they can now appreciate. The emotion that we feel as a result of attempts against the sovereignty, independence and freedom of small peoples is, naturally, greater than that of the old nations.

91. Today, it is Cambodia. For whom will the bell toll tomorrow? In truth, we wish to invite those who are trying to preach morality throughout this debate and who accuse us of interfering in the affairs of another State to be a little more serious in the analysis of the situation in Cambodia.

We who have suffered so much from foreign domination are more apt to see the risks involved in imperialism and neo-colonialism. To use an expression borrowed from a European newspaper, we are part of those who have nothing but their courage and their meagre resources, which have been ravaged by military war and pillaged by economic war.

92. It is therefore normal for us often not to speak the same language. But let us be careful because, in speaking of morality every day, certain States might lead us to preach an excessively brief and reverse morality. It would be unfortunate to dissimulate that it is the duty of the international community—in other words, the duty of each of us in his own way—to help in accelerating the process of disintegration of foreign domination in Cambodia. This debate on the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia is an historic opportunity for our Organization. This debate must take place, of course, without acrimony, because it is not directed against any people and claims no other purpose than to destroy imperialism and its valets, to serve justice and peace. At the debate must be undertaken without weakness.

93. My delegation is firmly opposed to any postponement of the consideration of the substance of this matter. On the contrary, we must put to a vote now the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by 33 nations.

94. To do otherwise would be, in the opinion of my delegation, to adopt somewhat hypocritically the policy of the ostrich.

95. We are ironically sceptical when we hear criticism on the part of some that we are interfering in the domestic affairs of Cambodia, first of all, because this problem cannot fall within the sole purview of the Asian countries and because, on the other hand, it is the Government of the United States and not the sponsors of the draft resolution, mentioned earlier, that has expressed haughty contempt for the sovereignty of that country and has, since the coup d'état of March 1970, been subjecting it to military aggression.

96. But in spite of the massive military assistance which the United States Government has been giving to Lon Nol and his team of traitors, despised by the people, the alleged Khmer Government will never be able to destroy the fierce determination of the heroic people of Cambodia. Indeed, the determined struggle of national liberation by the patriots of that country—which is one of the most peaceful in the world—makes it possible today for the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, presided over by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to control more than nine-tenths of the territory of Cambodia and daily to extend further its influence throughout the world among the peoples who love justice, freedom and peace.

97. In the liberated zones which constitute virtually the whole of the national territory, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia has now assumed in an effective and permanent fashion all the functions of statehood. The declaration dated 22 November 1973 [A/9344, annex I] of Prince Sihanouk, Chief of State and President of the United National Front of Cambodia, leaves no doubt whatever concerning the high level of effectiveness of the Government under his lofty direction.

98. I would not wish to speak of the alleged Khmer Government. In spite of the pathetic and despairing appeal of the Lon Nol group who, as usual, have again resorted to insult and calumny, the alleged Khmer Government in Phnom Penh, where it survives thanks to terror and corruption, artificially supported by American aggression, must know that one can never with impunity betray the legitimate aspirations of a people. This group, which is going to disappear faster than we believe, today appears in the United Nations where it usurps the seat which is that of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, as a private individual without a mandate.

99. The problem of determining the effective Government of Cambodia appears before the General Assembly clearer than ever. Let us remember the painful experience which our Organization had to live through in recent years. By refusing obstinately to recognize the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, our Organization was reduced to being but the alibi for those Member States that wanted to convert the United Nations into an instrument in the service of their aggressive policies.

100. In the Congo we are firmly convinced that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia—which is not only providing, inside the country and in a way which blocks all doors to doubt, effective examples of the exercise of sovereignty over the major part of the people of Cambodia, but is also, outside the country, assuming brilliantly its international role—is in every respect in a position to be admitted to the United Nations as the sole representative of the Cambodian people. On the other hand, the so-called Khmer Government has no longer any capacity for accrediting the representative of Cambodia in any organization of the United Nations whatsoever. Recourse to legal principles, however attractive, should not conceal the great political significance of this debate.

101. Together, let us put an end to United States aggression in Cambodia by expelling the Lon Nol group from the seat that it is usurping in the United Nations. All countries that are imbued with ideals and progress, peace and freedom, must give their massive support to draft resolution A/L.714, the adoption of which will indicate the success of our Organization against the forces of negativism.

102. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Like the majority of the States Members of this Organization, we too love classical mythology and we are glad to read and study its symbols. However, it does not appear to us that this is the best means of injecting vigour into the activities of this Organization or of increasing its efficiency and strengthening its prestige by compelling it year after year to take upon it the curse that the gods reserved for Sisyphus. For more than a decade now, in this same hall, we have heard the same arguments repeated, the identical fallacious arguments that we have had to listen to in the past few days when this Organization was discussing a problem very similar to the one that is now before the Assembly for its consideration.

103. Year after year, giving the world the best proof of the lack of imagination in the imperialist political style, some delegations repeated the very same arguments which have

been repeated here since yesterday, with the same purpose of trying to perpetuate an unlawful situation, to prolong a situation which is injurious to the prestige of this Organization and to maintain a type of situation in which the seat of a Member State is usurped by a group which does not represent either that State or any other State.

104. It would appear logical to think that after the tremendous rock of the opinion of the majority of the Members of this Organization had crushed the imperialist attempts, that had gone on for more than a decade, to convince us that it was the Taiwan clique which should represent the Chinese people, the lesson would have been learned and that, to say the very least, when an attempt was made to repeat history, they would have been able to provide us with some innovative procedure of something that would display a certain intellectual effort on the part of those who are attempting to have this Assembly repeat a very long history which was very harmful to the prestige of this Organization, and to maintain here a clique created, directed and maintained by United States imperialism in the place which has always been rightfully that of the Kingdom of Cambodia.

105. Strictly speaking, it would not seem necessary to come up to this rostrum to express the views of those Governments which, like my own, defend the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations, since some delegations have put forward a rosary of fallacies adduced in objection to draft resolution A/L.714, introduced by more than 30 delegations, including Cuba.

106. However, this morning [2190th meeting] we thought that this exercise by some delegations, which are attempting to compel this Assembly to preserve an unjust and unlawful situation, attained the height of cynicism in the statement of the representative of the United States of America.

107. In the course of this discussion various arguments have been advanced in opposition to the position reflected in draft resolution A/L.714 which, as I said at the outset, seemed to be drawn from what, with obviously excessive optimism, many delegations thought would be the pre-history of the Organization, and which were used in the past in order to maintain for over a decade an equally unlawful situation concerning the representation of China.

108. On the one hand, it is argued that those of us who proclaimed the necessity to have this Assembly restore the lawful Government of Cambodia to its rightful place would be engaging in improper intervention in the domestic affairs of that country. It is said that the countries adjoining the area, or the so-called neighbours of Cambodia, would allegedly have a special role to play in the Assembly's consideration of this item. It is pointed out that we are faced with the case of expulsion or admission of a Member State and that, therefore, such a decision would require an arbitrary majority of two-thirds and, lastly, the rumour is going about and being repeated as to the desirability of putting off a decision on this matter.

109. Those representatives who have spent more than two years in this Assembly will recall that similar speeches, in a

series, stemming from the same source, were repeated year after year in this Assembly, and all of us in the same room can testify to the fact of what was the end of that exercise. However, it seems worth while to us to answer some of these arguments concerning the discussion that is now under way.

110. First of all, we should express our surprise at the allegations of some belated defenders of the principle of non-intervention in Indo-China, and in Cambodia in particular, who are concerned today about the effort of a group of countries to restore justice and legitimacy in respect of the representation of that State, but who were unable in this Assembly to cite a single statement by their respective Governments condemning, regretting or even deploring the brutal intervention of which the Cambodian people has been the victim for years. That intervention was denounced year after year from this very rostrum by the representatives of the Royal Government of that country, an intervention which was discussed in various subsidiary bodies of this Organization, such as in the Security Council in 1964.³ That intervention, as far as the people of Cambodia was concerned, signified destruction and suffering, which has had and has a name, and which was denounced repeatedly by the Chief of State of that country and by his representatives in this Organization, without at that time finding any word of encouragement or solidarity on the part of those who today, in a surprising fashion, appear to have a marked interest in defending, allegedly, the principle of non-intervention in respect of that country.

111. Some have talked about the agreements of the so-called Cambodian Parliament of 1970, and the most euphemistic language has been used in referring to the so-called change of government in that country, as if the participants in this debate have perhaps forgotten that that Parliament was acting in conditions that were not precisely those obtaining in a routine normal change of government in any State, but rather was acting at a time when everyone was talking about Cambodia and expressing concern about Cambodia, because tens of thousands of uniformed Yankee "parliamentarians" had invaded the territory of that country, had overthrown the constitutional Government of Prince Sihanouk and, in that way, "enacted legislation" in the name of the Cambodian people.

112. To talk about constitutional changes and changes of government and, at the same time, to defend non-intervention without even saying a word of condemnation about United States military intervention and without even uttering the slightest word of concern about the criminal bombing by B-52 aircraft against the territory, is really to show a lack of respect for this Assembly.

113. All peoples of the world, including the people of the United States, rose up at that time to express their indignation against the brutal United States intervention against the people of Cambodia. Blood was shed; not only the blood of Cambodians who resisted aggression, but, in addition, blood was shed in many parts of the world, including the United States itself, when young students protested in indignation against that attack. Yet today this Assembly had to sit through an intervention by the United States Ambassa-

dor [2190th meeting] who came forward to defend nothing more or less than the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of Indo-China and, in particular, in matters relating to Cambodia.

114. Another argument has been used, which relates to geographical proximity to Cambodia. Indeed, whenever we have entered this Hall, since this debate began, we have found ourselves with a copy of a document in a number of languages which some generous person was kind enough to make available to all delegations day after day. I refer to a communication signed by seven representatives of some countries of Asia and the Pacific, who are expressing their particular interest or, to use their own words, the vital interests of the countries of the region in this discussion. We note among the signatories to this document the signatures of at least three countries which for years participated in the criminal United States aggression against the North Viet-Nameese people, and of at least one country which today serves as a landing and take-off site for Yankee bomber aircraft which are every day attacking this region, and in particular Cambodia. No matter how many pages the representatives of some countries of Asia and the Pacific use and no matter how much they try to make us forget the notice concerning the shortage of paper which the Secretariat has placed in every seat, I do not think they will make anyone forget that if the defence of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of Indo-China is the issue, then some of them are certainly not the most highly qualified to speak on this point.

115. However, apart from this point, my delegation has already had an opportunity in the course of the debate in the General Committee of the Assembly to indicate that it cannot agree to the concept of a United Nations Organization which apparently, in the opinion of some, would not be an Organization or have any claim to unity, but rather would be a sort of federation of regional groups where, in order to take decisions or have a debate, we would have to take into account dozens of rights of veto when various countries in different areas considered that their views should be heard.

116. The principles of the Charter and the principles of international coexistence are not the heritage of any geographical region, and international problems of such overriding importance as Yankee aggression against the peoples of Indo-China, problems that have aroused the concern of all peoples of the world and mobilized world public opinion, should certainly not be such as to be decided upon by a few countries situated in the vicinity of that zone. I say again that it is only some countries, because, as someone pointed out quite rightly at an earlier stage, the countries in closest proximity to Cambodia could not subscribe to the document to which I have referred, but would undoubtedly be sponsors of our draft resolution. The opinions of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Revolutionary Provisional Government of South Viet-Nam, two of the closest neighbours of Cambodia, are well known, and need not be disseminated each day so that representatives will remember them.

117. There is another point. In the statement made by the representative of the United States this morning he seemed

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year*, 1118th-1122nd and 1124th-1126th meetings.

to favour the concept of the pre-eminence of the views of countries of a specific area in seeking a solution to the problems of the area in question. That is why we should ask ourselves first and foremost, before we accept the interpretation that some Asian countries are attempting to present in this debate, in what geographic area of the world should we place the imperialists?

118. If we consider their interference in the affairs of Indo-China and their gross intervention in Cambodia and Viet-Nam, they would appear to be closer geographically to this country than some of Cambodia's Asian neighbours. But there is historical evidence which would seem to show that the United States considers itself a European country, a country of the Caribbean, a South American country, an African country, and certainly belongs to both polar extremes.

119. So that the United States allegation that we should take into account, first and foremost, the opinion and views of the countries of a specific area in the search for a solution of the problems of that area certainly gives us something to think about. In other words, the United States delegation would take into account, in the first place, the opinion of the African countries, for example, before taking a decision on the problem of recognition of the State of Guinea-Bissau. The United States Government would take into consideration, before making any pronouncement in the Assembly, and before taking any diplomatic or political action, the African opinions concerning trade with Rhodesia or support for Portuguese colonialism or the racist régime of South Africa, and would be bound by these African views in working out its own African policies. We should therefore also conceive of a situation where, for example, in Security Council meetings, such as those held in Panama City earlier this year—where an overwhelming majority of the countries of the Latin American area and, why not say it, of all of the other areas of the world, spoke out in favour of the sovereign rights of Panama over its canal—the United States would also have voted in favour of that resolution and would not have been compelled to have recourse to the veto to prevent the adoption of that resolution which reflected the views of all of the countries neighbours of Panama—including those which are not neighbours as well—and it would have been approved.

120. I do not think it essential to continue running through the whole gamut of problems confronting this Organization to prove that the argument of regional interest is of purely casuistic, fortuitous value and is designed deliberately to sow confusion in this debate in the same way as recourse has been had to other arguments ever since we have begun our consideration of the question of the representation of Cambodia.

121. Moreover, some representatives, including the representative of the United States, have attempted to cast doubt upon the information contained in the documents submitted by those of us who are in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations, doubt as to the effective control that that Government exercises over virtually the whole national territory of Cambodia and nearly all of its population. I believe that other speakers have already dealt

effectively with this matter and therefore I shall not press the point.

122. However, I should like, for purposes of the record of the Assembly, to refer to the conclusions contained in a special report which two United States Senators submitted on 27 April 1973 to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate concerning United States intervention in that country. I do not propose to read out the report or its conclusions. But from this data, from this report, as from all of the data provided from other sources that might be considered objective, one comes to the conclusion that the Lon Nol régime, created by United States imperialism, today holds a position in the capital of Phnom Penh and a few other isolated spots and, if we were to speak strictly, we would have to say that not even in Phnom Penh does that Government really govern.

123. Indeed, in the conclusions drawn by the report to which I have just referred, prepared by Senators James Lowenstein and Richard Moose, on page 5 one finds a statement of the activities to which the Embassy of the United States of America devotes itself in Phnom Penh. I shall not read out a listing of these activities, but it is abundantly clear that an Embassy which functions "as a communications relay point" or "an on-the-spot coordinator of forward air control for planes and strike aircraft"⁴—and I will leave off my quotation here, although the Senators' report goes on—an Embassy which functions in this way suggests to us not only that Mr. Lon Nol and his friends are protected in Phnom Penh behind United States bayonets, but also that auxiliary activities are carried on there by the only municipal authority of the city, namely the United States Embassy.

124. We feel that the decision that should be taken by the General Assembly and the dilemma that it confronts on this occasion are of decisive importance for the prestige of the Organization and the efforts of the majority of its Member States to strengthen the role that the United Nations can play, in accordance with its Charter, to promote a just international order that will respect the self-determination, equality and independence of all peoples.

125. Once again, we are confronted with a dilemma—difficult for some people and painful because of the intensive activity engaged in by the delegation of an imperialist, powerful and influential Power like the United States—which none the less is of concern to all countries of the third world anxious to see a correct solution provided to this problem. On the one hand, we have the will of an imperialist Power wishing to continue to use this Organization for the purposes of its aggressive policy against the Cambodian people and, on the other hand, the principles of the Organization; on the one hand the interests and will of a powerful nation, and on the other hand the interests of the majority of peoples; on the one hand the will and interests of imperialism, and on the other hand the prestige of our Organization.

126. We trust that the majority of the members of the Assembly will be able to put themselves into a position which is consonant with the prestige of this Organization, the interests of the majority of its Members, and with justice

⁴ Quoted in English by the speaker.

for the Cambodian people. My country which has recognized the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia from the very outset, which has maintained close relations of solidarity with that Government as it has with all the other peoples of Indo-China who have heroically resisted imperialist aggression, trusts that this Organization will be able to follow the example set by the heads of State or Government of more than 70 non-aligned countries who met in Algiers last September, by adopting draft resolution A/L.714.

127. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): My delegation, which is one of those Member States which originally requested the inclusion in the agenda of our current session of the item now under discussion, wishes to affirm its unqualified support for the call for the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations. The vast majority of the people of Cambodia look to the return of their legitimate Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to lead his country once again, for he alone is capable of bringing about national reconciliation, unity and peace in that unfortunate land. Interestingly, a commentary on the political conditions of Cambodia contained in a book compiled and written by officials of the State Department under the title *The U.S. Department of State Fact Book of the Countries of the World*, states:

“The political scene in Cambodia is marked by the prominence of Prince Sihanouk. Whether in the role of King, Prime Minister, private citizen, or Chief of State, he remains the dominant political leader of the country...”

Thus, the United States itself recognized that Prince Sihanouk is the leader who commands the overwhelming support of the majority of the Cambodian people.

128. Furthermore, it is pertinent to note here that the representatives of 80 States at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Algiers in September this year, affirmed that the Government headed by Prince Sihanouk is the only legitimate Government of Cambodia, and almost 50 States, including my own, have already accorded formal recognition to his Government.

129. The draft resolution sponsored by 33 delegations, including Somalia [A/L.714], rightly begins by recalling the purposes and principles of the Charter. Of particular relevance is Article 2, paragraph 4, of Chapter I, which states that “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state” and shall refrain from the threat or use of force in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Charter.

130. The circumstances surrounding the 1970 coup d'état which forced the Cambodian Chief of State into exile and which set up the reactionary régime of Lon Nol were clearly inconsistent with the principles outlined in Chapter I of the Charter, for those circumstances involved the subversion of the political independence of Cambodia and the violation of its neutrality by destructive foreign interference in the form of the arbitrary and wrongful use of military power and political pressure of far-reaching consequences. In fact, today Cambodia is a divided country which has become a

target of foreign aggression. If ever there was a case of unwarranted and mischievous interference in the internal affairs of one State by another, this was the American-inspired coup d'état which forced Prince Sihanouk into exile.

131. The United Nations, in our view, cannot remain passive when a major Power has used its military power to support the illegal régime of a usurper. There is always something destructive about such use of power, for it may plunge the world into disaster. The events we are witnessing today in Cambodia are reminiscent of those dangerous post-Second World War policies which caused the Korean War, threatened the independence of the Dominican Republic, and provoked the long and agonizing ordeal of the Viet-Nameese people.

132. There is a very important issue at stake, and there must be a clear and uncompromising recognition of what that issue is. We must not allow it to be sidetracked or covered up. The issue is whether a major Power is to be allowed to interfere with impunity in the affairs of a small neutral country in order to further its own political and military designs in South-East Asia.

133. The United States interference in Cambodia and elsewhere in South-East Asia has already caused incalculable sufferings to the peoples of that region. Because of this interference, Koreans have been pitted against Koreans, Viet-Nameese have fought Viet-Nameese and Cambodians continue to fight their brothers in struggles that have been unnecessarily bitter, protracted and bloody.

134. The motivation for American intervention in Cambodia follows a familiar pattern—that of wanting régimes that are anti-communist to be established in developing countries and to prevent the establishment of even the most mildly socialist governments. Principles such as the right of peoples to political self-determination and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States seem to become null and void if they stand in the way of American foreign policy.

135. The senselessness and tragedy of the Cambodian war becomes most apparent when one recalls the efforts of Prince Sihanouk to gain international agreement for the principle of the neutrality of Cambodia and Laos; when one recalls that it was his efforts to preserve neutrality and peace in Cambodia that made him unacceptable to the United States. Of course, it will be claimed that the Lon Nol coup d'état was a purely domestic affair, with no involvement on the part of the United States. It was claimed, it will be recalled, that Cambodia's neutrality was being respected even while American bombers were spreading death and destruction in cold-blooded, massive air strikes against the land and the people of Cambodia. In saying this, I am not making accusations; I am merely trying to explain the undisputed facts that led Cambodia to the present tragic situation.

136. It is against that background that the General Assembly must consider whether it can continue to recognize the representatives of a régime established in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter; a régime whose callous self-interest permitted the wanton killing of its own people and the devastation of its own land.

137. It is a fact that the present régime of Lon Nol neither commands the allegiance of the Cambodian people nor is it in effective control of the country. Its ineffectiveness is proven by the fact that, in spite of the enormous foreign military and political support it receives, it is only able to hang on precariously in one small area of the country and it represents only a reactionary small group of traitors. Its only claim to power lies in the military, technical and financial aid that it receives from the United States. It is opposed by the national spirit of the Cambodian people, which has rallied behind the United National Front of Cambodia. As a result of its efforts, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia now controls 90 per cent of the national territory inhabited by more than 80 per cent of the population.

138. The United Nations has already suffered, in the case of China, from the experience of according recognition to the representatives of a régime which was not the legitimate Government of the people it claimed to represent. It was pressure from the United States, its allies and clients that preserved that anomalous situation for almost a quarter of a century. We must not repeat those grave mistakes and injustices of the past.

139. My delegation believes that the United Nations now has a great opportunity to restore justice in Cambodia. It must not continue to recognize those who do not legitimately represent the people of Cambodia; it must, rather, express deep concern that the political independence and territorial integrity of a small nation has been violated by a major Power.

140. For the reasons that I have stated, my delegation fully supports draft resolution A/L.714, which calls for the restoration of the rights of the legitimate representatives of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia who should be allowed to take their lawful place in the United Nations, so that the finest qualities of that nation can again blossom in freedom and their social and cultural life can flourish in peace.

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

142. Mr. BARNES (Liberia): In accordance with rules 76 and 79 (c) of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, I move that the debate on agenda item 106, entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations", be deferred until the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

143. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly has taken note of a point of order raised pursuant to rules 76 and 79 (c). Rule 76 reads:

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

144. Rule 79 sets out the order of priorities: the first is to suspend the meeting; the second is to adjourn the meeting; the third is to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion. I shall therefore call on two representatives who wish to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion.

145. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to support the motion just made by the representative of Liberia.

146. With reference to procedure, a motion submitted orally, such as the one just made in the Assembly, has precedence in the plenary Assembly and in the Main Committees of the General Assembly. To cite only two such precedents, I should like to refer to the question of the Congo, that was raised at the 923rd meeting of the General Assembly, on 22 November 1960, on which occasion the delegation of Ghana orally submitted the motion that the debate be suspended *sine die*, pursuant to the terms of rule 76. That motion was accepted as a normal procedure by the President of that session of the General Assembly in accordance with the terms of rule 76.

147. The second precedent occurred when the question of the Middle East was being discussed at the 1933rd plenary meeting, on 17 December 1970. At that time the delegation of Jordan requested, since the question had not yet been concluded, that the item be included in the provisional agenda for the next session of the General Assembly, the twenty-sixth session, and that motion was given priority. That merely relates to the procedural aspects of the question that has been raised.

148. With regard to the substance, I think delegations will agree with me that this subject has been debated, that we have heard the opinions and the legal and political arguments of those who contend that the item should be resolved and that we have heard others who felt that consideration of this question was a flagrant act of intervention.

149. Someone said this morning, with some wisdom, that if representatives were freed from what he called the strait-jacket of instructions, they would vote in accordance with their consciences and the result of the vote would be surprising. Be that as it may, that is a possibility, something that might happen.

150. The idea of the motion that has been submitted is to offer delegations a way of avoiding a vote on a matter which I would term a very dangerous vote, a vote which, if cast in accordance with instructions, would weigh heavily on the consciences of many. I believe that to postpone this question, and not take sides on this Khmer problem, would be a tribute to the Khmer people, who are the only people who can decide upon the destiny of the country without intervention from anyone.

151. Mr. REYES (Philippines): My delegation's views on item 106 were expressed in a statement before the General Committee at its 212th meeting on 16 October and in the joint statement on the Khmer question which was issued as an official General Assembly document at the request of the Governments of Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines [A/9254]. These

views are among the fundamental considerations that prompt my delegation to support the proposal that the Assembly should defer final action on item 106.

152. We believe that the implications of the issue before the Assembly transcend the fortunes and the fate of the parties in conflict and that this issue is important enough to merit further careful thought and judicious consideration. The essence of the issue is whether the United Nations, through its supreme deliberative organ, the General Assembly, should embark upon the dubious and dangerous course of imposing upon the people of a Member State a Government in exile, in contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, of its own Charter. In the present case such a course is rendered even more hazardous by the uncertainty surrounding Prince Sihanouk's own position. For instance, what would happen if, after having been, in effect, recognized by the General Assembly, the Prince should be repudiated again, this time by his present or future associates? Would the General Assembly intervene and reinstate the Prince again and perhaps yet again, as the United Nations-sponsored leader of the Khmer people? And, having established such a precedent, would the General Assembly proceed to intervene in the same manner in the internal affairs of other countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions of the world?

153. We feel that this Assembly should pause and ponder the serious consequences of placing the United Nations in such an untenable position, and we therefore support the motion for adjournment of the debate on item 106, proposed by the representative of Liberia and ably supported by the representative of Uruguay.

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now, in accordance with rule 76 of the rules of procedure, call upon two speakers against the motion. I shall call first on the representative of Senegal and then on the representative of Yugoslavia.

155. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I am truly surprised to see that in this Assembly of responsible delegations there are persons who are afraid of hearing the truth. Why has the adjournment of the debate been called for when we are right at the heart of the debate? I would have understood better the intervention of my colleague and friend from Liberia if he had waited until the end of the debate before making a proposal for adjournment.

156. Before explaining the reasons why my delegation, on behalf of 33 sponsors, is opposing the motion for adjournment, I request you, Mr. President, to consider the proposal in the light of the provisions of rule 83 of the rules of procedure.

157. Indeed, the Assembly has taken a decision. That decision involves examining at the present session, the twenty-eighth session, the problem of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations.

158. It is now proposed that that decision of the Assembly should be made void and that this matter should be exam-

ined at the twenty-ninth session. However, rule 83 provides that:

“When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decides.”

159. Mr. President, I would therefore request you, before developing my arguments, to consider this question with the competent services of the Secretariat while I continue my statement.

160. Last week our Assembly held several meetings to debate a problem entitled “Strengthening of the role of the United Nations” [*item 25*]. At the beginning of this year, during the Paris Conference which took place in January regarding peace in Viet-Nam, questions were raised concerning the participation of the delegation of the United Nations headed by the Secretary-General personally. The countries which raised these questions thus wished to show their regret at the indifference that our Organization had always displayed in the face of the murderous war in Viet-Nam. In a few weeks, in Geneva, a Conference will take place in an attempt to put an end to the war that has been going on for more than twenty-five years in the Middle East. However, in spite of all the efforts made by the United Nations, both in the General Assembly as well as in the Security Council, a controversy has already developed concerning the possibility of the participation of our Organization in that conference when it is unquestionable that the master craftsman of the whole operation should be the Security Council.

161. Since the Paris Agreement of January 1973, the United States has spent \$423 million to drop 240,000 tons of bombs on Cambodia. During March 1973 alone, the American air force dropped from 120,000 to 150,000 tons of bombs on Cambodian territory, which is the equivalent of seven atomic bombs of a power equal to that which was dropped on Hiroshima. This violence which the Government of the United States has unleashed on Cambodia brought about the profound indignation of peoples throughout the world, including the American people, whose youth and elected members of Congress imposed an official halt to the aerial bombings upon their own Government on 15 August last. However, this intervention, whose extent and intensity have reached unimaginable proportions, was approved and encouraged by those whose representatives today claim to have the right to sit in the United Nations in the name of Cambodia.

162. We all remember the famous judgement of King Solomon when he ordered his headsman to decide between the two complainants who each claimed to be the mother of the same child, by cutting the child into two halves. Of course, the reaction of the real mother was immediately evident and the wise King no longer had any difficulty in making a decision. The problem before us today must be tackled with utmost seriousness. It is a matter which has cost far too many human lives, mostly those of civilians and in particular innocent children, women and old people, and whose wake of tears, blood and tragedy continues to grow. That is why we were shocked at the way in which this debate proceeded. We were also shocked when we heard from this

rostrum speakers dealing with this question in a tone of levity, suggesting that this was merely a quarrel between republicans and royalists.

163. Moreover, Article 2, paragraph 7, of our Charter was referred to many times. One of the speakers, it is true, even went so far as to extend the analysis of the question to considering that *apartheid*, this crime against humanity, was the domestic affair of the Government of South Africa. He would probably tell us also that Nazism was similarly the domestic affair of Hitler's Germany. I should very much like to know what the members of the Israeli delegation would think of this analysis.

164. We were told that the proposals we have put forward regarding Cambodia were without precedent. I do not understand—or, rather, I understand all too well—that some speakers should have forgotten that the case that the Assembly has studied on several occasions relating to the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations was virtually identical to the one we are now considering. Yet, it so happens that the majority of the speakers who tell us that this is a problem without precedent have for more than 25 years argued that the Government of the People's Republic of China with its seat in Peking did not represent the 750 million Chinese and that that population was represented by what was left of the army of Chiang Kai-shek in refuge in Formosa.

165. It is true that some of these arguments were intended only to serve as the framework for putting the policy of non-alignment to the test. I must recall that at the beginning of the session we heard the American Secretary of State refer to the aligned non-aligned also, but he was most careful not to use words as outrageous as those we have heard here hurled at more than 70 heads of State and Government of States Members of our Organization.

166. In fact, we know full well that the bombings in Cambodia have officially ceased since 15 August; but rumours that have circulated lately raise certain doubts whether in this matter Cambodia has really reached the end of its troubles. Our Organization would be shouldering a very heavy responsibility if, due to its failure to intervene immediately, the turn of events in that region were to lead to as lethal a situation as that which prevailed in the first seven months of this year.

167. We know that at present certain Powers tend to consider that the role of the United Nations should be reduced to a strict minimum and that the solution of important problems touching on world peace and security should be solved among the great Powers, as if it were their private business. In the course of the twenty-fifth anniversary session of our Organization, in 1970, the President of the United States of America clearly told us⁵ that his country had already chosen a partner with which it would solve all our problems and that we had no need to concern ourselves over our security or to worry about the solution of major problems besetting the international community. That trend, which is already causing anxiety to more than one Member of our Organization, now shows prospects of a

future fraught with difficulties for the very survival of our Organization. While we do not have the atomic bomb, let history note this fact: the real atom bomb is the hundreds of millions of human beings who represent the third world, who want their voices heard, who want to be trained and who want to create an international community based on true co-operation, on co-operation among the people concerned. That is not my phrase; that was the last sentence spoken by President Boumediene, the head of State of Algeria, when summing up the conclusions of the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, held in Algiers last September.

168. Today, we who represent here the great majority of those hundreds of millions of human beings of the third world want our voices to be heard, want our views taken into account—particularly on this Cambodian question, which is no longer a matter affecting simply one country or a martyred people, but a matter that touches all men of good will, who believe that relations within this international community must always rest on humanism based on peace, dignity, justice and freedom for men and women of all countries. The Cambodian tragedy must be stopped. As far as our Assembly is concerned, it must promptly adopt those measures that fall within the framework of its mandate. That is why my delegation, on behalf of the 33 sponsors of the draft resolution on Cambodia, firmly opposes adjournment of a matter that we should regret not having dealt with in even earlier years.

169. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The procedural situation, as I understand it, is the following: a point of order was submitted pursuant to the terms of rule 73, which provides that:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure.”

In conformity with the rules of procedure, the President agreed to the application of rule 76 to this issue, whereby two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion. Therefore, without precluding the possibility of entertaining any other suggestion which may arise, I now call upon the representative of Yugoslavia.

170. Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia): This Assembly, by adopting by 69 votes to 24 the request for the inclusion of this item in its agenda, had taken a considered position to debate and decide the issues before us. The General Assembly does not include an item or decide to consider a matter merely in order to postpone it, *sine die* or to the next session, or to shirk it at the very moment when, in an orderly and agreed manner, it comes up for consideration. We all know to what use this device of adjournment—or, more properly described, of strangling an item from the active agenda and eliminating it from the consideration of the General Assembly—has usually been put in the past: it was a device to prevent a much-needed decision on restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. That device was “successful” for some time, at great cost to the whole international community, but in the end the Assembly revolted successfully against it.

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1882nd meeting, paras. 50-61.

171. After hearing the debate so far on this issue, item 106, I can only say that a decision not to vote on the draft resolution of the 33 sponsors and not to decide the issue would really be to prevent us from voting on the draft resolution before us, despite its having been submitted in an orderly and prescribed way.

172. Draft resolution A/L.714 has precedence and has to be voted upon. That draft resolution is a document which is the property of this twenty-eighth session; therefore, not to vote on it now would really mean killing it. It must have its fair chance to be voted upon, adopted, or whatever, now, during this session of the General Assembly.

173. My delegation supports the proposal made here by the delegation of Senegal that, in accordance with rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, a two-thirds majority would be required to decide on what was moved previously for the adjournment, if it comes to pass. That rule says:

“When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decides. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be immediately put to the vote.”

And this Assembly has decided to consider item 106, which is now before us. What the sponsors of the draft have done by submitting it is to give an opportunity to everyone to record their position on an important matter. Why should we be afraid of the vote? Why force a spurious adjournment of a decision when the General Assembly had already decided to take it up?

174. It has become fashionable of late to call every vote a supposed confrontation. Now, suddenly, it is consensus or nothing. But this surely cannot be the valid way to conduct business in this international Organization. Since when have all the voting, all the taking of positions, all the expressions of one's preferences and one's clear support for something been in vain? The list of speakers is not, by any means, exhausted. Shall we deprive all the speakers who, on behalf of their Governments and their countries, wish to express their views on the weighty matter before us on this rostrum of their right to do so? That seems to be the intent of this sneak move.

175. For all these reasons, we would appeal to the General Assembly to reject, if it comes to a vote, the proposal for adjournment, for a postponement, which is in reality a proposal for eliminating the item and the draft resolution of the 33 sponsors. Let us have a full debate and then vote on the draft in the orderly and logical manner in which consideration of the item was proceeding before the recent sneak move. Let artificial obstacles to the vote on draft resolution A/L.714 be removed. Whatever is decided, and whatever the vote on this matter, my delegation proposes and requires that all votes should be taken by roll call.

176. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to sum up the procedural position as I see it.

177. I have already explained that the delegation of Liberia made a proposal pursuant to the terms of rules 76 and 79, which I have read out. According to that decision, I have called on two speakers in favour of and two against that motion. The speakers have made their statements.

178. Those who have spoken against the motion submitted by the delegation of Liberia have invoked rule 83. It has been read out, but I shall read it again:

“When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decides...”

179. The expression “proposal” used in rule 83 is also mentioned in rule 80, according to which “proposals and amendments shall normally be submitted...”. Proposals, according to the terms of rule 80, and repeated in rule 83, are proposals in the form of draft resolutions to which amendments can be presented. What has been included in the agenda is an item, according to section II of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. There is no proposal. Therefore, thus far no decision on a proposal has been taken. This is my interpretation of the word “proposal”. However, I do not want this interpretation of mine to be considered a ruling, but I wish to say that, from my point of view, the provisions of rule 83 would not apply, since it is not a question of a proposal having been adopted or rejected, but rather of an item that has been included and regarding which a motion for adjournment has been made.

180. If anyone disagrees with this point of view, I would then put this point alone to the vote, namely whether or not the decision falls within the provisions requiring a two-thirds majority, in which case rule 87 would have to be applied.

181. Since no one wishes to make any comments, the Assembly will vote on the motion submitted by the representative of Liberia. As stated earlier, a roll-call vote will be taken.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway⁶, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana.

Against: Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Soma-

⁶ The delegation of Norway subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

lia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, German Democratic Republic.

Abstaining: Iceland, India, Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Argentina, Australia, Burma, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, France.

The motion was adopted by 53 votes to 50, with 21 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.