



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 26: World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 27: Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 30: General and complete disarmament: (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency; (c) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 5 Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 31: Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee	1
Agenda item 32: Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; (b) Report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 33: Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 25: Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (<i>concluded</i>)	6
Agenda item 23: Admission of new Members to the United Nations	17

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 26

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8902)

AGENDA ITEM 27

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8903)

AGENDA ITEM 30

General and complete disarmament:
(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
(b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
(c) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 5

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8904)

AGENDA ITEM 31

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8905)

AGENDA ITEM 32

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests:
(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
(b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8906)

AGENDA ITEM 33

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8907)

1. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on the six agenda items connected with disarmament, which I shall now enumerate:

(a) Agenda item 26 on the world disarmament conference. This item was included by the Secretary-General in

the provisional agenda of the twenty-seventh session on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI).

(b) Agenda item 27, relating to the implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. This item was included in the provisional agenda of the current session on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2664 (XXV) and on the basis of the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 1937th meeting, held on 24 September 1971.

(c) Agenda item 30, relating to general and complete disarmament. This item was included in the provisional agenda of the current session on the basis of Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI).

(d) Agenda item 31 on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. This item was included by the Secretary-General in the provisional agenda of the current session on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2827 (XXVI).

(e) Agenda item 32, concerning the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. This item was included in the provisional agenda of the current session on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2828 (XXVI).

(f) Agenda item 33, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). This item was included by the Secretary-General in the provisional agenda of the current session on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI). The General Assembly, at its 2037th plenary meeting, held on 23 September 1972, on the recommendation of the General Committee, decided to include all these items in the agenda and to allocate them to the First Committee for consideration and report thereon.

2. The First Committee, at its 1860th meeting, decided to have a combined general debate on the items relating to disarmament allocated to it. It also decided that any delegation would be free, if it so wished, to make more than one statement in the general debate and that, on the conclusion of that debate, the Committee would consider separately the draft proposals or resolutions under each item. The relevant reports for the six items which I have mentioned are contained in documents A/8902, A/8903, A/8904, A/8905, A/8906 and A/8907, respectively.

3. In connexion with those items the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it adopt the nine draft resolutions, which appear in the documents to which I have already referred. These draft resolutions are the result of lengthy and intensive debates in the First Committee on the main aspects of the vital question of disarmament, in which the very important positions taken by almost all delegations in the First Committee were stated.

4. It is no easy task to sum up reports on six subjects of such importance in a single presentation. I have, however, endeavoured to do so to the best of my ability and, on behalf of the First Committee, I am happy to present the

draft resolutions for consideration by the General Assembly.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall first consider the report of the First Committee on item 26 of the agenda [A/8902]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution appears in document A/8913. I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee for adoption in paragraph 10 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 2930 (XXVII)).¹

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Paragraph 3 of the resolution just adopted provides for the establishment of a Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference consisting of 35 Member States, to be appointed by the President of the General Assembly after consultation with all the regional groups. I shall enter into such consultations and appoint the States concerned at a later date.

7. The General Assembly will now take up the report of the First Committee on item 27 [A/8903]. We shall proceed to the vote on the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

¹ The delegations of Congo, Pakistan, and Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 2931 (XXVII)).²

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 30 [A/8904]. The General Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the First Committee in paragraph 15 of its report. I shall put to the vote first draft resolution A. The report of the Fifth Committee on the financial and administrative implications of draft resolution A is in document A/8912. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 2932 A (XXVII)).³

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 27 abstentions (resolution 2932 B (XXVII)).⁴

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 31 [A/8905]. The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

³The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

⁴The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

²The delegations of Congo and Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour and wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: China, France.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 2933 (XXVII)).*⁵

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 32 [A/8906]. We shall now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the First Committee in paragraph 14 of its report, I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Albania, China, France, Portugal.

Abstaining: Algeria, Congo, Cuba, India,⁶ Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Romania, Zaire.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 105 votes to 4, with 9 abstentions (resolution 2934 A (XXVII)).

12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Albania, China, France, Portugal.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Greece, Hungary, India, Mauritania, Mongolia, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 89 votes to 4, with 23 abstentions (resolution 2934 B (XXVII)).

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution C. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland,

⁵ The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished its vote to be recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

⁶ The delegation of India subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Albania, China, France, Portugal.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 80 votes to 4, with 29 abstentions (resolution 2934 C (XXVII)).⁷

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

15. Mr. DE SOTO (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolutions B and C, which have just been adopted.

16. My delegation abstained on draft resolution B because paragraph 3 thereof reads as follows:

“Calls upon all Governments conducting underground nuclear weapon tests, particularly those parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, immediately to undertake unilateral or negotiated measures that would suspend or reduce such testing, pending the early entry into force of a ban on all nuclear weapon tests in all environments”.

The option that is offered to these States to reduce tests would be unacceptable to my country, because it admits of the possibility of continued testing.

17. As for draft resolution C, I should like to indicate that my delegation was a sponsor of that draft resolution in the First Committee, because it clearly condemns nuclear tests, a condemnation with which my country agrees. Nevertheless, I should like to make the following reservation. My delegation does not subscribe to the time-limit established in paragraph 3, because we believe that only the immediate cessation of all nuclear tests is justified.

18. Mr. MOLINA (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution B because of the contents of paragraph 3, which

was just read out by the representative of Peru. We consider that this paragraph represents a tacit authorization to continue nuclear weapon tests, and my country and my delegation are in favour of the absolute cessation of all such tests. Also we find a contradiction between the contents of paragraph 3 and the contents of paragraph 7.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The last report of the First Committee for consideration this afternoon relates to agenda item 33 and is contained in document A/8907.

20. The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the First Committee in paragraph 10 of this report.

21. A separate vote on operative paragraph 4 has been requested by the Syrian Arab Republic. As there is no objection I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, France, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 57 votes to 1, with 59 abstentions.

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark,

⁷ The delegation of India subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None,

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Guyana, Hungary, India, Mongolia, Nepal, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 17 abstentions (resolution 2935 (XXVII)).

23. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I wish to thank the members of the First Committee and to congratulate them upon the constructive results they have achieved.

AGENDA ITEM 25

Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (*concluded*)*

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now resume its consideration of agenda item 25.

25. A revised text of the draft resolution has been submitted in document A/L.676/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2.

26. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union to introduce the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors.

27. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The General Assembly is approaching the concluding stage of its consideration of the item entitled "Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". It now has to adopt a resolution on this item. For the first time in the existence of the United Nations, the General Assembly has considered in detail the matter of reaffirming, with a view to implementing, a fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter, namely that of the non-use of force, together and in close interrelationship with the question of the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, in other words, taking into account the objective realities of the present-day world. These realities are such that, on the one hand, in violation of the United Nations

Charter, force continues to be used in a number of regions of the world where the use of so-called "traditional" or "conventional" weapons is causing enormous casualties and colossal material destruction, and, on the other hand, the threat of nuclear war still looms over all mankind.

28. The position of the Soviet Union on the subject under consideration has already been stated in detail earlier, in the course of the general debate in the Assembly [2040th meeting] and during the discussion of this question at its plenary meetings [2078th and 2085th meetings].

29. Today, the Soviet delegation wishes to give a brief explanation of the revised draft resolution on this subject [A/L.676/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2] which was introduced on 27 November. The sponsors of that draft are the following 23 States: Afghanistan, Barbados, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Liberia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nigeria, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yemen.

30. This draft is the result of extensive consultations among delegations of States Members of the United Nations. In the course of those consultations, account was taken of the views and proposals that had been put forward by the contact group of the non-aligned States which participated actively in the preparation of the draft resolution. Account was also taken of the views put forward by numerous delegations in the course of the discussion of the item on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The revised draft resolution reflects numerous important decisions of the United Nations which also touched on the question of the non-use of force and prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons: the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)], the Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermo-nuclear Weapons [resolution 1653 (XVI)], and General Assembly resolution 2160 (XXI) on the strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, and of the right of peoples to self-determination.

31. The draft also duly explains and formulates clearly the provision of the Charter which reaffirms the right of States to self-defence against armed attack. It also emphasizes the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and the inherent right of States to recover such territories by all the means at their disposal. Recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples for their freedom and national independence, which has been established in numerous United Nations decisions, is also clearly reaffirmed.

32. In operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, in the light of the wishes of a number of States, the proposition is developed that renunciation of the threat or use of force must extend to, and include, all its forms and manifestations.

* Resumed from the 2085th meeting.

33. Taking into account the views of the delegations of the various groups of States, changes have also been made in the formulation of paragraph 2, which contains a recommendation that the Security Council, within its sphere of competence and at its discretion, should take appropriate measures for the full implementation of the declaration to be adopted by the General Assembly.

34. Thus, it is the conviction of its sponsors and of those who have actively contributed to its elaboration, that the revised draft resolution has incorporated everything useful and constructive that came to light in the course of both the discussion of this important international question in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and the exchange of views and consultations among delegations of States Members of the United Nations. It reflects the wishes of the non-aligned countries. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation once again feels bound to express its gratitude to all those who made energetic efforts to produce positive results with regard to the question of the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

35. The solemn reaffirmation by States Members of the United Nations, at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, of the principle of the non-use of force inseparably linked with the problem of the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be a tremendous contribution by the United Nations to the cause of strengthening peace and international security, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated.

36. Such a decision by the Assembly would be an expression of the firm resolve of States Members of the United Nations to exclude war from the life of human society and, in pursuance of the principal aim of the United Nations, to protect the present and succeeding generations from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and mass destruction. Such an action on the part of the United Nations would be in the interests of all States and all peoples; it would contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security and ensure that the renunciation of the use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons were fully observed, everywhere and by all people, as a law of international life and a firm, legal standard of international relations. Such a decision would also contribute to the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament which is to be considered at the World Disarmament Conference, the convening of which has just been decided upon at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

37. The significance of this for mankind as a whole and for all countries of the world, both developed and developing, is obvious. The sums expended on the arms race, which according to the most recent data amount to \$216,000 million per year, are diverting huge material and intellectual resources, and not only in the developed countries. Suffice it to say that during the past decade military expenditure in the developing countries has risen by more than 100 per cent.

38. The adoption by the General Assembly and, subsequently, by the Security Council, of a decision concerning the strict observance of the principle of renunciation of the

use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, would create favourable conditions for putting an end to the arms race, which has acquired monstrous proportions and has an extremely harmful effect on the well-being of the peoples of the world.

39. The Soviet Union was guided by all these considerations in introducing the item on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons for consideration at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

40. The voting that is about to take place will show both the United Nations and the whole of world public opinion who is in favour of the non-use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and who continues to oppose it.

41. In conclusion, may I, on behalf of the sponsors, express the hope that the revised draft resolution, which has been elaborated to take into account the views of numerous delegations, will receive the widest support of States Members of the United Nations. By adopting this draft resolution, the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session, will go down in the history of the United Nations as the Assembly of peace that saved mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

42. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan): The delegation of Afghanistan did not participate in the general debate on the item now before us. We would, however, wish to state briefly our views on the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union a moment ago on behalf of all the sponsors, including the delegation of Afghanistan.

43. The framers of the Charter of the United Nations have outlawed the use or threat of force in international relations against the territorial integrity or political independence of a State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. If force or the threat of force is still being exercised in international relations, it cannot be considered to be due to any omission on the part of the framers of the Charter.

44. We are aware, through the experience of the League of Nations, that the success of an international organization such as the United Nations depends on the degree of respect accorded to it by Member States, and in particular by the big Powers, which have the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security through compliance with the principle of the non-use of force.

45. While Members of this Organization have always been legally bound to this principle by the Charter, we have none the less witnessed the use and exercise of force in international relations during the past 27 years. Force has been used in order to perpetuate the subjugation and domination of peoples and to deny them their inalienable rights to self-determination and to freedom from colonial and alien domination.

46. In the Middle East, Israel, which owes its creation and existence to the United Nations, has by the use of force continually ignored the basic principles of the Charter and

the decisions taken by the United Nations. It has by the use of force expelled the people of Palestine from their indigenous and ancestral homes and has forced them to live as refugees for 25 years. As a result of the aggression committed by it in 1967, Israel continues to occupy parts of the territories of three sovereign States Members of this Organization.

47. A senseless war is still going on in Indo-China. During the past year we have observed the ever-growing manifestations of the present détente in many parts of the world, proving that there is a process of negotiation, understanding and realization that differences can be settled not by the use of force, but rather on the basis of negotiations and by peaceful means, particularly at the present time when the devastating weapons of mass destruction, both nuclear and non-nuclear, are at the disposal of mankind.

48. The Afghan delegation is of the view that not only is the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons of vital importance, but that the destruction of stockpiles and the imposition of a ban on the production of such weapons would also serve the ultimate interests of all peoples of the world.

49. While the delegation of Afghanistan accepts the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, there are certain situations which should be excluded from this proposition. Peoples under colonial and alien domination which are struggling for their liberation and self-determination cannot be denied the right to use all the means at their disposal, including force, in order to achieve their lofty aims and objectives. The same exception applies with respect to the right of self-defence, which has been laid down in Article 51 of the Charter.

50. In general, however, my delegation fully supports this cardinal principle of the Charter. We should like to take this opportunity to welcome the initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in presenting this item for consideration at the current session of the General Assembly.

51. As we are all aware, the principle of the non-use of force has been studied and considered on many other occasions in the United Nations. This principle has been discussed and elaborated by the General Assembly in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and also in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. However, this is the first proposal before the General Assembly which prohibits the use of force, including the use of nuclear weapons.

52. We are confident that such an integrated approach will remove some of the difficulties that the international community is being faced with in the field of general, complete and universal disarmament, and that it will undoubtedly serve the cause of peace and justice in a community of sovereign States.

53. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My delegation did not take part in the debate on agenda item 25. We therefore wish to explain at this juncture our position on and vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1.

54. The question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is of fundamental importance in present-day international relations, and consequently there is no need to stress its urgency. For this reason my delegation welcomes and supports the initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to include such an item in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The complete renunciation of the threat or use of force in all its forms and manifestations in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations is a basic prerequisite for the achievement of peaceful co-existence among all States. At the same time, the prohibition of nuclear weapons is an essential condition for the maintenance of international peace and security.

55. We are all aware that the Charter embodies the obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. This principle was reaffirmed in resolution 2160 (XXI) and the States were called upon to respect this principle fully in their mutual relations and to renounce and refrain from any action contrary to this.

56. The Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermo-nuclear Weapons contained in General Assembly resolution 1653 (XVI), which was adopted on the initiative of the group of non-aligned countries, stipulates that the use of these weapons is contrary to the spirit, letter and aims of the Charter and constitutes a direct violation of the Charter; it also states that any State having recourse to the use of these weapons commits a crime against mankind and civilization.

57. In spite of these clear decisions of our Organization and the obligations laid down by the Charter, it is a fact that we are still faced with numerous instances of threats and the use of force, such as aggressive wars, the occupation of foreign territories and constant attempts to undermine the independence and free development of many countries, particularly small and developing countries. The examples of Indo-China, the Middle East and the situation in Africa speak for themselves and show that we are still far from a state of security and coexistence among all States regardless of their size and power. Many peoples are still being held in colonial subjugation. The establishment of a certain equilibrium among nuclear Powers provides only a relative guarantee that nuclear weapons may not be used. The demand for the permanent prohibition of these weapons expresses the interest of all peoples that such a danger should be reduced and completely eliminated. In this context, I wish to emphasize that the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held in Georgetown in August 1972 has again underscored the imperative need to bring about general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament under effective international control. The non-aligned countries are convinced that the ever-spiralling arms race is inimical to world peace and security.

58. The draft resolution before us, of which my delegation has become a sponsor after careful consideration, represents a continuation of the efforts exerted by peace-loving countries in the United Nations with a view to eliminating force and nuclear weapons from international relations. At the same time, it reaffirms unequivocally, in accordance

with Article 51 of the Charter, the inalienable right of States to self-defence against armed attack. We are also mindful of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the inherent right of States to recover such territories by all the means at their disposal. The draft resolution clearly confirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the colonial peoples for their freedom by all appropriate means at their disposal. We firmly believe that the non-use of force or of the threat of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons should be fully observed as a law of international life. It is in this spirit that my delegation recommends the adoption of this draft resolution, considering it as a new step forward by the United Nations in the direction of strengthening peace and security for all countries. Only through common efforts and the political will of all countries can we create international conditions under which the use of any kind of violence and the subjugation of other peoples shall be excluded.

59. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now give the floor to representatives wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

60. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will be bound to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2. We regret to have to do so even though Mexico unreservedly supports the prohibition of the recourse to the use or threat of force in international relations as well as the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, both of which my country has demonstrated on repeated occasions by actual deeds. I repeat, we regret to have to do so for the reasons that were explained in the statement by the head of my delegation on 14 November, which is reproduced in the records of the 2084th meeting and whose main passages can be summed up as follows.

61. After waiting in vain for almost six years for certain nuclear Powers to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America,⁸ a protocol whose main obligation for States parties thereto is precisely, "not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the contracting parties of the Treaty . . .", who have undertaken to live under a régime where there would be a total absence of nuclear weapons, Mexico has arrived at the following conclusion that will serve as a guideline for my country whenever a vote is taken and whenever an initiative by the nuclear Powers is submitted to the General Assembly for adoption, such as the one now before us: first, we shall consider that general statements designed to obtain the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons can only offer prospects of effectiveness when the theoretical pronouncements contained therein are supported by acts; secondly, for our delegation, the act that we can most believe in is when the Power in question has already assumed or is ready to assume, in regard to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the obligations set out in Additional Protocol II.

62. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): The Swedish delegation will not be able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1 but will have to abstain and wishes to explain why.

63. The Swedish Government is keenly interested in both the matters dealt with in the proposal contained in the draft resolution. The first is the prohibition of the use or threat of force, as laid down in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter and reaffirmed in several General Assembly resolutions, and the Swedish Government has on many occasions affirmed its support for this principle. The Swedish Government has likewise had many occasions to support the idea of the elimination of nuclear weapons as a goal in the context of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

64. Nevertheless the Swedish delegation has doubts on the way in which those two matters are expounded in the draft proposal before us. I shall describe some of these doubts.

65. We certainly do not disagree with the judgement in the third preambular paragraph that the existence of nuclear weapons constitutes a threat—indeed, a threat to mankind—but in the context in which this paragraph is inserted the impression may incorrectly be created that the very existence of these terrible weapons constitutes a threat that is prohibited under Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter.

66. The implications of the sixth preambular paragraph about the inherent right of States to recover by all means at their disposal territories acquired by force are far from clear. If the formulation were to be interpreted broadly, it could completely undermine the very principle of non-use of force, for indeed there are a good many territories in the world which have been acquired by force at one time or another.

67. As to the proposed "prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons" in the tenth preambular paragraph and the "permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons" in operative paragraph 1, we should like to say that the question of the prohibition of the use or first use of these weapons is a very complex one which cannot be solved meaningfully in the simple way here contemplated, namely, by a fiat of the General Assembly—a fiat that would be very far from unanimously supported. We believe that this matter should continue to be handled within the framework of the negotiations on disarmament.

68. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): Having come to this rostrum in order to explain the vote to be cast by the Netherlands delegation on draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1 before the General Assembly, let me state at the outset that the Netherlands is second to none in deploring the use of force wherever it may occur in the world.

69. When they put their signatures to the Charter in San Francisco 27 years ago, the 51 original Members of the United Nations, including my country, formally renounced the use of force save in the common interest or in self-defence. We in the Netherlands know that in international relations, except in the two cases mentioned, the use of force is evil and can only lead to evil results such as destruction, loss of life, human suffering and misery. We feel that our solemn renunciation should not be placed in jeopardy by periodic resolutions of United Nations organs which might give rise to the suspicion that perhaps Charter obligations are not quite as binding as they ought to be. In the view of the Netherlands, these obligations are irrevoca-

⁸ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, p. 364.

ble and it would be appropriate, we feel, to rule out any appearance or possible interpretation to the contrary.

70. The revised draft resolution now before us is a slight improvement on the original text. We had grave political and constitutional objections to the first draft resolution. Although we still cannot go along with the present preambular text in its entirety, we note that the sponsors have accepted at least some alterations to make it more palatable. Apart from a new preambular paragraph, which we view with grave doubt, it is particularly operative paragraph 1 which remains unacceptable in its present form.

71. That paragraph gets various elements mixed up. Its first part reaffirms a Charter provision, and I have already explained why we doubt the usefulness of repetitive reaffirmations of Charter obligations. Why are they necessary? Are some obligations more binding than others? We have heard nothing to convince us that this repetition is useful, but we would not of course object to it if it were desired for itself. The second part of operative paragraph 1, however, is a different matter. It refers to a permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear arms. Such a prohibition is of course not a law of international life and no recommendation of the General Assembly is likely to make it so in the present political and military circumstances. It has been tried a number of times and it has always proved a non-starter. If pressed, it would remain a dead letter today, and the prestige of the General Assembly, in our view, should be spared dead letters.

72. The fact of the matter is that under present military conditions a prohibition of nuclear weapons would represent an unbalanced measure of arms control. In different parts of the world, specifically in Europe, such a prohibition would heavily favour one side over the other. Moreover, nuclear armaments have become a determining factor in maintaining a reasonably stable relationship between the two biggest Powers. One may deplore this for several reasons, but it is a reality that cannot be denied and it has to be recognized as a real, albeit uncomfortable, contribution to world security. In our view the prohibition of nuclear weapons does not take into account the whole framework of existing power relationships, and therefore is dangerous and undesirable. Balanced disarmament should be our goal, not measures which would upset the existing balance of forces.

73. In view of those remarks, the General Assembly will not be surprised to hear that the Netherlands delegation will not vote for the text of draft resolution A/I 576/Rev.1 as it stands. We consider this draft resolution untimely and unbalanced, and we shall abstain on it.

74. In conclusion I should like to add this. Last week multilateral preparatory talks opened in Helsinki on the prospects for a conference on European security and co-operation. In January a parallel set of similar talks will open on mutual and balanced force reductions. My Government is looking forward to a serious and businesslike exchange of views with the Soviet Government on both occasions. My Government knows that essentially the Soviet Government shares its opinion that in the field of peace and security progress can be made only on the basis

of meticulously prepared, carefully considered and responsibly presented views and proposals. My delegation wishes to assure our Soviet colleagues in this hall that no effort will be spared on our part to contribute towards the successful outcome of those talks.

75. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The proposal on the so-called "non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons" put forward by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko at the United Nations General Assembly is a downright fraud. The Chinese delegation has already made statements on two occasions [*2051st and 2083rd meetings*] to expose and refute it. Now, before the Assembly votes on the draft resolution in question, the Chinese delegation would like to add a few remarks.

76. We have pointed out that Gromyko's proposal is a downright fraud because the Soviet social-imperialists, with honey on their lips and daggers in their hands, have always been saying something while doing something else, harbouring murderous intentions behind their smiles. It is not difficult to see through their reactionary features if only one is good at judging them by their deeds after hearing their words. Flaunting the signboard of "curbing the arms race" and "strengthening international security", they are stepping up arms expansion and war preparations frenziedly; behind the smoke-screen of "anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism", they take the sovereignty and interests of other countries as their target for expansion and as stakes for political deals in their contention for world hegemony with another super-Power; behind the signboard of "socialist community", they subject their allies to aggression, interference, subversion and control; behind the signboard of "supporting self-determination", they openly incited and supported an aggressive war to dismember a sovereign State; in the guise of "international aid" they infringe the sovereignty of other countries, interfere in their internal affairs or even incite coups d'état to subvert them; and so on and so forth.

77. Take for instance the relations between China and the Soviet Union. The Soviet representative, Mr. Malik, had the cheek to talk glibly at this rostrum about Soviet readiness to restore good-neighbourly relations with China without the use or threat of force in its relations with China. Is that true? If what Mr. Malik has said really represents Soviet policy and not propaganda, then why should the Soviet Union station a million troops on the Sino-Soviet border? Why should it send Soviet troops to the Mongolian People's Republic?

78. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko's proposal on the so-called non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons obliterates the demarcation line between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. This is in effect tantamount to asking the people of various countries to give up their armed struggle against aggression and at the same time this is aimed at maintaining the super-Power nuclear monopoly and nuclear superiority for the purpose of carrying out nuclear blackmail and threats against the people of the world. People can see at one glance what this proposal is directed against. The Soviet Union, which has all along paraded itself as being "anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist"

and styled itself the "friend" of the third world, has brazenly put forward such a proposal. This is sufficient to show to what depth it has sunk. It is only natural that this proposal has been exposed and refuted by many delegations at the General Assembly, as it well deserves.

79. In these circumstances, the Soviet delegation was compelled to do some patchwork on its own draft resolution. Nevertheless, the present draft is still full of loop-holes and shows hardly any change from the reactionary content of the original Soviet draft.

80. In our view, if one is to talk about the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, one must not deviate from the present political reality but must face up to the essence of the question without evading the fundamental question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. As is well known, imperialism is the source of war in the present era; the power politics and hegemony practised by the nuclear super-Powers constitute the principal threat to international security. Although the patched-up draft contains in its preamble some casual mention of recognizing the right to "self-defence" and the "legitimacy" of the struggle of colonial peoples, yet the operative part still contains no clear distinction between aggression and self-defence and fails to express clearly support for just wars and opposition to unjust wars, but demands indiscriminately and without regard to conditions the "renunciation of the use or threat of force in all its forms and manifestations". All this is exactly the same as the original Soviet draft. The United Nations Charter provides 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". The failure to mention even this point in the operative part of the new draft is definitely not an inadvertent omission but a smoke-screen deliberately spread with ulterior motives.

81. The new draft does not contain any demand that imperialism and the nuclear super-Powers dismantle their military bases on foreign soil and withdraw their troops stationed abroad back to their own countries, nor does it contain any demand that the aggressors withdraw from the foreign territories they have occupied by armed force. In these circumstances, is not the demand for a general renunciation of the use of force by all countries tantamount to asking them all to recognize the imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist aggression and military occupation as permanently legal?

82. The new draft makes no mention at all of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, nor does it ask the nuclear countries to undertake the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances, particularly the obligation not to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear countries and nuclear-weapon-free zones. This shows that in asking the General Assembly to adopt a draft resolution declaring the "permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons" which has no binding force at all, the Soviet representative is merely engaged in deceptive, empty talk, because this will not in the least prevent the super-Powers from maintaining their nuclear monopoly and perpetuating their nuclear threat.

83. Certainly, we do not doubt the good intentions of some of the sponsors. This makes it all the more impermissible for the Soviet delegation to pass off fish eyes as pearls and to substitute the sham for the genuine. In our opinion, such a draft resolution, if adopted, would only benefit imperialism and the super-Powers in their aggression and expansion; it would be detrimental to the peoples' cause of safeguarding and winning national independence and would be detrimental to international security and world peace; it would not be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Therefore, the Chinese delegation will have to vote against the present draft resolution.

84. Mr. PATRICIO (Portugal): The Portuguese delegation wishes to formulate a few observations on the draft resolution entitled "Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons", which is now under consideration by the General Assembly.

85. As is evident from the wording of operative paragraph 1, the objective of this draft resolution appears to be to declare solemnly that States' Members of the United Nations should renounce the use or threat of force in international relations and accept a permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. But the United Nations Charter expressly prohibits Member nations from resorting to the use of force as a means of resolving international disputes, except in cases of legitimate self-defence, exercised either individually or collectively. Consequently, and by implication, the Charter prohibits the use of nuclear weapons in order to achieve political objectives.

86. We are thus, apparently, left with these two conclusions: either the present draft resolution seeks to reaffirm what is expressly laid down in the Charter—and as such is redundant and becomes an entirely useless gesture—or its objective is to try to bypass the Charter as the sole basic instrument governing the actions of the Member nations, in which case the draft resolution is unacceptable.

87. On the other hand, the language used does not seem to us to be the best possible, for operative paragraph 2 indicates that it is a "declaration" of the General Assembly; whereas under the terms of the Charter the General Assembly expresses its views in the form of resolutions, not of declarations. All this is certain to give rise to ambiguity in interpreting the draft resolution and the extent of its application.

88. I am sure that this Assembly has noted the flagrant contradiction that exists between the title of this draft resolution, which speaks of "non-use of force", and the terms used in its preambular paragraphs, which admit the use of violent means for the prosecution of certain aims. Thus it seems to us that the intentions of the authors of the draft resolution were prejudiced by a text which is not only diversionary but also difficult of interpretation in the light of every canon of international law.

89. We may be pardoned for noting in passing that we have been witnessing a strange phenomenon in the conduct of international relations over the last decade or so. One notes that resolutions, such as the present draft, are

frequently introduced and adopted by a majority even though they are by their nature redundant and mischievous; and some of those who are the most enthusiastic about their content become directly or indirectly involved in policies directed against neighbouring sovereign States, which cannot but be construed as flagrantly in contradiction with the letter of the Charter provisions. This is hardly flattering to the spirit of their intentions and we are left wondering at the purpose of this exercise.

90. It is in the light of these observations that my delegation's negative vote should be interpreted.

91. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): As the Ivory Coast delegation did not take part in the general debate on this agenda item, I would like to explain its position and the vote it is going to cast on draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1.

92. First of all, we should like to express our gratitude to the Soviet Union delegation for having taken the happy initiative of presenting for consideration by the General Assembly the important question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We should like to emphasize on this occasion the important contribution of that great Power and its allies to the work of the General Assembly in the elaboration of a genuine code of conduct in international relations.

93. It will be recalled indeed that it was as a result of the initiative of these States that the General Assembly, in the course of these last few years, adopted several solemn declarations of a universal character, in particular the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]; the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty [*resolution 2131 (XX)*]; resolution 2160 (XXI) concerning the strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, and of the right of peoples to self-determination; and lastly the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*].

94. Non-use of force remains one of the constant features of the national and international policy of the Ivory Coast. Accordingly, we subscribe with interest to the Soviet proposal to declare the renunciation by States of the use or threat of force in international relations. It is indeed far more beneficial for the international community to encourage the solution of disputes and conflicts by peaceful means rather than by recourse to the use or threat of force.

95. We cannot but regret in this connexion that the promoter of these debates has not hesitated, under the pretext of preserving the legitimate acquisitions of an ideological system against contamination from another system, to resort more than once to armed force in order to repress incipient signs of a desire for independence on the part of some of its allies and to constrain their peoples to a state of resignation when they aspired to more freedom and humaneness.

96. My delegation does not believe for a minute that the Soviet Union wished, by taking this initiative, to engage in

propaganda. On the contrary, we wish to believe that it was animated by sincere motives; that it is determined to renounce these methods, which are condemnable in all respects, and to set yet another example of moral probity through the effective implementation of the fundamental principle of non-use of force in its relations with States which do not belong to its sphere of influence, but also and above all in its relations with its allies. In that way, it will give full value to this initiative, which we whole-heartedly support.

97. Indeed, there has been much too much of a trend to give primacy to force in international relations, whereas international relations are based on legal principles which prohibit the use of force in any form, except in the very specific cases recognized by the Charter of the United Nations and in resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It is accordingly necessary to substitute for the language of force, the use of weapons of all types, and political, economic, military and other pressures, the language of reason and law through the use of negotiation, dialogue and the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter. The *détente* which exists at present in international relations as a result of the rapprochement between the great Powers, the initiatives taken in order to find peaceful and negotiated solutions to the serious conflicts of the moment, the efforts to normalize relations between the adversaries and enemies of yesterday and between the divided parts of a single nation, have been possible because men of good will have preferred to resort to dialogue rather than to force in order to settle their differences and to promote friendly relations between their peoples. Those results should inspire us to pursue our efforts to prohibit the use of force in international relations for any reason and in any form whatsoever.

98. Mankind aspires to peace and protection from destruction. The frenzied race in armaments of all kinds, and especially the accumulation of increasingly more devastating weapons by certain Powers, is against the aspirations to peace and our will to promote social progress throughout the world and establish better living conditions for all in greater freedom. The nuclear arms race, which causes the spectre of mass destruction to hover over the world, is the major and most serious threat to the survival of mankind. Even if we have just reasons to think that those who possess such weapons will not commit the folly of resorting to them, and that the balance of terror and fear remains our only chance, we cannot but deplore the lack of interest displayed by the great nuclear Powers when it comes to the anxiety of the world at large. The meagre progress made on the difficult road towards general and complete disarmament should not cause us to lessen our vigilance but should, on the contrary, encourage us to persevere in our efforts to convince those Powers of the need not only to prohibit the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons but also to halt their manufacture and stockpiling and to destroy them under international control. Such a view might appear Utopian, especially since none of those Powers intends to renounce its policy of power, or to be the first to do so. Accordingly we believe it to be in the interest of all mankind to encourage any initiative which might lead to the prohibition of the use of such weapons and of their testing, production and stockpiling as well as to their total destruction.

99. The proposal of the Soviet Union on the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons appears to us in this connexion to be as constructive as the proposal of the People's Republic of China on the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and the solemn undertaking by nuclear weapon States not to use such weapons in their relations with other States [2051st meeting, para. 168].

100. In fact, the problem of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is in the hands not of the non-nuclear-weapon States but rather of the nuclear Powers. It is those Powers which can undertake to renounce the use of such weapons. We, the smaller Powers, cannot but be gratified at such a commitment, which would be an important contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security. It is for them, therefore, to go beyond propaganda manoeuvres in order to establish conditions which promote advances in this field, advances which could only be to the benefit of mankind.

101. The non-recourse to the use or threat of use of force in international relations, as defined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, is rightly considered to be the most important principle which should govern relations between States. This principle has been proclaimed and reaffirmed on numerous occasions in solemn declarations unanimously adopted by the General Assembly. In addition to those referred to earlier, we might add the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [resolution 2627 (XXV)], both of which were adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970.

102. As for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, that principle was likewise affirmed in resolution 1653 (XVI) and reaffirmed later in other resolutions. All those principles remain valid for all States, regardless of their importance in terms of population, level of economic development or military power.

103. The problem today is not so much one of adopting a resolution or a new declaration enshrining that principle, as of giving it specific content, as well as all the other principles defined in the Charter and reaffirmed in those declarations. What is important is to make our conduct and our day-to-day acts accord with those principles, and to recommend in all circumstances recourse to negotiations and dialogue in order to resolve conflicts, whatever their seriousness or complexity, and to that end to encourage any initiative that might lead to the prohibition of the use of force. In that way we would be contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security and to promoting friendly relations between our States and our peoples. It would be pointless to reaffirm these principles if at the same time there was no political will to translate them into reality.

104. After these considerations, my delegation wishes to make some brief comments on the draft resolution presented by the Soviet Union.

105. First of all, the draft resolution appears to us to be limited to a single objective, namely, the prohibition of the

use of nuclear weapons, since the principle of the non-use of force has already been defined in the Charter. This principle must be conceived in its broadest sense and must prohibit the use of force in all its forms, whether by the use of conventional, nuclear, chemical or other types of weapons, as well as insidious subversion and pressures of all kinds that infringe on the political independence, territorial integrity and economic development of States, depriving certain peoples of their right to self-determination.

106. Moreover, the Soviet draft seems to proclaim a new principle, whereas in fact it is a reaffirmation of the principle of the non-use or threat of force as defined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. The draft might usefully have been supplemented by the proclamation of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is a corollary to the non-use of force in international relations. We consider these two principles to be closely interconnected and mutually complementary.

107. Lastly, we would recall that the General Assembly has adopted important declarations in which this fundamental principle of the Charter is reaffirmed. We do not understand very well why the Soviet Union has asked the Security Council to take a decision in order to give the proclamation of the Assembly the force of international law with binding effect under Article 25 of the Charter. Such a procedure appears to us to be unusual, the more so since one might reasonably doubt whether the five permanent members of the Security Council would agree among themselves on the formulation of such a decision. Furthermore, the statement of the representative of China fully justifies our apprehension in this regard.

108. We, for our part, consider that the General Assembly, which is made up of all Member States and in which the principle of the sovereign equality of States is most authentically expressed, is entirely competent under the relevant Articles of the Charter—in particular Articles 10, 11, 13 and 14—to elaborate such principles, observance of which would then be incumbent upon all. While being aware of the competence of the Security Council and the special responsibilities entrusted to its permanent members to serve peace and not only their own national interests—which do not always coincide with the interests of other Member States—we cannot but object to the tendency to doubt the competence of the General Assembly to elaborate universally acceptable principles.

109. The new text submitted to us in document A/L.676/Rev.1 does not appear to be acceptable, although it takes into account resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly on the question, because it is drafted in ambiguous terms and tends to introduce a certain confusion. Some of the paragraphs which have been added to the original text appear to us to be rather unfortunate and inappropriate, even if we agree with the spirit and the letter of those paragraphs. My delegation considers that we should encourage everything that can lead to peace and concord through negotiations, and not vindicate the use of force, at a time when we wish to proclaim our will to renounce the use or threat of force, in all its forms and manifestations, in our relations.

110. The delegation of the Ivory Coast, while reaffirming its complete adherence to the principle of the non-use of

force, will be unable to support the draft resolution, on which it has many reservations.

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, Albania, China.

Abstaining: Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France.

The draft resolution was adopted by 73 votes to 4, with 46 abstentions (resolution 2936 (XXVII)).⁹

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

113. Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan): I should like to make a brief explanation of our vote on the draft resolution. As a Member of the United Nations, Japan, like all the other Member States, firmly subscribes to the rights and obligations laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. Thus we are under an obligation to refrain in our international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. In our view, such an obligation under the Charter does not make any distinction between conventional weapons and nuclear weapons.

114. Having said this, my delegation cannot help entertaining some doubts as to the exact meaning of the wording found in some preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution. We have asked some of the sponsors for explanations on these points specifically. Unfortunately, however, their explanations have failed to dispel our doubts as to the possible implications that those wordings may have as regards the relevant rights and obligations which all of us assembled here have already assumed under the Charter.

115. For the reasons I have stated, my delegation has found itself unable to support the draft resolution and abstained in the vote on it.

116. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): While the non-use of force is a laudable objective, the United States believes that the Charter of the United Nations remains the basic guideline governing the conduct of nations, and we are sceptical about the utility of restating principles of the United Nations Charter through General Assembly resolutions because we feel that such resolutions tend to detract from the Charter itself. It is for these reasons that my delegation has just abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

117. We also believe that the distinction drawn in the Charter between the threat or the use of force in accordance with the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence—which is legitimate—and such non-legitimate uses as acts of aggression is the key principle governing the use of force in international relations. We regret that the draft resolution we have just voted on does not explicitly draw that distinction.

118. I wish also to point out that the United States and many other Members voted against General Assembly resolution 1653 (XVI), containing the Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Weapons. We continue to regard that resolution, which asserts that the use of nuclear weapons at any time and under any circumstances is, *ipso facto*, a violation of the Charter and a crime against humanity, as without any legal basis. The resolution we have just voted on refers to that earlier resolution and appears to assert that nuclear weapons have been prohibited.

119. However laudable the goals of this resolution, we are of course unable to support such a proposition, which so clearly flies in the face of reality and law.

120. Finally, I wish to make clear that the United States considers that nothing in the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs of the resolution we have just voted upon can change the provisions of the Charter regarding the legitimate use of force. Let me emphasize that, in our view, the sixth preambular paragraph would establish a right to use force which is beyond the provisions of the United Nations Charter. To our knowledge, no United Nations document affirms a right to use force in the circumstances described in that paragraph. Nor could my delegation accept an implicit interpretation of the Charter to that effect. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter states:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial

⁹ The delegations of Liberia and Somalia subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes to be recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

We must not, in the name of the non-use of force, convey to anyone the suggestion that we are creating loop-holes in this cardinal principle of the Charter.

121. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil): Allow me to explain Brazil's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1 on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

122. Brazil's position on these issues was made clear in my statement of 13 November last [2083rd meeting]. We hold the view that this item should not have been disposed of without more detailed discussion, which would have allowed all its political and legal connotations to be more carefully assessed. We were then and still are of the opinion that the General Assembly would be in a better position to deal with a draft resolution so fraught with doctrinal and possibly practical implications after a comprehensive and integrated debate on the related issues on the agenda; for instance, Implementation of the Declaration on the strengthening of international security [item 35], the World Disarmament Conference [item 26], the strengthening of the role of the United Nations [item 24], the review of its Charter [item 89], and peace-keeping operations [item 41].

123. Besides these methodological or procedural considerations, my delegation also entertains some misgivings about the substance of the matter as expressed in both the preambular and the operative paragraphs. Obviously, we are all in favour of the non-use of force in international relations, but we do not see how this principle, which is already suitably inscribed in the Charter of the United Nations and reaffirmed in quite recent declarations, could be advanced by the adoption of a new resolution. Moreover, by loosely connecting the non-use of force to the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the language of operative paragraph 1, we believe, raises more problems than it solves and casts doubt on the effectiveness of both prohibitions. It is to be pointed out that the phraseology of paragraph 1 does not make clear whether the non-use of nuclear weapons is conditional upon, or is a function of, the non-use of force. The question to be put is, If force is resorted to against countries possessing nuclear weapons, or against any other country, could the nuclear Powers feel they were freed of the obligation not to use their nuclear weaponry? These and other aspects of the problem were not satisfactorily clarified, as we think they must be in a resolution of such importance and significance.

124. The implications of the reference to the Security Council in paragraph 2 are also unclear to my delegation. To our mind, they raise legal and even constitutional questions of such importance that it would be impossible for us to dismiss them lightly, since they bear on the very letter and spirit of the Charter.

125. Furthermore, it is also to be deplored that the resolution fails to make any mention of the ultimate goal to be pursued as a matter of first priority in this context, namely, general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

126. As I have made clear in my previous statement on this item, the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is a totally unsatisfactory approach, since it would be tantamount to a validation of the continued possession and improvement of these weapons by a few States. And this simple possession, as I have pointed out, is, in itself, clearly a form of use.

127. Nevertheless, in view of the intrinsic relevance of these issues, my delegation is prepared to participate in further discussions on them because we do not think that they have been closed by the mere adoption of this resolution. It was for this reason that we abstained in the voting.

128. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation abstained in the vote on the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly. Our position on what is legitimate and what is illegitimate in the use of force is clear-cut. It is the same as that enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. That is more than can be said for the wording of some of the preambular paragraphs in this resolution.

129. Apart from that we find some of the preambular paragraphs unsatisfactory for other reasons. Some of them include references to resolutions which the United Kingdom voted against. Others appear to legitimize recourse to violence in the settlement of disputes. I therefore have to reserve the position of my Government on the preamble.

130. Now let me turn to the operative paragraphs. The United Kingdom sees only a limited role for declarations of a general character in the work which the organs of the United Nations undertake. We believe that both our duty and our best hope of making progress lie in laborious and patient negotiation on the specific, practical issues raised under the many specific items on the agenda of this Assembly and in other organs of the United Nations. Where the Assembly does decide to embark upon the preparation of declaratory resolutions, they can have value only if they are fully and carefully formulated and negotiated on the basis of very wide consultations and if they command the assent of the membership of the Organization as a whole.

131. In the case of paragraph 1 of the resolution just adopted, one of the principles of Article 2 of the Charter has been taken out of its context and merged with a major issue of arms control in a single sentence of carefully calculated ambiguity. If the paragraph is read in conjunction with certain preambular paragraphs and one listens to some of the explanations which have been made publicly and privately, the paragraph can be interpreted to mean one thing. If, however, it is taken in conjunction with other preambular paragraphs and one recalls other explanations, one finds that it can be, and is, interpreted in other ways. We cannot believe that resolutions of this kind advance the work of our Organization.

132. As to paragraph 2 of the resolution, my delegation is not clear what is meant by implementing a general proposition of such vagueness and ambiguity. In our view the job of the Security Council is to deal with specific problems brought to its attention in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter and in accordance with its provisions.

133. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland): I wish to explain the reasons why my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/L.676/Rev.1.

134. The Irish Government naturally stands firmly by the obligation in Article 2 of the Charter, which precludes the threat or use of force, and it is inevitably preoccupied about the terrible dangers to all mankind posed by recourse to nuclear weapons. However, while we subscribe to many of the preambular paragraphs we have serious reservations about the concluding preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1.

135. The eighth preambular paragraph recalls resolution 1653 (XVI), which called for the banning of nuclear weapons. My delegation voted against that text for reasons which we explained in the First Committee on 13 November 1961.¹⁰ We see no grounds for altering today the attitude we then took on that resolution.

136. However, our main reservations on the resolution as a whole, and in particular on paragraph 1, derive from considerations set forth in the memorandum submitted by my Government on 29 June 1962 in reply to the note issued by the Secretary-General by virtue of paragraph 2 of resolution 1653 (XVI). I wish to quote the following extract from this memorandum:

“The Government of Ireland are strongly in favour of taking all effective steps to eliminate the danger of nuclear war with all its disastrous consequences for mankind. As is well known, the Irish delegation in the General Assembly has often expressed its anxieties that the build-up and further spread of nuclear weapons could lead to a nuclear cataclysm. We are not convinced, however, that the signing of a simple declaration would be an effective method of preventing the use of nuclear weapons or that such a declaration would add anything to the clear terms of the Charter by which all members are obliged to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against any State and take effective collective measures for the . . . suppression of acts of aggression”.¹¹

137. In the judgement of the Irish delegation, the foregoing considerations are still relevant today. Consequently we felt unable to support the resolution just adopted.

138. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has followed with interest the debate that has taken place in the General Assembly concerning the proposal of the Soviet Union under which Member States would renounce the use or threat of force in their international relations as well as the use of nuclear weapons. It has also carefully considered the draft resolution introduced by the Soviet Union and other countries. True, the question of the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons remains one of the most important and topical problems with which the world community is confronted. In fact, no one could

question the fact that post-war international relations were founded on this obligation which is enshrined as one of the fundamental principles of the Charter in Article 2.

139. The United Nations was created in 1945 in the conviction that peace had been won and that the five permanent members of the Security Council, acting in unison, would have the will to do everything in their power to safeguard that peace in order to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”. Furthermore, if necessary the Council may be called upon to determine the measures designed to put an end to any use or threat of force. In view of the vicissitudes which the development of the international situation has suffered since 1945 our Organization was compelled to recognize that situations of conflict or tensions still exist in certain areas of the world, and that the establishment of a just and lasting peace is a complex and difficult problem which cannot be solved by a solemn declaration of our General Assembly or a reaffirmation of the principles of the Charter.

140. Furthermore, for some days now the European countries with which the United States and Canada have associated themselves have begun in Helsinki multilateral, preparatory talks designed to consider the desirability of organizing a conference on European security and co-operation. Such a conference could well provide ample opportunity for the examination of the substance that should be given to the concept of the non-use of force. Moreover, parallel exploratory talks which would make it possible to study the possibilities of arriving at a mutual and balanced reduction of forces in Europe are also envisaged.

141. Thus my delegation believes that it would be premature to subscribe to a simple declaration such as that suggested by the Soviet Union. My Government still believes that such a commitment should be the subject of detailed negotiations and that there should be no improvisation. It was for this reason that my delegation was unable to support the draft resolution which, incidentally, gives rise to many reservations of both a legal and a political character.

142. Mr. KARHILO (Finland): The vote of the Finnish delegation in favour of the draft resolution is to be seen as a further affirmation of the Charter principle of non-use of force in relations between nations.

143. I wish to note, however, that some points of wording in the resolution do not coincide with our interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations. In addition, our vote should not be considered as prejudging our position in questions pertaining to disarmament or to European security consultations.

144. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We have just heard the last speaker wishing to explain his vote after the vote. The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to speak before we complete our consideration of item 25.

145. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): On behalf of the 23 States which sponsored the important draft resolution that has just been adopted by the General Assembly, I should like to

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, First Committee*, 1193rd meeting, paras. 18-20.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, *Seventeenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 26, document A/5174, annex II.

thank warmly all those who voted in favour of this draft resolution, which represents a new and important contribution by the United Nations to the strengthening of peace and international security. I regret that two sponsors were not in the hall when the vote was taken; I am referring to Liberia and Somalia. I think their votes should be added to those cast in favour of the resolution. After all, they sponsored it.

146. The overwhelming majority of delegations voted in favour of it; only four votes were cast against it. That is significant. The arguments of those who abstained in the voting are far-fetched and unconvincing. Indeed, their basic argument is that the Charter contains a provision on the non-use of force. That is true. But, in the whole 27 years of the existence of the United Nations, have not all the resolutions adopted by United Nations organs reaffirmed provisions of the Charter or repeated them or supported them, or been based on them? If that is so, then why cannot the General Assembly adopt a decision which reaffirms the basic principle of the Charter, namely the non-use of force? Moreover, it reaffirms that provision, that principle, in close conjunction with another important provision, namely the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in present world conditions when the threat of nuclear war hangs over mankind. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, these two important principles of our time are combined in a single indivisible whole. So why can this not be confirmed? We are happy that the overwhelming majority of votes has reaffirmed both the principle of the non-use of force and that of the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in such close conjunction. This is undoubtedly a very important and serious decision taken by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session.

147. At today's meeting, we have heard the usual dose of Chinese anti-Soviet slander. We are not surprised. We have already become accustomed to it. But we draw a certain conclusion from it: during the year it has been at the United Nations, China has not forgotten anything of its great-Power, aggressive, hegemonic policy, and it has not learned anything either. But let us not lose hope or faith in the future. I, personally, am profoundly convinced that, with time, China will learn something and will co-operate with the other States Members of the United Nations. But at the twenty-seventh session, on all the important issues, it has adopted a negative position and has made no positive proposals. With such participation on the part of a great Power which lays claim to world hegemony, the United Nations will not go very far.

148. I think I shall be stating the general view of the Assembly as a whole if I express the hope that, with time, China will co-operate in the strengthening of peace and international security. In voting against the draft resolution on the non-use of force and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, China has shown that it is opposed to the basic purpose of the Charter, to the strengthening of peace, to the prohibition of the use of the most devastating weapons of mass destruction. China has thereby opposed the position of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations and, first and foremost, the position of the countries of the third world. Those countries are drawing the necessary conclusions. There is a

clearly demonstrated difference between the words of the Chinese leadership to the effect that China is one with the third world and a member of that world, and the position of China in fact, when it voted against this important resolution for which the overwhelming majority of countries of the third world voted.

149. Moreover, having endured the failure of its position and finding itself completely isolated, in company with Portugal and South Africa, China and its delegation have resorted to the usual dose of anti-Sovietism, of anti-Soviet hysteria, in order to conceal their failure and isolation. But they will not get very far with that. They will not convince anyone. That is how China started the twenty-seventh session, and that is how it is apparently terminating the session—with anti-Sovietism—in order to conceal its negative position on all the most important issues.

150. I believe that many delegations and the countries they represent will draw the necessary conclusions from such a position on the part of China.

151. Furthermore, we cannot fail to note who it is that China finds itself in the same boat with: the worst enemies of the peoples of Africa—Portugal and South Africa. This fact speaks for itself. It would have been amusing, were it not so tragic. To what depths has China sunk in finding itself in the company of racists and colonialists who are throttling the African peoples and, in spite of the numerous decisions of the United Nations, working against the liberation of the African peoples and the cleansing of the great and glorious continent of Africa, with its multimillion population, of the last vestiges of colonialism! We feel that the African delegations will draw the necessary conclusions from this position as it has manifested itself at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

152. As for the usual dose of anti-Soviet slander, it is nothing but a fabrication and so malicious that the Soviet delegation feels it to be beneath its dignity to reply to such slander.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Admission of new Members to the United Nations

153. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has before it draft resolution A/L.683 and Add.1, which expresses the desire that Bangladesh should be admitted to membership in the United Nations at an early date, and draft resolution A/L.685 and Add.1, which expresses the desire that the parties concerned should make all possible efforts, in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect, to reach a fair settlement of the issues that are still pending, and calls for the return of the prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 307 (1971).

154. After extensive consultations, it is proposed that these two draft resolutions be adopted together without debate and without a vote.

155. This procedure will give expression to the consensus of this Assembly, which is in favour of both the admission

of Bangladesh and the implementation of Security Council resolution 307 (1971), which I have just mentioned. It is also generally agreed that the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations should be considered within the framework of an over-all solution of the existing political, legal and humanitarian problems. It is therefore essential to consider that by the simultaneous adoption of these two draft resolutions the interdependence of these two viewpoints will be recognized. A peaceful solution on the subcontinent should be promoted; in this context the Simla Agreement is to be welcomed.

156. Since, as I understand it, it is possible for the Assembly to accept and adopt these two draft resolutions without a vote; it goes without saying that any delegation wishing to do so can make statements on the subject after the adoption of the two draft resolutions.

157. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to follow this procedure and to adopt these two draft resolutions without debate and without a vote?

The draft resolutions were adopted (resolutions 2937 (XXVII) and 2938 (XXVII)).

158. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions after the adoption of the two draft resolutions.

159. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): As we have just accepted the proposal of the President of the General Assembly, and as both draft resolutions have been adopted without a vote, it remains for me to express the satisfaction of my delegation with the General Assembly's constructive decision, which will, I hope, contribute to further positive developments and, ultimately, to the establishment on the great Asian subcontinent of durable peace and co-operation based on equality.

160. All who wish to do so may state their views on the action the General Assembly has just taken, but I am confident that much of what I am going to say reflects some of the views prevailing among the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.683 and Add.1, a group of 23 countries representing all the geographical regions of the world.

161. We are indeed gratified that the General Assembly as a whole has adopted that draft resolution which, after affirming the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter, and expressing the General Assembly's stand that the People's Republic of Bangladesh is eligible for membership in the United Nations, expresses its desire that Bangladesh should be admitted to membership in the United Nations at an early date.

162. By adopting this draft resolution the General Assembly has given unequivocal moral support to the application of Bangladesh and to its right to enter our ranks on an equal footing as an independent, sovereign and non-aligned State.

163. In doing so, the General Assembly has, in my opinion, demonstrated in a very clear manner that it

recognizes a new reality, that is, the existence of a new State recognized by 96 countries in all parts of the world, a member of almost all of the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the recipient of the largest humanitarian programme ever mounted by our Organization.

164. In expressing the wish to see Bangladesh join our ranks soon, the General Assembly has clearly manifested its desire to see Bangladesh enter the United Nations at an early date. It is the understanding of my delegation that there is a prevailing recognition in this hall of the all-round usefulness of, and imperative need for, having in our midst a country of 75 million people which is already an important and active international factor, an independent State which has adopted from its very inception the non-aligned policy of not belonging to any military blocs, which has proclaimed its active support for the principle that the region of the Indian Ocean should be free of foreign military bases and which has declared its readiness to establish relations and friendly ties with all the countries of the world on the basis of sovereign equality, non-interference and respect for their territorial integrity.

165. The sponsors of the draft resolution are particularly pleased that the General Assembly has adopted their text as it stands without impairing the basic United Nations position, which is firmly rooted in the clear provisions of the Charter, that the right to membership must not be subject to any conditions other than the provisions of Article 4, a position emphasized also in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1948.¹²

166. We have always maintained that the membership of any State in the United Nations must not be subjected to any pre-conditions, because if there were such pre-conditions, related not to the Charter but to the fulfilment of certain previous or future decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, how many of the present 132 Members of the United Nations would now enjoy the privilege of sitting in this hall? We have always opposed discrimination of any kind for any reason whatsoever. In the same way that we do not recognize and shall never reconcile ourselves to the existence of second-class citizenship, we will never reconcile ourselves to second-class membership in the United Nations.

167. My delegation has stated before, in the Security Council, in the General Committee and in plenary meetings, what prompted it, as well as the delegations of other countries, to sponsor Bangladesh's application for membership. Very briefly stated, the reasons are the following.

168. We wish to assist a new State, in need of all possible assistance from the world community, to stand on its own feet and to broaden and strengthen the basis of its independence by becoming an equal and sovereign Member of the world Organization in its own right and by expanding the network of its international ties and responsibilities.

169. We wish to bring the United Nations as close to full universality as possible in accordance with the Charter, a

¹² *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948, p. 57.*

noble goal towards which this Organization has never stopped aspiring as it has surmounted many obstacles along this not-always-easy but most rewarding path.

170. We wish to facilitate further progress towards the normalization of the situation in the great subcontinent by introducing a definite and constructive new ingredient and by ensuring that all parties are equal and equally share the same responsibilities. It should always be borne in mind that to be a Member of the United Nations does not mean only to enjoy privileges; it also implies the acceptance of obligations and responsibilities. We should not forget that exposure to the requirements and pressures of multilateral diplomacy makes almost everyone more aware of the realities of international life and of the legitimate interests of others, in all their complexities.

171. But, while being equally aware of the fact that no country can become a Member of the United Nations without the concurrence of all the permanent members of the Security Council—that is to say, until those among them who make it impossible for a country like Bangladesh to enter our Organization refrain from doing so—we trust that the General Assembly's adoption of our draft resolution constitutes telling political and moral support for Bangladesh's application. By putting its stand on this matter on record, the Assembly has contributed a constructive element to the situation, not the least of which was letting the people and Government of Bangladesh know that their request, that their just right to be recognized, has not been shelved, that it remains a matter of active attention for the international community and that, indeed, far from being alone, they enjoy the widest measure of support and sympathy. The presence of Bangladesh in our ranks and its active involvement on the international plane would contribute, in the final analysis, to the strengthening of our Organization and to the solution of all disputes on the subcontinent by peaceful means.

172. I know that I am expressing the feelings of many delegations when I state that we share the general satisfaction that the draft resolution was adopted without any unnecessary divisions. Indeed, the sponsors of our draft resolution invested a tremendous amount of time, patience and flexibility in the negotiations and adopted a constructive approach in order to ensure that this favourable result should come to pass.

173. What happened here today, the way in which the General Assembly has acted in its wisdom—namely, its recognition of realities, the absence of confrontation and the achievement of consensus—has always been implicit in the intention and method of our action. We have always wanted to bring together and not to divide, to overcome differences and to contribute healing elements in the subcontinent and elsewhere.

174. We are not closing our eyes to the fact that serious problems, such as the legacy of war, still exist and have to be solved. Among these problems are some which are of the foremost humanitarian concern and have to be removed and settled, taking into account the legitimate interests of all parties and of all States. We hope that—in a spirit of co-operation, equality and mutual respect—many of these problems will soon be resolved, especially after the new and

encouraging developments that have been taking place on the subcontinent in the course of the last few days. We hope—and this is the general feeling of this Assembly—that all pending problems will be solved, including the return of the prisoners of war and the repatriation of civilian and military personnel to their respective countries.

175. We are indeed most gratified that our action in proposing this item for inclusion in our agenda has enabled the General Assembly to express its stand that Bangladesh is eligible for membership and its desire that, accordingly, it should be admitted to the United Nations at an early date. We earnestly hope that all the problems between the States of the subcontinent will be resolved in a peaceful manner.

176. Yugoslavia, for its part, could not feel otherwise since it has good and friendly relations with all the countries in the subcontinent—being always ready to promote these relations—has good and friendly relations with all the Powers influencing events in the area and is prepared to develop these relations still further.

177. Let me conclude, Mr. President, by thanking you personally and all those who, by their efforts and endeavours, their perseverance in preventing unnecessary divisions, and their understanding, have made possible the decision that the General Assembly has taken today.

178. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I believe that we have good reason to congratulate ourselves. The General Assembly, and particularly the parties directly concerned, have given clear proof of political wisdom in approving by consensus draft resolutions A/L.683 and Add.1 and A/L.685 and Add.1. In order to arrive at this unanimous decision, several weeks of lengthy and intensive consultations and negotiations were required. It was no easy task. But, thanks to the hard work, patience, interest and flexibility of various delegations, once more it has been clearly demonstrated that in the United Nations, as in any multilateral body, it is always possible to arrive at a compromise solution which, while it may not be entirely satisfactory, is none the less preferable to a public confrontation, which serves only to exacerbate passions, accentuate divisions and make more remote the prospects of broader and more definitive understanding.

179. The Argentine delegation participated actively in those efforts and we are proud of this, not only because the results are before us, but especially because we were able to note the extraordinary good will, the will to arrive at mutually acceptable formulas and the desire for peace and the settlement of old grievances manifested by the representatives of the three countries of the Asian subcontinent affected by this problem.

180. A very significant place in our recognition is reserved for you, Mr. President, for your untiring willingness to find an acceptable and fitting way out on a question that for several days caused concern to the General Assembly. That patient and understanding attitude on your part facilitated very substantially the solution that was achieved. As we stated at the outset, the presidency of the twenty-seventh session is entrusted to a man of experience with a definite dedication to peace and friendship, and the facts have borne this out.

181. Exactly a year ago the Security Council and the General Assembly were confronted by a serious crisis in the Asian subcontinent. A large majority among us witnessed with pain and sorrow a conflict between two important countries of the developing world with which we maintained close relations of friendship on an equal footing. It goes without saying that that was the case for Argentina. We endeavoured at the time by every possible means available to put a stop to hostilities, to prevent their extension and to lay the foundation for the subsequent consideration of their causes and of appropriate solutions, in a climate of moderation and understanding.

182. There emerged from that crisis a reality that is called Bangladesh. Access to independence by that new sovereign State, through the unanimous desire of its people, has been recognized by more than 90 countries, including Argentina. A new stage has begun in that region and, very realistically, many of us hope and maintain that that new stage should represent the beginning of important agreements that would bring peace and co-operation between Bangladesh, India and Pakistan, united as they are by geography and by a common destiny. Thus victory would go to none, but to all; it would be the victory of fraternity, enabling them together to overcome the problems of under-development.

183. It was thus with enormous satisfaction that we welcomed the statesmanlike gesture of the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan when they met and concluded the Simla Agreement. That was and continues to be the right course, the path that will lead to the final, definitive solution we all desire. The road that is still to be traversed is arduous, but both countries have taken the right path and from now on difficulties can be overcome in that same spirit that prevailed at Simla. Each day we see encouraging signs which to a large degree contribute to the achievement of that objective.

184. Within this scheme Bangladesh should and must make an essential contribution. As a first step it has submitted its application for admission to membership in the United Nations. The position on this point upheld by the Argentine delegation, both in the Committee on the Admission of New Members and in the Security Council, is well known. We pronounced ourselves categorically in favour of the entry of Bangladesh, both for the political reasons that we have always expressed in favour of the universality and democratization of the United Nations and for juridical reasons based strictly on the observance of the Charter and the valuable opinion of the International Court of Justice. We still believe that Bangladesh must be admitted to membership in our Organization on the basis of the provisions of Article 4 of our Charter and without adding to that comprehensive and complete enumeration any other conditions, as established by the Court in its advisory opinion of 1948.¹³

185. For all these reasons we adhere unreservedly to the consensus that made possible the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Yugoslavia and other countries. Consequently we wish this recommendation of the General Assembly to become a reality as early as possible, thus

enabling us to be among the first to welcome the sovereign presence of Bangladesh in the United Nations.

186. Having said that, we wish to reaffirm with equal emphasis our conviction that to solve all pending problems on the Asian subcontinent and to create a climate of peace and tranquillity it is necessary for all the parties concerned to refrain from any act that might compromise the prospects of settlement and reconciliation. More important still, it is necessary for those three countries to comply immediately with their juridical obligations, and to that end to make manifest their political decision.

187. No one is unaware of the fact that, first and foremost among those legal obligations, are those that stem from the Geneva Conventions of 1949, the implementation of which was requested last year by resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. The unjustified retention of a large number of prisoners of war after the cessation of hostilities has been and continues to be one of the most serious obstacles to the final understanding that we advocate. Argentina voted in favour of Security Council resolution 307 (1971) and of General Assembly resolution 2793 (XXVI) which, *inter alia*, referred to the question of prisoners of war.

188. We request, and we believe we have every right to do so, that our vote and that of so many other delegations be respected and abided by. Only thus will it be possible to move towards the solution of many other problems besetting that region.

189. Guided by those aims, my delegation sponsored draft resolution A/L.685 and Add.1. We trust that this time our appeal will not be in vain and that very soon we shall be able to rejoice at seeing the complete elimination of the divergences that still persist between those three friendly countries—Bangladesh, India and Pakistan.

190. Mr. SEN (India): We appreciate your efforts, Mr. President, in having the two resolutions adopted without debate or voting. We welcome in particular your reference to the desire that the parties concerned should make all possible efforts, in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect, to reach a fair settlement of the issues that are still pending. We are also grateful for the efforts of various delegations in this respect. We fully acknowledge the anxiety of the international community about the prisoners of war. In fact this concerns us very much indeed. It formed the subject of long discussions between ourselves and Pakistan during the Simla summit meeting. At first Pakistan wanted the immediate release and repatriation of the prisoners of war. We informed Pakistan that we could not agree to that without the concurrence and consent of Bangladesh, as the prisoners of war had surrendered, not to India alone, but to the joint command of India and Bangladesh.

191. After a long exchange of views the problem of the prisoners of war was made the subject of a specific agreement, mentioned in article 6 of the Simla Agreement:

“Both Governments agree that their respective heads will meet again at a mutually convenient time in the future and that, in the meanwhile, the representatives of

¹³ *Ibid.*

the two sides will meet to discuss further the modalities and arrangements for the establishment of durable peace and normalization of relations, including the questions of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees, a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir and the resumption of diplomatic relations.”¹⁴

192. The Simla Agreement was a solemn undertaking entered into by two heads of Government and ratified by their Parliaments. In fact it was the Government of Pakistan that insisted on ratification by Parliament even though that procedure was not necessary under the Constitution of either country. According to article 6 of the Simla Agreement, Pakistan agreed that the question of prisoners of war would be discussed along with the other questions. Pakistan assured us that it would recognize Bangladesh by the end of August.

193. When the Delhi meeting was held at the end of August, India stated that Bangladesh was—as it still is—a necessary party to the discussion of the repatriation of Pakistani prisoners of war and civilian internees and that the recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan would facilitate further progress on that problem. Pakistan took note of the Indian view and said that the question of recognition of Bangladesh was under serious consideration. In view of that explicit statement by Pakistan, we should like to know why Pakistan has not yet recognized Bangladesh. We should imagine that if Pakistan were anxious to have the prisoners of war back it would not have delayed recognition of Bangladesh, which could pave the way for the discussion and solution of this problem.

194. We are glad that the preamble to the second resolution, and your own statement, Mr. President, note with satisfaction the Simla Agreement. The Prime Minister of India took the initiative in convening the Simla summit meeting and we were glad to receive a positive response from the President of Pakistan at Simla. My Prime Minister signed the Simla Agreement with full faith and the conviction that all our problems in the subcontinent should and could be solved peacefully through bilateral discussions. We firmly adhere to that approach. Any outside interference would not only complicate the situation but make the solution of the outstanding problems more difficult.

195. We do not understand why the Government of Pakistan has not taken any step which would lead to mutual recognition—by Pakistan of Bangladesh and by Bangladesh of Pakistan—and is still resisting that vital step which would facilitate the opening of discussions for the solution of the problem of prisoners of war, and indeed of all the other problems. The United Nations Charter is based on the sovereign equality of nations and it would be a violation of the Charter if it were sought to put pressure on Bangladesh or India through the instrumentality of the United Nations, in utter disregard of the realities of the situation and in violation of the principle of sovereign equality.

196. What are the implications of Pakistan's non-recognition of Bangladesh? It is important to bear in mind that not to recognize the reality of Bangladesh would be

tantamount to denying the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bangladesh. It would also imply that according to Pakistan the hostilities had not ceased and that there would accordingly be a constant threat to Bangladesh as a sovereign and independent State. How can the relations be normalized in the subcontinent until Pakistan recognizes Bangladesh? We should like to know why Pakistan is not following the example of more than 90 countries of the world in this matter.

197. We do not wish in any way to underrate the efforts that have been made by several delegations to secure an amicable settlement of the present situation. However, we must make it clear that even more important than the return of prisoners of war is the establishment of durable peace, for the return of prisoners of war without the removal of the threat of resumption of hostilities would only create an illusion of normalization and peace and might lead to an increased threat of resumption of hostilities. That important aspect has to be kept in mind. We were not opposed to draft resolution A/L.685 in the hope that Pakistan and Bangladesh will accord mutual recognition to each other unconditionally and thus contribute to the restoration of normalcy in the subcontinent.

198. This Assembly has, we are glad to say, stated that the problem of the return of civilian and military personnel is important for the establishment of a climate of tranquillity and peace in the area. In that connexion we welcome the statement of the Prime Minister of Bangladesh that he is willing and ready to permit all the civilian personnel in his country, including their families, who wish to go to Pakistan to do so. We regret, however, that the Government of Pakistan, instead of reciprocating that gesture and allowing Bangladesh nationals in Pakistan who wish to return to their homeland to do so, is putting obstacles and difficulties in their way. We regret, further, that, instead of fully reciprocating the joint offer made by India and Bangladesh to repatriate the families—that is, the women and children—of both civilian internees and prisoners of war, the Government of Pakistan has responded with an offer to return only 10,000 members of the families which are detained in Pakistan, a very small fraction of the total number involved. We should like the Assembly to note that the Bangladesh nationals in Pakistan are neither prisoners of war nor civilian internees. They have committed no crimes for which they are being detained. They must be allowed to return to their homeland without delay and without restrictions. We hope that the Government of Pakistan will give urgent consideration to this important matter and not allow human beings to be counted or treated like head of cattle.

199. Every sovereign government has the duty to safeguard and defend its territorial integrity, and so long as Pakistan does not recognize Bangladesh that threat will continue, not only to the integrity of Bangladesh but also to the establishment of durable peace in the subcontinent. That is indeed the crux of the problem. If Pakistan desires peace in the subcontinent and the normalization of relations it must recognize Bangladesh without delay. We appeal to the Government of Pakistan to give urgent consideration to this matter in its own interest and in the interest of peace and the normalization of relations in the subcontinent.

¹⁴ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 858, No. 12308.

200. We have noted the President's statement that the simultaneous adoption of these two resolutions should be viewed as constituting an interdependence between two viewpoints. We interpret this to mean that, so long as Bangladesh is kept out of the United Nations and so long as Pakistan refuses to recognize Bangladesh, the solution of pending problems will be difficult, if not impossible. It is, therefore, essential for Pakistan to recognize Bangladesh if it wishes to achieve a normalization of relations, the establishment of durable peace, and the solution of all pending problems, including the return of prisoners of war.

201. There can be no other interdependence or interrelationship between these two aspects. The admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations cannot, obviously, be subject to the fulfilment of any conditions other than those specified in Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter. This self-evident principle has now been endorsed by the Assembly. Draft resolution A/L.683 just adopted by the Assembly affirms in an unqualified manner the eligibility of Bangladesh for membership in the United Nations. This is indeed a refutation of the arguments used to block the application of Bangladesh. We earnestly hope that the desire expressed in that text about the admission of Bangladesh will be realized without any further delay and that the Security Council would recommend the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations forthwith.

202. I should, in this context, recall that as early as November 1949—I repeat, as early as November 1949—the Assembly adopted resolution 296 K (IV), which requested the permanent members of the Security Council to refrain from the use of the veto in connexion with the recommendation of States for membership in the United Nations. Since we all wish to abide by the resolutions of the Assembly, let us also keep that resolution in mind.

203. Mr. ROY (Pakistan): I should like to express the position of the delegation of Pakistan on the simultaneous adoption by this Assembly of the two draft resolutions in documents A/L.683 and A/L.685. The agreement reached to allow the simultaneous adoption of the two draft resolutions, together with the interpretative statement made by the President, was arrived at after six weeks of consultations involving over 50 delegations. It was finalized late on Monday evening, 27 November, after protracted and difficult negotiations. The agreement reflects the desire of the General Assembly to serve the cause of conciliation and to promote an over-all settlement of the problems arising from last year's war on the South Asian subcontinent.

204. I would be failing in my duty if I did not record the appreciation of my delegation for the unceasing efforts that the President has made to promote the agreement to which I have just referred. I hope that the President will permit me to offer the gratitude of my Government to the Secretary-General for his continuing interest in the affairs of the subcontinent and for the initiative that he has taken to help the process of reconciliation among the parties concerned.

205. A large number of States Members of this Organization have manifested their desire and interest in a just and peaceful settlement in the subcontinent. Foremost among them is the People's Republic of China, which has been

unswerving in its insistence that the problems resulting from the dismemberment of Pakistan by the use of force should be resolved in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. I take this opportunity to express to the Government and people of China the profound gratitude of my President and my people for their solidarity with us in our tribulation and travail. We also thank all our friends for their sympathy and support to us in our efforts to find a formula which would embody an agreed solution of the item under discussion.

206. The Government of Pakistan has consistently adhered to the view that the admission of "Bangladesh" could not be seen in isolation from the other consequences of the conflict which gave it birth. In the Security Council we had urged members to defer a decision on it to a time when, through a resolution of the other outstanding consequences of the conflict, the conditions became propitious for its admission. We were, therefore, unhappy at the haste shown in the Council to force a decision which, it was well known, would not be favourable to "Bangladesh" in the existing circumstances. Similarly, Pakistan was concerned at the initial attempt to raise the question in the Assembly without relation to the solution of the problems surrounding the application.

207. We are encouraged by the President's statement that "it is also generally agreed" by this Assembly "that the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations should be considered within the framework of an over-all solution of the . . . political, legal and humanitarian problems" [*supra*, para. 155]. If the question is approached in this manner, and in consonance with the spirit of the operative paragraph of draft resolution A/L.685, there is no reason why it could not result in the creation of conditions for a just and lasting peace among the peoples of the South Asian subcontinent.

208. Ever since it assumed power, the present Government of Pakistan has been making the most strenuous efforts to reach a fair and equitable settlement of the issues arising from the conflict last year. We are anxious that the prejudices and preconceptions of the past should not form an obstacle to peace—peace both with India and with those who were until recently our compatriots. The President of Pakistan has manifested in concrete action his willingness, indeed his determination, to bring about a change from the path of confrontation to that of conciliation. It was this determination which enabled him to go to Simla and sign an agreement for peace with India. It was this determination which inspired him, a few days after assuming office, to release Sheikh Mujibur Rahman unconditionally. It was again in this spirit that the President and our Government have taken unilateral action to reach an understanding with regard to establishing amicable relations with the authorities in Dacca. Pakistan offered to send back some 30,000 Bengali personnel of the Pakistan armed forces and about 15,000 Bengali civil servants of various categories. We offered to give 100,000 tons of rice to relieve the distress in "Bangladesh". President Bhutto repeatedly appealed to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman for a meeting to resolve, without any preconditions, the outstanding problems between the two former wings of Pakistan.

209. The leaders of "Bangladesh" demand that Pakistan recognize them before they will have anything to do with

Pakistan. Yet we have at no time ruled out the establishment of a new relationship with the country's former eastern province. But this cannot be done when there is no contact between us, and while various problems remain to be resolved. In fact, speaking in Peshawar last Friday, the President of Pakistan said:

"The time has come that we should enter into a dialogue with Muslim Bengal. We are ready for negotiations if Sheikh Mujibur Rahman so desires . . . We can thrash out matters at the Conference table . . . if mistakes have been committed on either side, there should be no hesitation in apologizing".

I submit that this is a clear expression of Pakistan's flexibility. Why should we not resort to the procedures of conciliation which the Charter of the United Nations advocates, and which, since time immemorial, have been used to resolve disputes and problems?

210. In view of our sincere efforts at conciliation and the international obligations of "Bangladesh" and India under Security Council resolution 307 (1971), any attempt to extract political concessions from Pakistan by refusing to release and repatriate prisoners of war is all the more deplorable.

211. Article 4 of the Charter, relating to the admission of new Members, provides that before a new State can be admitted to membership in the United Nations, it must, in the judgement of the Organization, be able and willing to carry out its international obligations. It is not sufficient for the applicant merely to make a declaration to this effect. The report of Commission I/2, which drafted the relevant part of the Charter,¹⁵ stressed that "the Organization would exercise its discretionary powers with respect to the admission of new members . . . To declare oneself 'peace-loving' does not suffice to acquire membership in the Organization". The ability and willingness of the applicant to carry out its international obligations must be demonstrated in concrete action.

212. We agree with the opinion of the International Court of Justice contained in its report for 1948 that the conditions in Article 4, paragraph 1, constitute an exhaustive enumeration and are not merely stated by way of guidance or principle. These conditions, however, do not exclude the relevance of Security Council resolution 307 (1971) for the purposes of establishing whether the conditions of Article 4 have been fulfilled. The opinion of the Court goes on to say:

"It does not, however, follow from the exhaustive character of paragraph 1 of Article 4 that an appreciation is precluded of such circumstances of fact as would enable the existence of the requisite conditions to be verified.

"Article 4 does not forbid the taking into account of any factor which it is possible reasonably and in good faith to connect with the conditions laid down in that

Article. The taking into account of such factors is implied in the very wide and very elastic nature of the prescribed conditions; no relevant political factor—that is to say, none connected with the conditions of admission—is excluded".¹⁶

The implementation or otherwise of the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 307 (1971)—a resolution which deals with the conflict which created "Bangladesh"—is a factor which is connected inextricably with the conditions for admission laid down in Article 4 of the Charter. Consequently, the implementation of Security Council resolution 307 (1971) cannot be seen as imposing an extraneous political condition on the admission of "Bangladesh".

213. Furthermore, Security Council resolution 307 (1971) also called upon "all those concerned" to observe the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and to apply in full their provisions as regards the protection of the wounded and sick, prisoners of war and civilian population. The use of the words "all those concerned" was deliberate in order to bind not only India and Pakistan, but also "Bangladesh", whose authorities had by that time assumed the powers of administration in Dacca. In accordance with article 118 of the third Geneva Convention¹⁷ and articles 132 and 134 of the fourth Geneva Convention,¹⁸ all prisoners of war and civilian internees should have been released and repatriated, without delay, upon the cessation of active hostilities. The text of the Conventions, as well as the authoritative commentaries on them, leave no room for doubt or ambiguity that after the cessation of hostilities, the obligation of the detaining Power is to release and repatriate all prisoners of war without any delay or conditions. The obligation is unequivocal, unilateral and unconditional.

214. Eleven months after the cessation of hostilities over 90,000 Pakistani prisoners of war and civilian detainees continue to be held captive in Indian camps. This continued incarceration of our prisoners is neither humane nor does it accord with the Geneva Conventions. Pakistan, for its part, has attempted to adhere as scrupulously as possible to the injunctions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and of Security Council resolution 307 (1971). It was to comply with our obligations under these instruments that we had earlier unilaterally released and repatriated all Indian civilian internees, as well as all Indian sick and wounded prisoners.

215. Two days ago, President Bhutto announced the unilateral decision of the Government of Pakistan to release all the Indian prisoners of war held in Pakistan. Addressing the Indian prisoners, President Bhutto said:

"You are free to go to your country or if you want to stay in Pakistan you are welcome to stay as our guests. I have come specially to say farewell to you. You are released and you can go back to your homes."

¹⁵ See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948*, p. 63.

¹⁷ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 972, p. 224.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 973, pp. 376-378.

¹⁵ United Nations Conference on International Organization, I/2/76.

President Bhutto told the prisoners of war that their release was in accord with the conscience and decisions of the whole world embodied in Security Council resolution 307 (1971) of 21 December last year, and General Assembly resolution 2793 (XXVI) of 7 December 1971, as well as the Geneva Conventions. The President regretted that more than 90,000 Pakistani prisoners of war were still held in India.

216. The people of Pakistan will, of course, welcome the return of the 540 prisoners whom India has now offered to repatriate. But why should the principle of repatriation not be recognized in the case of the tens of thousands who will continue to be detained? What difference does it make to the wife, the brother or the sister of a prisoner that he was unfortunate enough to be captured in the eastern and not the western theatre of the same conflict? Security Council resolution 307 (1971), which dealt with the conflict in its entirety, noted in its eighth preambular paragraph that “a cease-fire and a cessation of hostilities prevail”. This is the only condition the fulfilment of which is required under article 118 of the third Geneva Convention to bring about the release and the repatriation of prisoners of war.

217. The continued detention, for 11 months, of the prisoners of war is without doubt the cause of the deplorable transgression of the standards prescribed for their treatment by the Geneva Conventions. In October alone six separate incidents occurred in which 18 prisoners were killed and 37 were wounded. The explanation that all these incidents result from escape attempts does not suffice. For instance, the report of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on the incident at Camp 35 in Allahabad on 13 October has this to say:

“The delegates [of the ICRC] let Brigadier Mansingh understand that, of the six prisoners killed during this incident, two at least, if not three, seemed to be cases of cold-blooded murder rather than of self-defence”.

The Government of India cannot evade its responsibility for the circumstances that make such incidents possible.

218. The argument that the release and repatriation of the prisoners of war captured on the eastern front requires the concurrence of “Bangladesh” is legally and morally untenable. The release and repatriation of prisoners of war upon the cessation of active hostilities does not require the agreement or consent of any Power, neither that of India nor that of the Dacca authorities. The Commentary of the ICRC on the third Geneva Convention states that the drafters of the Convention felt it necessary to make the requirement thus to repatriate unilateral “so that its implementation would not be hampered by the difficulty of obtaining the consent of both Parties”.¹⁹

219. On the other hand, the Dacca authorities refuse even to discuss this question—not that any discussion is necessary—until we recognize “Bangladesh”. To extract political concessions of this nature from Pakistan is to use human beings as pawns. This is not the way to secure Pakistan’s

recognition of “Bangladesh”. The pressure being exerted on us is unnecessary. We are quite prepared to reach an honourable settlement with the Dacca authorities through agreement and mutual accommodation. We ask, what do they wish from us that we are not prepared to concede to them? The continued detention of the prisoners cannot serve the interests of “Bangladesh” in any way. We appeal to them not to allow themselves to become pawns in the game of power politics.

220. My delegation has not objected to the adoption of draft resolution A/L.683 in view of the consensus of the Assembly, which you, Mr. President, have reflected in your statement, that the recommendation in document A/L.683 and those in document A/L.685 are interdependent. The settlement of pending issues which the resolution in document A/L.685 desires, primarily the return without delay of the prisoners of war which it has called for, are the necessary prerequisites for the fruition of the desire expressed in the resolution in document A/L.683, that “Bangladesh” be admitted into the United Nations at an early date. As you have just stated, Mr. President, it is “essential to consider that by the simultaneous adoption of these two draft resolutions the interdependence of these two viewpoints will be recognized” [*supra*, para. 155]. My delegation regards this as fundamental to the question, not only in terms of the moral and procedural requirements of the United Nations, but also in respect of the basic political realities of the South Asian subcontinent. It is by translating that interdependence into reality that we can ensure the creation of conditions that will lead to peace and tranquillity in the area.

221. The delegation of Pakistan, therefore, sincerely hopes that the parties concerned will take determined steps to establish a constructive dialogue in order to resolve the pending issues. The Government of Pakistan stands ready to contribute to this in a positive and pragmatic manner. But, in particular, we strongly urge that the prisoners of war be released immediately in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and resolution 307 (1971) of the Security Council.

222. This Assembly, by the expression of its determination to act in concert and by consensus, has lived up to the principles of conciliation and peaceful settlement enshrined in the Charter. The determination of the international community to adhere to those principles cannot fail to inspire the parties concerned in their approach to the resolution of the problems they confront. Too often in the past we have resorted to force to make realities conform to our choice. The dialectics of power have been disastrous for both our peoples as well as for international order. Let us, through dialogue, create a reality that is in accord with the overriding desire of all our peoples to focus their energies in the perpetual battle against poverty, hunger and disease. Let us do it now, before the tide of despair engulfs us again.

223. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As it is necessary for me to leave the Chair, I should like before leaving the meeting to thank all the members who, with a sense of lofty political responsibility, have contributed to finding a positive solution to the problem under discussion. I wish to emphasize the fact that it has been possible, in spite of the difficulties of the problem, to reach a

¹⁹ See *Commentary: III Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War* (Geneva, International Committee of the Red Cross, 1960), p. 541.

compromise. The consensus achieved proves that in our Assembly there reigns a spirit of understanding and co-operation which is an encouraging sign for our work.

Mr. Nkundabagenzi (Rwanda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

224. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Both in the Security Council and in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly the Chinese delegation has repeatedly stated its principled stand on the question of the admission of "Bangladesh" to the United Nations. That stand is as follows: pending the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council, and a reasonable settlement of the issues between India and Pakistan and between Pakistan and "Bangladesh", "Bangladesh" is not qualified for membership in the United Nations. This principled stand of the Chinese delegation is in full accord with the spirit of the United Nations Charter. It has been clear-cut and consistent.

225. Chapter II of the United Nations Charter has made explicit stipulations with regard to qualifications for membership in the Organization. Applicants for membership in the United Nations must, "in the judgement of the Organization", be "able and willing to carry out these obligations" contained in the Charter in order to be considered as qualified to be Members of the United Nations. It goes without saying that the application of any State for membership in the United Nations can only and must be considered in accordance with the above-mentioned provisions.

226. As you may all recall, at its 2003rd plenary meeting on 7 December last year, the United Nations General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority of 104 votes a resolution sponsored by Algeria, Argentina and 32 other countries, calling for cease-fire and troop withdrawal on the South-East Asian subcontinent [*resolution 2793 (XXVI)*]. Subsequently, the Security Council adopted resolution 307 (1971) with a great majority of 13 votes, calling on all those concerned to cease fire and withdraw their troops as soon as practicable from all areas of conflict, including Jammu and Kashmir, and calling on all those concerned to release and repatriate the prisoners of war without delay in observance of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. "All those concerned" referred to in the resolution certainly include "Bangladesh", which is now applying for membership in the United Nations. Therefore, the two resolutions mentioned above are important resolutions directly concerning "Bangladesh". In view of the foregoing the question of "Bangladesh's" application should in no way be discussed outside the context of the above two important resolutions.

227. Nearly a year has passed now since the adoption of the two resolutions, and yet the Indian Government has thus far failed to withdraw all its troops to its own territory. What is more, in collaboration with the "Bangladesh" authorities, the Indian Government has continued to detain more than 90,000 Pakistan prisoners and civilians, refusing to release and repatriate them. The "Bangladesh" authorities even insist on bringing the Pakistani prisoners of war to trial. They have all along unwarrantedly rejected the

reasonable proposal repeatedly put forward by President Bhutto of Pakistan for holding meetings between the two sides unconditionally. Since the "Bangladesh" authorities, at the instigation of their behind-the-scenes supporters, have refused to implement the important resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council directly concerning them, how can it be asserted that they are "able and willing" to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter? How can it be asserted that they are qualified for membership in the United Nations?

228. However, back in August this year the Soviet Union and India raised the question of the admission of "Bangladesh" in the Security Council²⁰ when the above important United Nations resolutions remained unimplemented, and rejected the reasonable views of the representatives of China and many other Council members for postponing consideration. They pressed for a vote on the question.

229. These arbitrary acts of imposition on their part have aroused the strong dissatisfaction of many delegations and forced the Chinese delegation to use the veto. Following that, some people again tried to use the General Assembly to exert political pressure on the Chinese delegation and other justice-upholding countries. This is certainly impermissible.

230. The Soviet Government has played a most ignominious role in the development of the situation on the South Asian subcontinent. The tension in the subcontinent was created solely by the Soviet Union. On 9 August last year, the Soviet Government concluded with the Indian Government a so-called Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation, which is in essence an aggressive treaty of military alliance. Subsequently, the Soviet Government directly supported and abetted the Indian Government in unleashing armed aggression against Pakistan, thus dismembering a sovereign State. Since the war they have colluded with the "Bangladesh" authorities in illegally detaining more than 90,000 prisoners of war and civilians as hostages for blackmail and threat against Pakistan, a victim of aggression, and have tried to force it to make concessions on the question of Jammu and Kashmir in an attempt to swallow the whole of Jammu and Kashmir. This is indeed bullying people too much. One may ask, Which sovereign State in the position of Pakistan could tolerate such humiliation? Could any justice-upholding countries permit them to continue their evil-doing like this? Are not people talking about humanitarianism day in and day out? How can people remain indifferent and watch the more than 90,000 prisoners of war and citizens of a Member State long detained in concentration camps and subjected to continued slaughter?

231. People had expected that, in order to relax the tension on the South Asian subcontinent, the parties concerned there would truly implement the relevant United Nations resolutions and arrive at a reasonable settlement of the issues between them through consultations on an equal footing by getting rid of outside interference. However, the Soviet Government has done its utmost to encourage the

²⁰ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1972*, document S/10771.

Indian Government and the "Bangladesh" authorities to refuse to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and tried by every possible means to obstruct a genuine reconciliation between Pakistan and "Bangladesh". On the other hand, it has pressed for the admission of "Bangladesh" to the United Nations before the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Obviously the Soviet Government's intention is to aggravate the tension on the South Asian subcontinent and continue to create confusion so as to seek gains therefrom and further the expansion of its spheres of influence in the South Asian subcontinent and the Indian Ocean. Now, it is clear to all that the Soviet Government is by no means concerned about whether or not "Bangladesh" can be admitted to the United Nations, but it is trying to use the question as a means of political blackmail.

232. The United Nations should be an organ upholding justice on the international level. Now that the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations have been restored, we are duty-bound to stand firmly together with all peace-loving and justice-upholding countries and peoples to defend the just cause of various peoples, safeguard the national independence and sovereignty of all countries, defend world peace, and firmly oppose certain people's attempt to use the United Nations as a tool for practising power politics and hegemony. It is the character of new China to uphold principles and stand for justice and reason. What China seeks in the South Asian subcontinent is simply the promotion of a reasonable settlement of the issues between the parties concerned through consultations on an equal footing. China stands for postponing the consideration of the admission of "Bangladesh" to the United Nations and firmly opposes the Soviet Government's plot in this matter; it does so for the very purpose of defending the United Nations Charter and urging the parties concerned on the South Asian subcontinent to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, thus helping to produce a relaxation of tension. This is the demand of the entire people on the subcontinent. We are not fundamentally opposed to the admission of "Bangladesh" to the United Nations. China has always cherished profound and friendly sentiments for the people of East Bengal. We hope that the "Bangladesh" authorities will make their own decisions independently and meet with the Pakistan leaders at an early date so as to reach a reasonable settlement of the issues between Pakistan and "Bangladesh", thus demonstrating that it is a truly independent State. However, China cannot agree to the admission of "Bangladesh" under the present circumstances, that is, before the important United Nations resolutions are implemented by the parties concerned and a reasonable settlement of the issues between India and Pakistan and between Pakistan and "Bangladesh" is reached.

233. Thanks to the efforts of many justice-upholding countries the General Assembly has finally surmounted the unreasonable obstructions put up by the Soviet delegation at the last moment and has decided on the simultaneous adoption, without vote, of the two parallel resolutions under the item on the admission of new Members, one resolution calling for the implementation of Security Council resolution 307 (1971) and the return of prisoners of war by the parties concerned, and the other expressing

the desire that "Bangladesh" will be admitted to membership in the United Nations at an early date.

234. In his statement, the President of the General Assembly has pointed out clearly that the above two resolutions adopted simultaneously are interdependent. This has foiled the scheme of the Soviet Government and shows clearly that only when the relevant Security Council resolution is implemented and the illegally detained Pakistan prisoners and civilians are released and repatriated will it be possible to consider the admission of "Bangladesh" to the United Nations.

235. The Chinese delegation hopes that the parties concerned will truly and speedily implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council in the spirit of the decision made at this plenary meeting and thus make it possible for "Bangladesh" to be admitted to membership in the United Nations at an early date. But, if the Soviet Government should cling to its obdurate course and try to force the Security Council to vote again on the question before the relevant United Nations resolutions are implemented, in violation of the spirit of the decision made at this plenary meeting, we would reiterate from this rostrum that, in order to defend the principles of the United Nations Charter and the interests of all the people on the South Asian subcontinent, the Chinese delegation will be forced to oppose it firmly again.

236. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): It is a source of great satisfaction to my delegation that the two draft resolutions, one sponsored by Yugoslavia and 22 other Member States, contained in document A/L.683 and Add.1, and the other, sponsored by Argentina, Iran and 14 other Member States, contained in document A/L.685 and Add.1, have been adopted without debate and without vote. My delegation wishes to express its high praise for the dedicated efforts and the co-operative spirit shown by many delegations in reaching a compromise on this sensitive issue. The efforts of those delegations were rewarded today by the successful adoption of the two important resolutions by the General Assembly. We sincerely believe that these two resolutions will be most helpful in promoting further détente in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent and the early admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to our world Organization.

237. The Japanese delegation has consistently supported the early admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations. During the deliberations on the application for admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh at the Security Council meeting last August I unequivocally stated that the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations was a matter of particular interest to Japan which, as an Asian State, had deep concern for the maintenance and promotion of peace and stability in the Asian region.²¹ It is our considered judgement that Bangladesh satisfies all the requirements set out in the Charter and is fully eligible for membership in the United Nations.

238. We are all aware of the fact that Bangladesh is already a fully-fledged member of a number of interna-

²¹ *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Year, 1659th meeting.

tional organizations of the United Nations family, such as the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and is playing a responsible role in those organizations. We are truly convinced that the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations will uphold the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations and strengthen the functions of our world Organization in maintaining peace and security in the world.

239. Japan was one of the six original sponsors of Security Council resolution 307 (1971) which was adopted on 21 December 1971. At that time we expressed the hope that the resolution would have a fair chance to open up a vista for durable peace in the subcontinent, with goodwill and a genuine desire for peace on the part of those concerned. Since that time we have been viewing with great sympathy the intense efforts at reconciliation made by the parties concerned, which culminated, for example, in the conclusion of the Simla Agreement between India and Pakistan. This Agreement stipulated, among other things, that representatives of the two sides would meet to discuss further the modalities and arrangements for the establishment of a durable peace and the normalization of relations, including the question of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees. Very recently we have received the news that the mutual repatriation of a significant number of families of internees to their home States would take place shortly. It was also encouraging to hear the news that India and Pakistan are prepared to return some prisoners of war.

240. It is our earnest hope that these measures will result in the early solution of the humanitarian problems, as mentioned in the Security Council resolution 307 (1971), and the speedy repatriation of prisoners of war and other military as well as civilian personnel.

241. In conclusion, may I once again express our satisfaction at the adoption of the two resolutions by the General Assembly.

242. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): My delegation has been glad of the way in which we have been able to adopt the two resolutions before us. Our reasons for supporting the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations were set out in the Security Council last August²² and they have not changed. We do not consider that the admission of any State to the United Nations should be subject to conditions other than those laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

243. At the same time we recognize that there are certain unresolved difficulties between Pakistan and Bangladesh which both parties have expressed their desire to resolve but which they have not yet found the way to overcome. We would like to congratulate the sponsors of these two resolutions and all the parties directly concerned for achieving a skilful and constructive result under this item on the General Assembly's agenda. We believe that this constitutes a happy omen for good relations between the

parties. Other welcome proof of their sincere desire to make progress has recently been given by the decisions on both sides, to which the President referred, to release certain prisoners of war and civilian internees. We all hope that the continuing efforts of the parties to reach agreement will soon be crowned with success.

244. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation wishes first of all to express its satisfaction that the General Assembly has just adopted a draft resolution in which it states that it considers the People's Republic of Bangladesh eligible for membership in the United Nations and expresses the desire that Bangladesh will be admitted to membership in the United Nations at an early date. That is a rational and realistic approach, and we welcome it. Now the necessity and the possibility of admitting Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations have thus been reaffirmed by the General Assembly, too.

245. It is a well-known fact that admission to membership in the United Nations is governed by the Charter, in particular by Article 4, in which it is stated that:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

246. The Soviet Union, like the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, considers that Bangladesh, the eighth largest country in the world, with a population of 75 million, meets all the necessary criteria of Article 4 of the Charter and all the requirements that countries must fulfil to become Members of the United Nations. The People's Republic of Bangladesh is a sovereign State which enjoys wide international recognition and authority. Outstanding evidence of this is the fact that, in the relatively short period of time since the people of Bangladesh achieved their national independence, over 90 States from all five continents of the world have recognized it as a sovereign and independent country and have established diplomatic relations with it. The People's Republic of Bangladesh is taking an active part and playing an increasing role in international life. It has proclaimed as the basis of its foreign policy the principles of non-alignment, peaceful coexistence and friendship with all peoples. Bangladesh is a member of many international organizations, including many specialized agencies of the United Nations, such as the World Health Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the International Labour Organisation, the International Atomic Energy Agency and others. As is known, quite recently Bangladesh became a member of the United Nations Children's Fund and obtained the status of Permanent Observer to the United Nations.

247. As was demonstrated in the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly and in the earlier discussion in the Security Council of the question of the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations, the majority of States Members of the United Nations are in favour of the immediate and unconditional admission of that country to membership in the Organization. Such an

²² Ibid.

approach is just and lawful. It is in conformity with the idea of co-operation between sovereign States, and it is in keeping with the principle of the universality of the United Nations, a principle which is fundamental to the effectiveness, justice and vitality of this Organization. Such an approach in practice reaffirms the adherence of States to the principle, reaffirmed on numerous occasions by the United Nations, concerning the need to support national liberation movements and their achievements.

248. A further step in the implementation of the principle of the universality of the United Nations would be the speedy admission to the Organization of both German States, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, and the way to this is completely open as a result of the important agreements which have recently been achieved between the two sovereign German States.

249. Steadfastly adhering to Leninist principles of international solidarity and active support for national liberation movements, the Soviet Union from the very outset has advocated that the just application of Bangladesh for membership in the United Nations should be accepted without delay and that that country should assume its just and proper place in the family of States Members of the United Nations.

250. As is known, in the Security Council the application of Bangladesh was supported by a majority of 11 members, including four of the permanent members. There is no doubt whatever that the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations, which will undoubtedly be expedited by the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly, will contribute to the solution of many difficult problems confronting the people of that country.

251. Born of the sufferings of war, of the struggle for independence, of destruction, privation and hunger, the young developing State of Bangladesh, like many of its sister States in Africa, Asia and Latin America, needs the assistance and the support of the United Nations. Everyone knows that the United Nations is already taking an active part in providing such assistance to Bangladesh. The membership of Bangladesh in this Organization would formalize and strengthen its already existing ties with the United Nations and the latter's support of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

252. There is no doubt whatever that the early and unconditional admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations would not only be in accord with the interests of its people, who are building a new and peaceful life, but would also be in the interest and serve the purpose of the further normalization of the situation on the South Asian subcontinent. The admission of Bangladesh would undoubtedly contribute to the subsequent successful settlement of all issues still pending. The interests of the peoples of the South Asian subcontinent call for a cessation of confrontation. The States of that region are faced with extremely serious tasks related to overcoming the conditions of a past inherited from colonial times, with its economic and social backwardness. This, as can readily be understood by everyone, is possible only in conditions of peace and good-neighbourly relations. A positive and significant step towards the normalization of the situation

was the agreement between India and Pakistan signed at Simla in July 1972, which has been given a favourable reception in the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

253. In that regard, we interpret the second draft resolution adopted today as the expression of the wish that in the South Asian subcontinent all the parties concerned will make efforts, in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect for each other's sovereignty, to settle all the issues still pending between them. However, this is an issue quite separate from that of the admission of new Members to the United Nations, which is on the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. In our opinion, the admission of Bangladesh would be a further step which would contribute to the efforts of the States of that region to reach the broad highway of co-operation rather than confrontation.

254. The Soviet delegation firmly objects to any further requirements or conditions being laid down for that country in the further consideration of the question of the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations. Such an approach would discriminate against Bangladesh, would place it on an unequal footing with other States, and would be a violation of the United Nations Charter, and particularly of Article 4. Moreover, attempts to lay down additional conditions for the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations would create a harmful precedent for the United Nations and its prestige, the consequences of which are difficult to assess, not to mention the fact that the United Nations would once again be thrown back into the era of the cold war when, through the fault of the imperialist States, sharp confrontations and prolonged deadlocks arose over the question of the admission of new Members.

255. In his statement on the question of the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations the Chinese representative, for the second time in the course of today's meeting and in his usual spirit, resorted to a whole series of fabrications and anti-Soviet attacks. What slanders did he not bring up? According to the reasoning of the Chinese representative, it appears that the Soviet Union and India, not the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, had applied for United Nations membership for Bangladesh, and that the fact that Bangladesh was not admitted to the United Nations solely because of the Chinese veto was false and that it was due in some way to the position of the Soviet Union and India. What other terrors and nightmares does the representative of China dream of? He has spoken here of schemes, collusion, instigation, and so on. Apparently the Chinese representative is measuring political events by his own yardstick. Many representatives of Member States have been able to convince themselves of this on more than one occasion. We merely wish to state that the whole of this anti-Soviet slander is apparently necessary to the Chinese delegation only in order to conceal the real nature of China's position with relation to the People's Republic of Bangladesh. That position, Mr. Huang Hua, has been very clearly and accurately described, in particular by the Chairman of the National People's Party of Bangladesh, Muzaffar Ahmad, who recently said:

"The Peking leaders did not help the people of Bangladesh at the time of the national liberation struggle

for their independence. Now they are hindering our young sovereign State from becoming a Member of the United Nations, which would have helped to establish a lasting peace and stability in the subcontinent."

256. We have even heard the threat uttered here that China will continue to use its veto if the Security Council takes up the question of the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations, not on the conditions which the Chinese delegation is trying to dictate, but on the basis of the United Nations Charter. Such is the true position of China, directed against the interests of the people of Bangladesh and against peace and stability in the South Asian subcontinent.

257. The peoples of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh need, first of all, peace and tranquillity. The Soviet Union, for its part, is doing everything it can to ensure the relaxation of tension and the development of friendly relations among all the States of the South Asian subcontinent.

258. The situation of instability, tension and conflict was quite recently one that only played into the hands of the imperialist forces. Many people can now see into whose hands those who oppose the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations and who hamper the establishment of conditions of trust and good neighbourliness in the South Asian subcontinent are playing.

259. As far as the Soviet Union and the overwhelming majority of States are concerned, the question of the admission of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations is one that is beyond dispute. We have no doubt that the People's Republic of Bangladesh will soon be admitted to the United Nations family and that its representatives will be welcomed by the delegations of the overwhelming majority of countries which are Members of the United Nations. That is the course of events and no one will be able to change it.

260. The Soviet Union has consistently assumed and continues to assume a position of support for the just cause of the people of Bangladesh and their lawful aspirations and yearnings towards freedom and national independence.

261. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): In view of the very late hour I shall limit my statement to only a few pertinent remarks directly concerned with the relevant resolutions we have adopted.

262. My delegation would like at this moment to join the previous speakers in congratulating the President of our Assembly and the other delegations involved in the intense and strenuous consultations carried out on draft resolutions A/L.683 and A/L.685. These consultations have now succeeded in producing the consensus that we have just witnessed.

263. My delegation would also like to express its highest appreciation for the spirit of co-operation and goodwill displayed by the parties directly concerned with the issues before us.

264. The position of the Indonesian delegation with regard to the admission of Bangladesh to the United

Nations is clear. We strongly believe that Bangladesh should be admitted as a Member of our Organization and that the question of its admission should be viewed solely on the basis of Article 4 of the Charter and should not be subject to other conditions.

265. But at the same time it is also my delegation's view that the release of the Pakistani prisoners of war and their return to Pakistan is a matter of the utmost urgency. It should be a matter of high priority. Their repatriation is of great importance, if not a *conditio sine qua non* for the establishment of normal and friendly relations between the nations of the South Asian subcontinent. Since peace is indivisible, the return of real peace to South Asia will be a positive contribution to peace and security not only in our part of the world but in the whole world.

266. My delegation appeals to all parties directly concerned to do their utmost to facilitate the speedy settlement of the issues outstanding between them, especially the issues of recognition and the release of prisoners of war.

267. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): At the outset I wish to congratulate the parties on their flexibility and understanding in working out the constructive compromise which was reached here this afternoon. We all know of the many hours that a number of intermediaries, with great determination and the highest skill, laboured to reach this happy conclusion, and I believe a special word of appreciation is due our President for the helpful role he played in achieving those results.

268. For the United States, the acceptance of two resolutions by consensus is a particularly apt solution, because the procedure followed and the actual texts very much reflect my Government's view. The United States, in another United Nations forum, has clearly expounded its policy with respect to the admission of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations. It established diplomatic relations with Bangladesh on 4 April 1972, and we have had close and most cordial relations with the leadership and people of Bangladesh.

269. We take special satisfaction in our own participation, together with others, in the United Nations Relief Operation in Dacca to co-ordinate contributions from the international community to relief efforts in Bangladesh.

270. The United States voted for the admission of Bangladesh in the Security Council and we hope that country will be admitted to this body at an early date.

271. Since the tragedy of last year there have been some hopeful developments which must be further encouraged. In recent days we have learned of the arrangements to return home some Pakistani and Indian prisoners of war, as well as some Pakistani and Bangladesh civilians. And, going further back, the Simla Agreement, which has been referred to frequently during this session of the General Assembly, was a most hopeful beginning, and continues to have our warmest support. That Agreement, despite the problems which have beset its implementation, still gives promise that old problems will be approached in a spirit of accommodation. It is our hope that this same spirit will extend to the efforts of Bangladesh and Pakistan to find a basis on which

to resolve problems between them. A period of calm will be most helpful in permitting the leaders of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh to sort out their various problems and establish new relationships.

272. I believe that these are objectives on which all of us can agree and that is why my Government continues to attach such importance to full and speedy implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 307 (1971), adopted last December.

273. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Recently we have been witnesses of the strengthening of the process tending to turn the United Nations into a truly universal organization. Since the day of its admission to membership in the United Nations the People's Republic of Bulgaria has not ceased its unvarying support for the principle of universality. Bulgaria has always and at all times contributed actively to the strengthening of this principle, proceeding from the conviction that this is one of the most important conditions for the enhancement of the authority of the world Organization and the strengthening of its effectiveness. The United Nations is becoming increasingly a forum in which representatives of millions of human beings who not long ago did not enjoy that right are able to make their positions known on the problems of international co-operation.

274. A new factor which without any doubt will contribute greatly to the strengthening of the principle of universality and enhance the prestige and effectiveness of our Organization is the admission to membership in the United Nations in the very near future of the two German States—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

275. Another factor that would also help this process would be the admission of the new State of Bangladesh, since that would enable a nation of 75 million people to participate on an equal footing in the various activities of the United Nations, which would thus become more representative and, consequently, a more effective instrument of international co-operation.

276. The People's Republic of Bulgaria was one of the first countries to recognize the young State of Bangladesh. It is with particular satisfaction that we note that at present more than 96 States from all continents recognize the People's Republic of Bangladesh and are establishing with that State relations of friendship and close co-operation. In the meantime, a number of specialized agencies of the United Nations system have admitted this new Republic to their ranks. This development speaks for itself and demands that the United Nations take it into account.

277. We are gratified by the fact that at present the large majority of States Members of our Organization share the view that Bangladesh should without delay occupy its rightful place in the United Nations. As on other occasions, it has become quite obvious that in such a case it is necessary to take as a point of departure the lasting interests of co-operation among peoples. In fact, it is undeniable that the admission of a new Member State depends only on the terms of Article 4 of the United Nations Charter. In this connexion we believe that consider-

ations seeking to link the question of the admission of a State to membership with other problems fall outside the framework of the present discussion. Such problems can be considered on other occasions, should that prove necessary.

278. The Bulgarian delegation is firmly convinced that the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations, apart from constituting the recognition of a reality, will contribute greatly to the establishment of a durable peace on the Indian sub-continent and will enable the peoples of that region to devote all their efforts, resources and energy to the urgent task of promoting the well-being of their populations and to the work of peaceful construction.

279. The People's Republic of Bangladesh exists and reaffirms itself each day as an important factor for social progress and peace. It undoubtedly constitutes an important element in that region by reason of its enormous human, economic and cultural potential. The Government of Bangladesh solemnly declared, on the very day of the birth of the new State, that it accepted the obligations laid down in the Charter and undertook to comply with them.

280. The short history of the young Republic has shown most strikingly that it is in a position to assume the obligations and duties incumbent upon United Nations Members and that its Government has devoted itself to the solution of the problems of building a just society with a view to ensuring the well-being of its people in conditions of durable peace and security and in a spirit of understanding with all States and peoples.

281. The recent official visit of the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to Bulgaria made it possible to highlight the fact that relations between those two countries are developing favourably and that there are propitious conditions for the expansion and strengthening of those relations. In the joint communiqué issued on that occasion it was stated:

“The two Ministers reaffirmed the attachment of their respective countries to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and expressed regret that Bangladesh should still be kept out of the Organization. The Bulgarian Government believes that Bangladesh meets all the requirements for admission as a Member of the United Nations and that its admission to the world Organization will strengthen the principle of universality of the United Nations and contribute to the improvement of the political climate and stability in southern Asia.”

282. The Bulgarian delegation is convinced that the decision just taken by the General Assembly will exert a favourable influence on the just solution of the question of the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations. We hope to be able in the near future to welcome the representatives of the young Republic to our midst. The sooner we do, the better it will be for our Organization, for stability in South Asia and for co-operation among the peoples in that part of the world, as well as for world peace. The peoples of that region must cope with many problems and, quite rightly, they accord priority to the problems of accelerated economic development with a view to fighting the under-development which

is the heritage of a long period of colonial exploitation. They therefore need peace and security in order to solve those difficult problems successfully; but peace and security can be ensured only in conditions of respect of each other's interests, which thus creates the pre-conditions for the strengthening of confidence.

283. Expressing its gratification at the unanimous decision on this question by the General Assembly, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria expresses its certainty that there will be no further obstacles to the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations in the near future.

284. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Linked by relations of friendship with the various protagonists of this drama, and not wishing to take any sides other than that of peace and reconciliation, France throughout last year's crisis advocated the implementation of a political solution, which, in our view, was the only solution likely to prevent an armed confrontation.

285. Just as, at that time, France tried to suggest peace-making plans, it has since been guided by realistic concerns in its desire to contribute to the extent of its possibilities to the normalization of the situation on the subcontinent and the establishment of lasting peace.

286. Our whole attitude has been defined in terms of that objective. On the one hand, taking note of an irreversible reality, last February we recognized Bangladesh, after scrupulously keeping the Pakistani authorities informed of our intentions and of the justification for our decision. On the other hand, we bent every effort vis-à-vis all the parties to encourage a search for acceptable solutions to the problems that divide them. We informed them that we were ready to make our contribution to any attempt capable of leading to negotiation, conciliation and reconciliation.

287. However, we are bound to note that difficulties still stand in the way of normalization, which fortunately has already taken some shape by virtue of the Simla Agreement and which is necessary to establish durable peace and co-operation on the sub-continent. Those difficulties can be overcome only through a dialogue among all the parties concerned. However, certain pre-conditions posed thus far prevent the opening of such a dialogue, the object of which must be to settle, as far as possible simultaneously, all the pending problems.

288. My delegation deemed it useful to recall, briefly, its attitude towards the general situation in that area of the world, because it is obvious that the dramatic circumstances attendant upon the birth of Bangladesh weigh heavily on our debate and explain the divergences we note.

289. For my delegation, as was stated by the representative of France in the Security Council debate on the question before us,²³ Bangladesh belongs in the United Nations now. We therefore wish that its application last August had met with the unanimously favourable welcome that the Council gives as a rule to the candidature of new States and that a positive recommendation had been

addressed to the General Assembly. Despite the issues still pending and the divergences that still existed among the parties concerned we believed that a positive decision should have been taken, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and, in particular, with Article 4, which in our view fully sets forth the conditions for the admission of new Members.

290. Although this positive decision could not be taken, we had hoped that the countries directly concerned, encouraged by the international community, would draw sound conclusions from the debate that had taken place in the Security Council and endeavour to create more favourable conditions. We know that that wish was heeded and that since last August many attempts have been made to bring the differing views closer together. We believe that such attempts are continuing, but today we note they have not yet borne fruit and that conditions therefore remain largely unchanged.

291. In the present circumstances, and whatever our desire to welcome Bangladesh to our Organization, we are constrained to recognize that the Security Council is not in a position to pronounce usefully on the application of the new State. In our view it would, therefore, be desirable to wait before we again seize the Council of this matter until the obstacles still standing in the way of a dispassionate and positive examination of the application before us are removed.

292. In our view, moreover, the settlement of some of the pending issues should not be linked with the over-all political settlement. It is thus that purely humanitarian considerations militate in favour of rapid measures concerning the repatriation of families and respective nationals of the former belligerents. In this connexion my delegation noted with great satisfaction the recent decision taken by the authorities of India to release 6,000 wives and children of Pakistani prisoners, and the decision of Pakistan authorities to do likewise in the case of 10,000 Bengali wives and children, as well as the declaration of Bangladesh that it is prepared to allow all Pakistani civilians to return to their country. May further gestures of this kind be repeated soon so that this painful problem may be settled as rapidly as possible and in a definitive manner.

293. Similarly, the fate of prisoners of war would appear to have to be settled by the strict implementation of article 118 of the third Geneva Convention. A decision taken in accordance with the provisions of that text, in our view, cannot but change in a very marked and positive manner the climate of our debates and contribute to the favourable development of attempts designed to open the way for negotiations, conciliation and reconciliation. The Pakistani authorities, by liberating the Indian prisoners of war they held, and then the Indian authorities, by doing the same with Pakistani prisoners of war from the western front, appear to us to have made a very positive contribution to the achievement of this objective.

294. It is in the light of these considerations and pre-occupations that my delegation gladly associated itself with the consensus which made possible this evening the adoption of the two draft resolutions before us.

²³ *Ibid.*

295. It warmly congratulates those who favoured this welcome compromise, agreed upon after arduous consultations in which their wisdom, skill and perseverance were of such value.

296. Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Poland was among the first countries to recognize the People's Republic of Bangladesh and to establish with it relations of friendship and co-operation. In the United Nations we took an active part in efforts aimed at the recognition here too of the reality of the existence of Bangladesh and, on this basis, at the settlement of the problems of the Indian subcontinent. Consistent with this policy, we have given, and are giving, our full support to the proposal concerning the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations and we became a sponsor of the draft resolution that has just been adopted by the General Assembly recommending such admission. We are deeply gratified by its adoption.

297. The need to admit Bangladesh to the United Nations without delay is most evident. It corresponds to the very elementary sense of reality. We have the fact of the existence and activities of a State of 75 million inhabitants, the eighth most populous country in the world. The achievements of that State and of its people in overcoming the results of the tragic conflict that had afflicted them and the restoration of normal life and the creation of conditions of economic development are there for all to see. We have the recognition of the State by more than 90 countries, by almost three quarters of the membership of this Organization. We have Bangladesh membership and active participation in several organizations and specialized agencies that form part of the United Nations system. And, what is of particular importance, we have the constitutional commitment of Bangladesh to the principles of the United Nations Charter in the very first act of that nation—its declaration of independence. We have also the peaceful policies carried out by Bangladesh in pursuance of these principles in the interest of stability and security on the Indian subcontinent.

298. All these facts lead to only one conclusion: a recognition of the legitimate right of the people of Bangladesh to be represented in this Organization on the basis of equality, and the admission of that nation to membership in the United Nations without delay. We would say, further, that the speedy admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations is in the best interests of the Organization itself. It cannot be denied or even delayed if this Organization wishes at last to live true to the principle of universality, whose validity and importance should not be questioned any longer by anyone, as experience has shown.

299. In our approach to the problem of the Indian subcontinent we are motivated not merely by our sympathies but also by the sense of realism and our sincere wish to maintain, develop and strengthen our relations with all countries of the Indian subcontinent. Realism dictates the need to recognize the situation existing on the subcontinent. It dictates the need to admit Bangladesh to the United Nations promptly and as a matter of principle, without any preconditions and subject only to the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter.

300. Realism also obliges us to recognize that the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations and the exercise

of its inherent rights may make a serious contribution to the solution of the existing problems of normalization on the subcontinent. It would certainly create an additional platform for activities towards this end.

301. It is with regret that we have found that the United Nations is not as yet resourceful enough to take the only just and right decision, which would be to admit Bangladesh without further delay. Motivated by the principle of universality of the membership of the United Nations, in accordance with the Charter, and, on the other hand, by the strong desire to overcome as soon as possible the difficulties that still exist with regard to the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations, Poland joined the other 22 countries in sponsoring draft resolution A/L.683 and Add.1, which has just been adopted by the Assembly. It remains our strong hope that Bangladesh will very soon enter our Organization in accordance with that resolution. Poland will spare no effort to have this goal achieved.

Mr. de Guiringaud (France), Vice-President, took the Chair.

302. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey): I should like to explain my Government's position on the result we have just achieved on the issue confronting this General Assembly. At this late hour I will try to be brief and to the point.

303. The two draft resolutions, one relating to the admission of Bangladesh and the other to the prisoners of war and the application of Security Council resolution 307 (1971), and the statement made by the President, illustrate the real character of the problem we are discussing. The question is not merely the admission of a new Member to the United Nations; if it were so, my delegation would not hesitate to give its support to the admission of Bangladesh, as we did to its membership in the specialized agencies. We stated our feelings towards the people of Bangladesh in our explanation of vote on the adoption of agenda item 23 on the admission of new members. I said then:

“Before Bangladesh became a separate State as the result of the tragic events of last year, the deep and warm feelings between my country and Pakistan encompassed all the people of Pakistan regardless of whether they were from the eastern or the western part of the country. Our feelings now towards the people of Bangladesh cannot be any different from those we have for the people of East Pakistan. This alone would be sufficient reason to explain how very anxious Turkey is to see peaceful and friendly relations established between those two countries of the subcontinent.” [2037th meeting, para. 69.]

304. The question we are faced with is more than the admission of a new Member *per se*. The question is also that, although one year has elapsed since the cessation of hostilities on the subcontinent, 90,000 Pakistani prisoners of war have not yet been returned to their homes. This is an unjustifiable situation, from the humanitarian as well as from the legal point of view. It is legally unjustifiable because the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 establish clear norms to be applied in such a situation. Article 118 of the third Geneva Convention stipulates that prisoners of war should be released immediately after the

cessation of hostilities. Moreover, in Security Council resolution 307 (1971) the Geneva Conventions of 1949 are confirmed by an organ of the United Nations whose decisions are binding in character.

305. The situation is even more unacceptable from the humanitarian point of view: 90,000 people are kept prisoner although the war which caused them to be made prisoners of war ended a year ago.

306. Peace is more than the mere absence of war. Peace does not depend only on an agreement or a treaty, or on the formal recognition of a State. Nor is it the admission of one more Member to the United Nations that could achieve peace. Peace means above all putting an end to the human suffering caused by war. This is a very fundamental condition of peace. All other legal and political conditions of peace depend on this very basic humanitarian condition. The existence of a link between putting an end to the prolonged sufferings of 90,000 people and other political matters seems to us beyond doubt because, no matter what we decide, the link is there in a very concrete and self-evident manner. How can we expect to find a political solution which will bring peace to and establish normal conditions in the subcontinent while this anomalous situation relating to prisoners of war continues to prevail?

307. We consider the question of the admission of Bangladesh to United Nations membership against this legal and humanitarian background. Security Council resolution 307 (1971), which calls upon all those concerned to observe the Geneva Conventions of 1949, must, in our view, be respected. My delegation, in its explanation of vote on the adoption of agenda item 23, expressed its doubts about the usefulness of a debate in improving the situation in the subcontinent. It was with this same view that my delegation participated actively in the efforts made to reach a compromise solution in order to avoid a harmful debate which would have further delayed the establishment of normal conditions in the region. As a result of the arduous efforts of delegations representing the authors of both draft resolutions, the compromise formula—which reflected not the full views of the parties but rather certain sacrifices of their official positions—was adopted. The adoption of both resolutions simultaneously has only been possible on the basis of the statement that in his wisdom the President decided to make in order to indicate—and I quote his own words—that:

“It is also generally agreed that the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations should be considered within the framework of an over-all solution of the existing political, legal and humanitarian problems. It is therefore essential to consider that by the simultaneous adoption of these two draft resolutions the interdependence of these two viewpoints will be recognized.”
[*Supra*, para. 155.]

308. The issue of interdependence to which the President referred is the crux of the situation, where Bangladesh on the one hand applies for membership in the United Nations and on the other hand is expected to implement its legal obligations. It will be an act of political realism on the part of Bangladesh, as it aspires to membership in this Organization, to see to it that its record with regard to the

implementation of the decisions of this body becomes crystal-clear.

309. The release and repatriation of the prisoners of war is a legal obligation, regardless of any other consideration on the part of those who detain them, in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Conventions, the interpretation of which leaves room for no equivocation. On this issue the responsible organs of the United Nations have already pronounced themselves. This was the aim and understanding of my delegation when we sponsored the balanced and uncontroversially drafted resolution in document A/L.685, just adopted. It is our sincere hope that the agreement we have reached today will be followed by more substantial agreements among the parties concerned on all pending issues, leading, we hope, to the eventual recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan. But allow me to stress at this juncture that recognition cannot be considered as a legal right in international law. No State can demand it. It is a political option which the State granting recognition may exercise at its own discretion.

310. As my delegation had occasion to express in one of its earlier interventions [*2037th meeting*], the earnest wish of Turkey is that when all obstacles have been removed, we may hope to see the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations unanimously supported.

311. Mr. SZARKA (Hungary): The agenda item relating to the application of Bangladesh for membership was and is quite unambiguous to the Hungarian delegation, a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/L.683 and Add.1, just adopted by consensus.

312. In a letter dated 8 August from the Foreign Minister, Mr. Abdus Samad Azad, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Bangladesh applied for admission to the world Organization [A/8754-S/10759]. As appears clearly from the letter addressed to the Secretary-General, the People's Republic of Bangladesh accepts the obligations contained in the Charter and solemnly declares its readiness to fulfil them. In the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, it cannot be questioned that the People's Republic of Bangladesh completely meets all the requirements that are laid down in Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

313. Those who, in contradiction to the opinion of the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations, disregard the principle of universality in connexion with the admission of Bangladesh and, whatever their reasoning, proceed from their own restricted particular interests, do harm not only to the prestige of the United Nations but also to themselves.

314. There are still other reasons that require the world Organization to find a quick and satisfactory solution to the question of admission. As is well known, during the short time of its existence, the People's Republic of Bangladesh has gained great international prestige. By now, nearly a hundred States belonging to the international community have recognized the new Republic and maintain political, economic, commercial, cultural and other relations with it at various levels. A growing number of international specialized agencies are admitting it to membership. These facts are proof that the international

community regards the People's Republic of Bangladesh as a young, developing country which proclaims as basic principles of its foreign policy the safeguarding of peace, the strengthening of good-neighbourly and friendly relations among countries, and the relaxation of international tensions. The practical implementation of these foreign-policy principles has already been given expression since the formation of the Republic. It is common knowledge that the People's Republic of Bangladesh has made a great many efforts to settle and develop its relations with the neighbouring States of the subcontinent. Its early admission to the world Organization would offer the young Republic still greater opportunities to join as rapidly as possible in the political, economic and cultural life of the international community.

315. From the very first days of the establishment of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, the Hungarian People's Republic has maintained with it, as with other countries of the subcontinent, good, fruitful relations beneficial to the interests of both sides, as well as to the community of nations. We think it is a historic duty of every country to develop such relations, for this is helpful in achieving the definitive liquidation of the colonial heritage in a given region of the world. Since the admission of Hungary to the United Nations, and on the basis of the principled policy of its Government, the Hungarian delegation has always supported the admission of new Members meeting the requirements of the Charter. Standing on that very basis, it is only natural that the Hungarian delegation supports the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations.

316. We are confident that reality and justice will prevail and that the obstacles raised with regard to this question will be overcome, in the interests of all of us and in the interests of our Organization.

317. Mr. PLAKA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has just concluded its consideration of the question entitled "Admission of new Members to the United Nations", by adopting two resolutions which are closely interconnected and interdependent in regard to their implementation.

318. The Albanian delegation would like briefly to explain its attitude in this respect. Indeed, our position on the events which have taken place in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent is well known. It remains unchanged, for nothing has changed in that region since last year, when the General Assembly, by its resolution 2793 (XXVI), requested the two parties involved in the conflict in the subcontinent to withdraw their armed forces from the occupied territories towards their own sides of the frontiers.

319. That resolution, which was adopted after a serious debate by the affirmative vote of 104 Member States, was designed to put an end to the aggression unleashed by India against Pakistan, an aggression which, as is well known, was perpetrated because the Soviet Union incited it and gave it a great variety of support, and which had as a result the dismemberment of a State Member of the United Nations.

320. No one can deny the fact that the continuation of the aggression of last December in the subcontinent, with

all the consequences flowing therefrom, serves the designs of the Soviet social-imperialists, who by this device, in co-operation and concurrently with American imperialism, seek to consolidate their control in this region with a view to attaining their expansionist designs against the freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples of Asia, and in the first place, against the People's Republic of China.

321. The question under consideration, apart from the considerations that have guided its proponents—which we have not failed to bring out—falls within this framework. It can only serve the purposes of the two super-Powers by diverting the attention of world public opinion from the designs of their expansionist policies in the zone of the Indian Ocean, and in particular from the targets of the Soviet social-imperialists who are also attempting to erase the black mark against them resulting from their shameful support last December of the military attack against the sovereignty of an independent State.

322. We have already emphasized in this Assembly that the main problem which concerns us on this question is to ensure peace on the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent and to defend the sovereign rights of the peoples of this region. Accordingly, in our opinion, it remains the imperative duty of the General Assembly to implement its resolution 2793 (XXVI) relating to the Indo-Pakistani conflict, to adopt measures aimed at putting an end to the aggression against Pakistan, and to ensure the withdrawal of Indian troops and the liberation of Pakistani prisoners of war, thereby leaving Pakistani people free to resolve their own domestic problems. That would serve the interests of peace-loving Member States and their desire to continue to strengthen the United Nations.

323. We firmly support the just attitude of principle of the People's Republic of China concerning this question, be it in the Security Council or here in the General Assembly. This position contributes to the strengthening of the effectiveness of our Organization not only because it defends justice and is inspired by the noble objectives of support for the sovereign rights of the Pakistani people, but also because it is in accord with the interests of the cause of freedom and independence against a policy of *diktat* and blackmail of the United States and the Soviet Union.

324. This has further unmasked the position of the Soviet Union on the so-called question of the admission of "Bangladesh" to the United Nations, the aim of which was to legalize a situation created by aggression and place Member States before a fait accompli, thus completely revealing the designs of the Soviet Union to achieve hegemony in this region.

325. In conclusion, the delegation of Albania wishes to reaffirm once again its position on this matter, namely, that it is the duty of the United Nations to ensure observance of the relevant resolutions in the matter so as to protect the sovereign rights of the Pakistani people. That clearly has priority.

326. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (*translation from Russian*): The formation of the People's Republic of Bangladesh is a historic fact recognized by the overwhelming majority of States of the world, including two

thirds of the States Members of the United Nations. Mongolia was among the first to recognize the People's Republic of Bangladesh and to establish friendly relations with it. The authority and position of the People's Republic of Bangladesh are increasing and growing stronger every day, as is shown, in particular, by the fact that the draft resolution concerning the admission of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations was submitted by States having different social structures and representing the five continents of the world.

327. The People's Republic of Bangladesh has proclaimed, as the basis of its foreign policy, the principles of non-alignment and the development of friendly co-operation with other States, and has declared itself to be in favour of the strengthening of peace and international security. As the Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Mr. Mujibur Rahman, stated:

"My Government follows a policy of non-alignment in international affairs. But the policy of non-alignment which we have in mind does not imply an inactive, passive policy. We are striving to play a positive role in the international community in the interests of maintaining universal peace and security."

328. The People's Republic of Bangladesh is directing its efforts towards the speedy elimination of the dire consequences of the recent events in the India-Pakistan subcontinent and the normalization of relations among all the countries of that region.

329. All this indicates that the People's Republic of Bangladesh fully meets all the conditions required by the United Nations Charter of States wishing to be admitted to the Organization. There is no doubt that this peace-loving State will know how to carry out its obligations arising out of membership in the United Nations and will make its worthy contribution to the solution of important tasks confronting our Organization.

330. Guided by the foregoing, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the People's Republic of Bangladesh has an unquestionable right to become a Member of our Organization and it supports the application of Bangladesh for membership in the United Nations. No conditions whatsoever should be attached to meeting the request of Bangladesh.

331. The admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations would be an important, positive factor which would contribute to the normalization of the situation in the India-Pakistan subcontinent and to the solution of the problems still pending there, and would assist in strengthening peace throughout the world.

332. The realization of the legitimate right of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations would also help to enhance the prestige and effectiveness of the work of our Organization. Our delegation cannot fail to express its profound regret over the fact that the question of the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations has been postponed as a result of the obstructionist attitude of the People's Republic of China. That position shows the true

face of those who by their words parade as the best friends of peoples fighting for freedom and independence, but who, by their deeds, jeopardize the interests of those peoples.

333. We are convinced that, in spite of any obstacles, justice will triumph and the People's Republic of Bangladesh will take its lawful place in the United Nations.

334. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to convey to the President of the General Assembly the warmest congratulations of the Tunisian delegation on the success he has just achieved through the unanimous adoption, without debate, of the two draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 23.

335. I avail myself of this pleasant opportunity to pay a tribute to the spirit of co-operation of the sponsors of these draft resolutions. We are especially gratified at the encouraging attitude of our brothers and friends, the members of the delegation of Pakistan and the observers from Bangladesh, who have enabled us to avoid confrontation on a problem which was made complex and delicate by political circumstances and which, furthermore, does not leave us indifferent. Quite the contrary.

336. In co-operation with other delegations, the Tunisian delegation, in a spirit of brotherhood with the two delegations concerned and also because of its devotion to the principles of the Charter, has attempted to advise understanding and compromise so as to safeguard the chances of co-operation that sooner or later—and the sooner the better—will be established between the parties concerned.

337. We applaud the efforts made by the Secretary-General to that end and we shall continue to support such efforts. We believe that by adopting these two resolutions by consensus the General Assembly has clearly expressed the hope that Bangladesh will be admitted to the United Nations and, furthermore, that the prisoners of war will be released as soon as possible, so that the process of co-operation between the parties concerned may develop harmoniously and with a view to the solution of pending issues and the establishment of links based on mutual respect.

338. We hope that the realization of the wishes expressed by the General Assembly in two different resolutions will contribute to the creation of a climate of confidence and co-operation on the Asian subcontinent. The admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations may effectively contribute to the solution of some of the pending problems. The liberation of prisoners and the urgent solution of humanitarian problems in general may well help to turn the page of a conflict whose operational aspects have fortunately come to an end.

339. Let us therefore address a pressing appeal to the parties concerned—especially Pakistan and Bangladesh—to work, in a spirit of mutual respect, for the establishment of true co-operation between them. We also address an appeal to the members of the Security Council, and in particular to the great Powers, to help the parties concerned, to

embark without delay upon the process of mutual co-operation by promoting the rapid implementation of the objectives set forth in the two resolutions we have just adopted.

340. We have already learned with interest of the decisions taken by both sides to release the wives and children of prisoners. We are convinced that the task of the members of the Council will be facilitated by the climate of détente that—in addition to the recent initiatives—the parties will help to create in the future through other actions and decisions which fall within the context of the spirit of the consensus announced today and which could well be a prelude, let us hope, to another consensus, on the actual admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations as well as the admission of other countries whose entry into the United Nations can only strengthen our Organization and help us achieve our objective of universality for the United Nations.

341. Mr. KANKA (Czechoslovakia) (*translation from Russian*): The existence of the People's Republic of Bangladesh is an undeniable reality which is in fact not doubted by anyone. This fact is also reflected in draft resolution A/L.583 that has just been adopted. The People's Republic of Bangladesh has now been recognized by 91 States, and many of those States, including the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, have established diplomatic as well as trade and other relations with it. This is a clear expression of the will of the international community to admit Bangladesh to the family of nations. This has been confirmed also by the fact that Bangladesh, with the support of the majority of member States, has been admitted as a full-fledged member of various international organizations and organs of the United Nations system. The participation of Bangladesh in these organizations is evidence of the readiness of its Government to carry out, with full responsibility, the obligations it has assumed. At the same time, this reflects the conviction of broad sections of the international community that the Government of Bangladesh is ready and able to play an active role in international peaceful co-operation.

342. All the delegations present in this hall are well aware of the fact that the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh has on several occasions clearly stated that it recognizes the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and that it is also acceding to a number of international conventions of a humanitarian character. Both the principles of foreign policy proclaimed by the Government of Bangladesh and its practical activities are evidence of the fact that that State is guided by the principles of the Charter, the principles of non-interference and friendly relations with all countries of the world, and that it is vitally interested, from the point of view of its domestic as well as its foreign interests and needs, in peaceful development in Asia and throughout the world. That is why to continue to deny the People's Republic of Bangladesh, which is the eighth largest country in the world in terms of population, the right to participate in the work of the United Nations is, in the view of the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, contrary to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, which establishes no conditions for admission to membership in the Organiza-

tion other than those set out in Article 4, paragraph 1, according to which:

“Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations”.

A situation whereby the People's Republic of Bangladesh is denied the right to become a Member of the United Nations is also a violation of the principle of universal representation in the United Nations, a principle whose observance Czechoslovakia has always advocated. This principle was once again reaffirmed in the Declaration adopted on 12 August 1972 at the recent Georgetown Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries. The Czechoslovak delegation is firmly in favour of the speedy admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations on the understanding that no obstacles should be placed in the way of the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations.

343. The Czechoslovak delegation is firmly in favour of the speedy admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations and considers that no conditions should be laid down for the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations.

344. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to express its satisfaction at the consensus that was reached concerning the simultaneous adoption of the two draft resolutions, one expressing the wish of the General Assembly to see Bangladesh admitted to the United Nations at an early date and the other wishing to see the prisoners returned immediately to their homes.

345. My delegation wishes also to convey to the President of the General Assembly the expression of our gratitude for the well-balanced manner in which he summed up the different aspects of the consensus vis-à-vis the different views before us. All delegations here know that such a procedure was possible only after lengthy and sometimes difficult negotiations. The remarks of the President accordingly reflect a very delicate balance, and I do not believe it useful to attempt to interpret them one way or the other. It is desirable to take them as they are.

346. Furthermore, the purpose of this Assembly in adopting the two draft resolutions simultaneously by consensus is not to give satisfaction to one point of view over the other. The purpose of the consensus that has been reached is essentially to recall all the problems that exist in the Indian subcontinent and thus to create a favourable climate for their peaceful solution.

347. Some of the interpretations given by representatives who preceded me, in particular as regards the return of prisoners, do not appear to me to be in keeping with what the President of the General Assembly told us, nor to correspond to the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Conventions.

348. However, without pressing the point, I should like to recall that the problem of prisoners is an eminently

humanitarian one and, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.685 and Add.1, I feel that the solution of that humanitarian problem should brook no delay, and this regardless of the reasons.

349. My delegation, like most of the previous speakers, is pleased with the latest events in the subcontinent. I shall not describe those events in detail because of the lateness of the hour.

350. My delegation is happy also with the consensus we have achieved. My delegation hopes that this climate of co-operation will help to solve all problems rapidly. It is in that spirit that I had the honour to work with other

ambassadors, and in particular the representatives of the parties concerned, these past few days. My delegation undertook this exercise and these efforts only in the hope that the spirit of understanding that had emerged would continue and make it possible at last to return to a normal situation in the Indian subcontinent.

351. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I have no doubt that the Secretariat will inform Mr. Trepczyński of the thanks and praise addressed to him by many speakers.

The meeting rose at 8.50 p.m.