



## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 123: The situation in Kampuchea ( <i>concluded</i> ).....	1271

**President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM**  
(United Republic of Tanzania)

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon), Vice-President, took the Chair.-*

## AGENDA ITEM 123

The situation in Kampuchea (*concluded*)

1. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): There can be no doubt that the General Assembly is discussing a grave and serious problem, which perhaps constitutes one of the most fundamental issues before the General Assembly. The situation in Kampuchea not only has far-reaching implications for regional and international peace and security; at the same time it also engulfs a number of basic principles that are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

2. I should like briefly to refer to all of those aspects. They are: first, the principle that all Members of the United Nations shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State; secondly, the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples; thirdly, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States; fourthly, the principle of universal respect for the observance and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all; and fifthly, the principle of international human solidarity with those suffering from hunger.

3. Austria forcefully condemns the foreign military intervention in Kampuchea. That intervention was carried out in violation of the territorial integrity and political sovereignty of Kampuchea and stands in flagrant contradiction to the right to self-determination of the people of Kampuchea.

4. Austria condemns with the same vigour the continued interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation, an interference which has led to the establishment of the Heng Samrin régime.

5. At the same time, Austria condemns in the strongest possible terms the outrageous violations and

disregard of the most basic human rights, which characterized the unacceptable pattern of behaviour of the Pol Pot régime. I wish to refer in this context to Austria's active sponsorship of the relevant draft resolution submitted to the Human Rights Commission last year — document E/C N.4/L.1402 — which called for an investigation of the human rights situation in Kampuchea.

6. The Austrian delegation recognizes the fact that the current situation in Kampuchea warrants political assessment by the General Assembly and we are aware that this debate is conceived with that task as a goal.

7. However, we cannot overlook the devastating situation in Kampuchea, the apocalyptic proportions of human suffering and the senseless sacrifice of human life among a people with a noble tradition, which are now faced with extinction by war, famine and disease.

8. Our first and foremost objective therefore is to save the remnants of the Kampuchean nation from total annihilation, alleviate the tremendous suffering and render humanitarian help. It is precisely because of these humanitarian considerations that we feel obliged to participate in this debate. If we do not put an end to warfare and foreign interference, we shall not be in a position to secure the basic rights of the Kampuchean people and, indeed, their very survival as a nation.

9. We therefore call upon all nations directly and indirectly involved in the conflict to refrain from the further use of force and to respect the right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination.

10. At the same time, we repeat our call to all countries in a position to do so to join in the international relief effort that is being mounted within the framework of the United Nations, as a necessary corollary of this political action.

11. We should like, in this context, to express to the Secretary-General of the United Nations our appreciation of his successful effort in convening the Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the People of Kampuchea,<sup>1</sup> which has produced encouraging results. What is needed now is the good will of those concerned in order to ensure absolutely that all Kampuchean benefit from those international relief efforts.

12. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): My delegation is speaking on the item "The situation in Kampuchea" rather reluctantly, especially in the light of what preceded the inclusion of that question on the agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. As members know, that item was proposed by a certain number of countries of the South-East Asian region [A/34/191].

<sup>1</sup> See document SG/CONF.1/SR. 1 and 2.

In this connexion, we wish to express our amazement at the short-sightedness of some who apparently are unaware of the game they are being pushed into and are, involuntarily or willingly, offering a helping hand in uncorking the bottle and letting the jinnee escape, with all the incalculable consequences.

13. For we all know only too well that practically every nation represented in this Assembly has condemned the Pol Pot clique or, to say the least, nurtures no sympathy whatsoever for it. Everyone is fully aware, even if some do not make public statements to that effect, that the ignominious former régime had to be stopped precisely in order to save the future of the Kampuchean people as a nation, that a dark page in that country's history has definitely been turned and that a new era has now been ushered into Kampuchea.

14. Let us say quite frankly that our delegation does not consider it useful to discuss that question here in the way the initiators of the agenda item intended to tackle it. We see the introduction of that question on our agenda as brazen interference in the internal affairs of that country, the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

15. What purpose does that proposal serve? What do its authors want to discuss? Do they want to cast doubt on the maturity of the Khmer people and its willingness to get rid of the tyrannical régime that oppressed it and to build, with the help of its friends, a new, independent and peace-loving State on the ruins of what remains in that country? Or do they still intend to speak of the so-called foreign armed intervention, occupation and domination of Kampuchea? The question inevitably comes to mind whether those who make such assertions really think they are helping to promote justice, progress and human rights, in short, the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. I wonder if it is possible to adopt a purely legalistic standpoint on this issue and to remain blind to the highly political relevance of the matter.

16. Let me refer in this context to the statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister of the Central African Republic in the general debate last October [32nd meeting] when he spoke, among other things, of his bitter disappointment over the silence of the United Nations in the face of the massive and flagrant violations of human rights in his country. We also drew our attention to the need for greater awareness by the United Nations of cases of entire populations being victims of genocide, torture or killing at the hands of a brutal, oppressive dictator. The Permanent Representative of Uganda, in his recent intervention in the Third Committee of the General Assembly,<sup>2</sup> spoke likewise of the silence of the United Nations while Governments represented within this Organization continue to perpetrate atrocities against their own peoples.

17. Should we then continue this gloomy pattern of behaviour and close our eyes to a new manifestation of the terrible experience of ruthless dictatorship?

18. Is it that the promoters of this discussion wish to speak of the situation in Kampuchea as inherited from the defunct régime of the infamous rulers of "Demo-

cratic Kampuchea"? Do they want to speak about the untold sufferings of the people of that country, of the total disruption of normal life left behind by the Pol Pot clique?

19. If that is the case, let us then discuss the formidable difficulties facing Kampuchea now and the means of surmounting them. Let us talk about our actual contribution to the enjoyment by the Kampuchean people of their right to self-determination, to security and tranquillity in the region. This would quite obviously require the presence of the régime which is effectively exercising power throughout the country, i.e. of the representatives of the People's Revolutionary Council, the sole legitimate representative of the Khmer people, since it is that people which is primarily interested in the recovery and reconstruction of Kampuchea. To conduct such a discussion without the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea would be nonsense; it would singularly limit the scope of our discussion and, last but not least, would constitute a violation of the sovereign rights of that country and be tantamount to interference in its domestic affairs.

20. My country, Hungary, did not wait until the recent convening of the Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief for the People of Kampuchea to offer and forward its assistance to that country. After the overthrow of the despotic rulers of Kampuchea, my Government was among the first to recognize the People's Republic of Kampuchea; it has pursued a consistent policy of aid to the new régime in Phnom Penh and will continue to act in the same way in the future as well.

21. We are saddened to state that there are some circles in and outside the region which, by their actions, do not promote but, on the contrary, impede peaceful development in Indo-China and obstruct the efforts of the countries of that region to overcome, once and for all, the consequences of one of the most barbaric wars in recent times, a war that has been imposed on them by one of the most powerful industrial nations of the world.

22. During this debate there have been frequent references to the root causes of what has been occurring lately in that part of the world. And it is very singular that the memory of some speakers has proved surprisingly short, as they apparently fail to remember the dramatic events that shook the region and actually the whole world, the cruel and highly sophisticated war machinery set in motion against those countries, the assistance rendered by some of the most fervent advocates of the so-called political solution in Kampuchea to the process of extermination so skilfully conducted in Indo-China by a huge army coming from the other side of the ocean.

23. Is there anyone who would deny that the root causes of the present tragedy in South-East Asia, of the death and destruction, misery and displacement of persons, can without any hesitation be traced back to that wide-scale aggression against the region, to the decade-long struggle of the heroic people of Indo-China to repulse all kinds of imperialism—a struggle which culminated in their resistance to foreign intruders and their local puppets in the 1960s and the 1970s.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty Fourth Session, Third Committee, 28th meeting, paras. 29-33, and ibid., Third Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.*

24. To evoke the underlying causes of the present situation in Kampuchea by saying, as did the representative of the United States, that the so-called Vietnamese occupation has been responsible for the immense sufferings and loss of lives among the Khmer civilian population, that it has made more bitter the tragedy of that people and has escalated the destruction of life and property; to depict, furthermore, the situation of humanitarian relief efforts by expressing special concern at the implications of the increasing Vietnamese offensive in western Kampuchea and by declaring that that Vietnamese offensive undermines the ability of the international community to save the Khmer people—all this is as incorrect as it is untrue of the whole situation. It is also rather strange to hear the same representative assert that:

“...if Vietnam is allowed to invade, to occupy and to impose a régime in Kampuchea...what country can feel certain that a dispute with a more powerful neighbour will be resolved not by force, but by peaceful means?” [64th meeting, para. 13.]

I must confess that I cannot help recalling the rather hectic chapters of the recent and less recent history of the country he represents, which are characterized by repeated efforts—some of them successful—to impose its will on others and to solve its disputes with other countries by force.

25. The same can be said of another country which, speaking of emerging regional hegemonism and pointing to Viet Nam—as it rehashes the dusty tale about “an Indo-China Federation” allegedly plotted by that country—and making much noise over the necessity of “preventing the relief materials from falling into the hands of the Vietnamese aggressor forces”, must be confusing the roles, because if there is regional or other hegemonism or plots to control others, they come from nowhere but Peking [*Beijing*].

26. We had no intention of opening up already closed pages of recent history and we are whole-heartedly for understanding and mutually beneficial co-operation among all the States and nations of the area. But we felt compelled to remind ourselves of the historical truth, in view of some repeated assertions contradicting that truth, when responsibilities seemed to vanish and the blame was put on those who, having withstood the assault of imperialist and reactionary forces, are now embarking on the peaceful reconstruction of their countries and need peace more than anything else.

27. The whole well-orchestrated campaign against the Indo-Chinese countries, especially Vietnam, reveals a great deal of hypocrisy on the part of those who, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, join this doubtful endeavour. Even the humanitarian question is utilized by some of them only to appease their guilty consciences, to conceal their share of responsibility and, perhaps, to take revenge in this way for their past errors and crimes.

28. Finally, I should like to comment on the draft resolutions before the Assembly. Draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, which was presented by a number of countries, would take us, in our opinion, in an utterly wrong direction. Its advocacy of the theory of “two ad-

ministrations” or, as it is called in the draft, of “all parties to the conflict” and its insistence on a so-called political solution to settle the non-existent question of “the situation in Kampuchea”, far from reflect the reality in that country, do not in any way contribute to the appeasement of passions, make it even more difficult to erase the names of the oppressors of the Kampuchean people from contemporary history, place the authors of this draft resolution on the side of the genocidal régime of Pol Pot and present them as opponents of the emergence of a strong and independent Kampuchea. For these reasons, it is quite understandable that my delegation cannot endorse that proposal.

29. On the other hand, since its over-all assessment of the situation in Kampuchea coincides with our general appraisal of the evolution of events in that part of the world, the proposal contained in document A/34/L.7/Rev.1, and Add. 1 enjoys the support of my delegation. Therefore we have become a sponsor of it, and we strongly recommend it to the General Assembly for adoption.

30. To conclude, my delegation has also noted the proposal presented by the representative of India in document A/34/L.38, with the explanation presented by the Indian delegation to accompany it. We have no objection to the General Assembly’s examination of this proposal separately from those which have been submitted by other countries.

31. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR was against the inclusion, in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly, of the item entitled “The situation in Kampuchea”. We continue to believe that there are absolutely no grounds whatsoever for including this item. Discussion of the question of the situation in Kampuchea without the consent of the People’s Revolutionary Council, the sole legal Government of the people of Kampuchea, and without the participation of its representatives here must be construed as nothing less than a gross violation of the sovereignty of the Kampuchean people and interference in its internal affairs. We regard it as completely inadmissible that their place in the United Nations should be occupied by people who represent a régime which has long been overthrown and condemned by the Kampuchean people.

32. We have listened very carefully to this discussion. What has it shown? Approximately 50 countries have taken part in the discussion of the so-called “question of the situation in Kampuchea”. Only one delegation has openly come to the defence of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime which has been overthrown. There were no other overt advocates of that clique of executioners and murderers. The misdeeds of the Pol Pot régime are too obvious and undeniable for anyone to be so bold as openly to defend it. All the other delegations quite properly condemned the crimes of the Pol Pot régime committed against their people.

33. At the same time we noted that a number of delegations, particularly those of certain States of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] and Western States, while condemning the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime, attempted to convince the Assembly that

the assistance rendered by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to the Kampuchean people adversely affected the situation in that country.

34. Is it really possible to aggravate further the situation of a people that has already suffered genocide, when in the course of a few years almost one half the population of the country has been destroyed, that is, 3 million people out of 7 million?

35. The very same delegations, while referring to the norms of international law, tried to prove the illegality of the assistance that the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam rendered to Kampuchea. However, contemporary international law recognizes that States are obliged to render assistance to those peoples that are struggling for their liberation. Numerous resolutions to that effect have been adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

36. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has given and continues to give assistance to the Kampuchean people, at the request and with the consent of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea and then at the request the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, in accordance with the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between Viet Nam and Kampuchea, done on 18 February 1979 [A/34/94-S/13101, annex] which clearly defines the conditions which should govern relations between the two Governments and, in particular, the conditions in which assistance should be rendered by Viet Nam.

37. In this connexion, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR, like many others, is firmly convinced that there is no particular "Kampuchean problem" which requires the intervention of the United Nations. The "Kampuchean problem" has already been resolved by the people of Kampuchea themselves and that irrevocably. The freedom-loving Kampuchean people have overthrown the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime. The People's Revolutionary Council which has been established in Phnom Penh is the only legitimate Government of the young Republic, the genuine spokesman for and champion of the interests of the people of Kampuchea. It exercises control over the entire territory of the country and it governs all activities as far as domestic policy and foreign policy are concerned. Naturally, only the representatives of the Kampuchean people—that is, the People's Revolutionary Council—can represent it in international relations and speak on its behalf in the United Nations and other international organizations.

38. At the present time, the efforts of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea are aimed at offsetting the after-effects of more than three years of out-and-out genocide and terror inflicted on that people by the bloody régime of Peking's [Beijing's] puppets. Life in the country is returning to normal. Factories and plants are being reopened, as well as schools and health services, and also the living conditions of the inhabitants are being stabilized and improved.

39. The attempts to impose on the People's Republic of Kampuchea a sort of "international settlement" constitute intervention in the internal affairs of the Kampuchean people. Essentially such a "settlement" would mean rehabilitating one of the most barbaric régimes in the history of mankind, which euphemistically might be referred to or is referred to as one of the "parties to the

conflict". As the People's Revolutionary Tribunal showed in Phnom Penh, the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique organized a deliberate mass destruction of completely innocent people, evicted the population from towns, concentrated all the inhabitants of the country in forced-labour camps and destroyed the economic and cultural structure of the country and family and social relationships. Such actions by that régime which has been overthrown by the Kampuchean people are a blatant violation of the rules of international law elaborated by the United Nations, in particular the provisions of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide [resolution 260A (III), annex].

40. The victory of the Kampuchean people put an end to the monstrous "social experiment" carried out from 1975 to 1979 by Peking and its henchmen. The Chinese leadership had hoped to turn the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime into an instrument for the implementation of its own expansionist designs. It supplied it with weapons and sent into Kampuchea thousands of its advisers. It must, first and foremost, bear responsibility for the attempt to inflame a new hotbed of tension in Indo-China and to bring about armed conflict between Kampuchea and socialist Viet Nam.

41. However, the Kampuchean people thwarted the dark designs in South-East Asia of the ruling circles in Peking. Rather than being an instrument for unleashing war in Indo-China, Kampuchea has turned into an active factor for peace and stability in that part of the world. There are now prospects that there will be established in South-East Asia a state of lasting peace and security and broad international co-operation. The peace-loving foreign policy pursued by the People's Republic of Kampuchea is in accordance with the desire to develop good-neighbourly relations among all peoples in that area. Its policy, which is based on principles that dictate respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as friendship and co-operation, has earned the respect of many countries. More than 30 States in the world have stated that they recognize the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

42. The People's Republic of Kampuchea is at present going through a very difficult period in trying to overcome the after-effects of United States aggression and Maoist experiments and needs selfless and vigorous assistance in restoring its shattered economy to enable it to re-establish speedily normal conditions for those who have survived destruction. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the United Nations should give all necessary assistance to help in the national rebirth of the Kampuchean people. That will be feasible if the General Assembly endorses the draft resolution submitted by a number of non-aligned and socialist countries in document A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1. Draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, which has been submitted on the initiative of the countries members of ASEAN, is unacceptable to our delegation, since it is intended essentially to justify the criminal régime of Pol Pot by giving it the innocent appellation of "party to the conflict", which is blasphemy vis-à-vis the Kampuchean people.

43. We understand that, in considering the draft resolutions, the President will abide by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, in particular rule 91. We consider that the request for priority for draft

resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 is not supported by any convincing reason.

44. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): When, at the outset of this session [4th meeting], the General Assembly discussed the report of the Credentials Committee, almost every speaker who approved the credentials of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime condemned the atrocities it committed against the Kampuchean people. Yet today, when the Kampuchean people is once again living in peace and tranquillity under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Council, those same delegations have nothing to say but to call for the restoration of the *status quo ante*. What is more, some of them, occasionally under the guise of humanitarian assistance, are actually supporting and giving sanctuary to the defunct and decimated Pol Pot forces.

45. We are now being asked to discuss an item which they call "The situation in Kampuchea", an item that should have been inscribed on our agenda when over 3 million Kampucheans were murdered in cold blood; when millions of people were evacuated from their houses in the cities to be subjected to hard labour in the countryside; when schools, hospitals, pagodas and modern institutions were literally abolished; when the agricultural and industrial infrastructure of Kampuchea was destroyed, and when a whole people was subjected to genocide and famine.

46. Thanks to the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea, the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime has forever become a thing of the past. Kampuchea is now at peace, and its people, under the vanguard leadership of the People's Revolutionary Council, is reconstructing a country which was viciously obliterated, not by United States bombs this time, but by an undeclared internal war waged by bloody tyrants against a peaceful people.

47. The international community is morally bound to render political support and economic assistance to the new Kampuchea, which is linked to its neighbours in Viet Nam and Laos by bonds of friendship and an historic legacy of common struggle against imperialism and alien domination.

48. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia): The decision denying the seat of Kampuchea to its legitimate Government, followed by the consideration of agenda item 123, entitled "The situation in Kampuchea", in the absence of the legitimate representatives of that country, has put this Assembly in a situation which, to say the least, is incredibly curious.

49. The plight of the Kampuchean people is indeed tragic and deserves the full attention of the international community. Yet it is strange that a group of individuals with fraudulent credentials ostensibly issued by a defunct régime that does not even have a mailing address of its own, let alone a territory to control, should be allowed not only to occupy the seat of the State of Kampuchea but also to engage in slanderous campaigns against some Member States that have contributed so much to the struggle of oppressed peoples throughout the world.

50. That, in our view, does not augur well for the effective functioning of our Organization. Moreover, it is

a desecration of the memory of the Kampucheans that have fallen prey to the genocidal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime. The United Nations is, after all, composed of States and not of overthrown régimes or cliques disowned by their own peoples. So-called Democratic Kampuchea is simply a legal fiction that serves neither the well-being of the people of Kampuchea nor the maintenance of peace and security in the region. It would be in the enlightened self-interest of the countries of the region and, indeed, of the international community at large to put an end to this illegal state of affairs.

51. The smoke-screen of alleged foreign intervention, devised as a means of exercising gross duplicity, has provided a convenient opportunity for the fugitives from justice not only to avoid facing the consequences of their crimes against their own people, but also to bamboozle the international community. This insolence cannot constitute a precedent, nor should it be allowed to continue, if the world is to be spared from a dangerous confrontation.

52. My delegation has strongly opposed the usurpation of the seat of Kampuchea and will continue to resist all manoeuvres aimed at maintaining this illegal state of affairs. Likewise, we consider it inappropriate and contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations to take up the consideration of a situation in a sovereign State Member of this Organization against the expressed will of its people, in wilful disregard of their aspirations and with the exclusion of their legitimate representatives. We believe that such an exercise as we have been engaged in during the past few days will tend to undermine the effectiveness of the United Nations and further aggravate and polarize the situation in the region concerned. And this would only serve the selfish interests of imperialism and international reaction by creating favourable conditions for the advancement of their exploitation and hegemonistic ambition.

53. It is therefore imperative that the consideration of this item and the recommendations that will emanate from our present debate be focused on measures aimed at mitigating the suffering caused as the result of the inhuman policy of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime and its mentors. The international community should on this occasion demonstrate its solidarity with the suffering masses of Kampuchea and support them in their most difficult hour. It is in this spirit that my delegation is participating in the debate on this item. We shall accordingly oppose all measures intended to justify interference in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and any manoeuvres aimed at infringing upon the sovereign rights of its legally established Government.

54. A discussion by the General Assembly of the situation in Kampuchea would have been in order at the time when that country was the victim of imperialist aggression, at the time when, at the instigation of expansionist Powers, the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime committed a series of armed attacks and incursions into the territories of neighbouring States, at the time when the extermination of minorities and all progressive elements in Kampuchea was the order of the day. If such a debate had taken place then, and firm action taken by the international community, perhaps millions of innocent lives could have been saved and the world could have been spared the agony of witnessing the near extinction of a heroic people.

55. The famine and other difficulties faced by the Kampuchean people today are a direct consequence of the retrograde policy of a brutal régime that served foreign interests alone. In order to impose its own wicked and backward conception of society, this clique tore apart the very fabric of social life in Kampuchea, thereby destroying life and property, uprooting people and subjecting them to genocide and famine. More than 3 million persons are reported to have perished as a result of the criminal policy of Pol Pot and his clique. The brutality of that régime was indeed beyond description in magnitude. It has been unanimously condemned by all Governments and organizations. It is ironic, however, that its agents should continue to get support in their fraudulent claim of representing a people they had so mercilessly oppressed, while the victims are left to the vagaries of rhetoric and meaningless gestures.

56. It is in recognition of the basic rights of people to determine their own future and in the full awareness of the positive trends now prevailing in that country, that socialist Ethiopia has extended full diplomatic recognition to the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, represented by the People's Revolutionary Council. It is in the same spirit of solidarity that my delegation sponsored draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1. We strongly believe that the adoption of this draft resolution would go a long way in ameliorating the explosive situation in the region and in bringing peace and stability to the area.

57. Mr. Dago TSHERING (Bhutan): The General Assembly is taking up the serious threat to peace and stability caused by the situation in Kampuchea. The reason why so many representatives have gathered here to consider the item is that we all share a common obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to promote international peace and security and the well-being of all peoples. Indeed, we are here to fulfil this common obligation and to combine our efforts to deliver mankind from the scourge of war.

58. But today we find that the people of Kampuchea are not only facing war but also that their very existence is threatened. If there is no such threat to their survival, we fail to understand the cause of the exodus out of Kampuchea in the wake of recent instability in the area.

59. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, while announcing the Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the People of Kampuchea in a telegram sent to States Members of the United Nations, stated that the people of Kampuchea are

“ . . . facing suffering, misery and deprivation on a massive scale, including disastrous shortages of food, medical supplies, shelter and transport. There is appalling malnutrition, particularly among the children, 90 per cent of whom are severely malnourished.”

60. The paper entitled “Background information in connexion with the Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the People of Kampuchea”, contained in document SG/CONF.1/1 and Corr.1 under the heading “UNHCR programme”, reported that there had been a huge new influx of Kampuchean into Thailand. Almost 200,000 had arrived in October alone, having suffered the destructive consequences of war,

famine and disease. It further predicted that over 100,000 more would arrive in the very near future.

61. On 5 November, the representative of Thailand, while speaking at the Pledging Conference for Kampuchea, said that

“ . . . as many as 300,000 men, women and children in the vicinity of the Thai-Kampuchean border are poised right now to enter Thailand if there is any flare-up in the fighting. The human tide arriving in Thailand is growing larger, not receding.”<sup>3</sup>

62. So much suffering has been caused to so many people in so short a time. We in Bhutan, a Buddhist country, look at humanitarian problems with sorrow and compassion. We appreciate the admirable efforts made by all concerned to alleviate the tragic human suffering.

63. Innocent people continue to suffer in that ravaged land of Kampuchea. The situation demands immediate humanitarian aid for the hapless people, on a non-partisan basis. The positive response by the international community at the Pledging Conference for emergency relief held last week was encouraging, with pledges amounting to \$210 million. Like many Member States, we too believe that all concerned should cooperate fully with international organizations in facilitating the distribution of supplies on the basis of arrangements which would assure the world that those supplies would arrive in the hands of the suffering civilians for whom they were destined.

64. Human suffering, whether in South-East Asia or in any other part of our planet, cannot be eradicated unless the underlying problems are resolved. In this respect, we cannot condone the suffering inflicted by the Pol Pot régime or the use of force by any State, under any circumstances, to resolve problems. The international community must help to find a peaceful solution. In order that there might be movement towards such a peaceful settlement of the problem, the people of Kampuchea must be allowed to determine their destiny without outside interference. We believe that Kampuchea has the same right to independence and integrity as all other States.

65. The Kingdom of Bhutan attaches great importance to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and the aims of the non-aligned movement. Article 1 of the United Nations Charter stated the first purpose of the Organization as being:

“To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.”

66. At their Sixth Conference, held from 3 to 9 September of this year at Havana, the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries declared that

<sup>3</sup> For the summary record of this statement, see document SG/CONF.1, SR.1, para. 46.

those countries should act even more resolutely against threats, attacks and acts of pressure, domination, subversion and interference in their internal affairs, and reaffirmed the need for the non-aligned countries to respond to those problems with courage and solidarity [A/34/542, annex].

67. It is in view of these principles that His Majesty the King of Bhutan, when addressing the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, said:

“We are concerned with the increasing tensions and conflicts in South-East Asia which jeopardize peace and stability in the region. It is our firm belief and conviction that intervention in the internal affairs of States cannot be justified under any circumstances whatsoever, as it goes counter to the sovereign inalienable right of every State to determine its own social, economic and political system, and to manage its own affairs. Furthermore, as the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States lies at the very heart of non-alignment, any such interference would be all the more reprehensible if it were committed by a member of our Movement. We hope that the aspirations of the countries of the region for peace and stability will be realized on the basis of the non-alignment principles of respect for sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, non-use of force and non-aggression.”

These principles will guide us in taking a position on the three draft resolutions before the Assembly.

68. Mr. ROMULO (Philippines): We have had an historic and important debate which it is my privilege to close. We have heard the statements of many national delegations about the situation in Kampuchea. The consensus is that we have in Kampuchea a human catastrophe of the first order. Few will deny that it is the most terrible which has occurred in our generation. The only other event in our century to match it was the holocaust a generation ago during the Second World War.

69. In Kampuchea, the tragedy continues even as we speak these words. It may get worse when the dry season begins and the clash of armies and guerrillas mounts in fury on that already ravaged land. It may get even worse—to what degree we shudder to think—if other and more powerful antagonists join the fray.

70. In more ways than one, Kampuchea is a clear and present danger to the peace and security of the entire region, as to the world as a whole. But even more, given the existence of the starving and disease-stricken millions within Kampuchea and spilling over its borders, the situation in Kampuchea is a reproach to mankind, a burden on our conscience that I am certain we shall not want to live with, and that will belie our protestations of compassion on some future occasion if we fail to act on the situation before us now.

*Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) took the Chair.*

71. It is a small comfort to note that we have already recognized the urgent need to act and, as in the case of

the refugees who come by sea, we have already had innumerable meetings and have acted, where material needs are the immediate question, to make goods and funds available. Just a week ago, at the behest of the Secretary-General, we held a Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the People of Kampuchea at which 50 nations made funds available to the agencies charged with the task of meeting this problem in the field. But all this is not enough. For the problem is not only to make available funds and goods and to transport them to the site; the problem is not only to ensure that the funds and goods go to those who need them most, without discrimination of any kind; the problem, in the final analysis, is how to ensure that starvation and disease do not ramify into political and military fratricide, local wars into a geopolitical convulsion in which great Powers become involved and, conversely, how to ensure that political considerations do not produce more suffering and death.

72. In the situation before us, let us distinguish between elementary human needs and the more complex demands of politics and ideology, but let us also not forget that eventually one affects the other.

73. It is in the light of this, and anticipating the growing seriousness of the problem, that the five members of ASEAN in August of this year, decided to request the inscription of this item on the agenda of the thirty-fourth regular session of the General Assembly [A/34/191] and to appeal to all Member States to approve a resolution, a draft of which is before us as document A/34/L.13/Rev.2, which we and the other sponsors, numbering 30 in all, sincerely believe will be a positive step not only towards alleviating the immediate human needs of the Kampuchean population, but also towards establishing the framework and conditions for resolving the more intricate political questions involved, through firm actions by the United Nations and the Secretary-General.

74. Members also have before them two other draft resolutions, A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1, sponsored by 19 nations, and A/34/L.38, sponsored by one nation. It is obvious from careful examination of our draft resolution, which takes precedence under the rules of procedure, and the other two draft resolutions, that our draft resolution is the only one that meets all the requirements of a more lasting solution to this problem, just as it meets the most urgent and immediate need for humanitarian action. There are a number of compelling reasons why the General Assembly should approve draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 and no other draft resolution.

75. First, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 analyses the basic causes of the present tragedy, tracing it to acts of armed intervention by outside Powers—without identifying those Powers or that Power—in the internal affairs of Kampuchea. The purpose of not identifying the specific causes is to avoid blaming or criticizing anyone and instead focus attention on the effects and the proposed steps towards ameliorating or eradicating them.

76. Secondly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 summarizes the actual and probable consequences of the events in Kampuchea and the ramifications of these consequences as they affect neighbouring countries and the entire region, as well as the danger entailed if other Powers feel they have to get involved.

77. Thirdly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 puts its finger squarely on one grievous consequence, namely, the "widespread hardship and deprivation and the large-scale famine" among the Kampuchean people, which in turn leads to a continuing mass exodus of those still strong enough to get to neighbouring countries, thereby creating a grave refugee problem. Although the United Nations, on the initiative of the Secretary-General and other national and international organizations, responded quickly to the situation, many problems have arisen in relation to this specific emergency that must become part of the momentum we have already generated.
78. Fourthly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 points out the need to allow the Kampuchean people to enforce their right under the Charter of the United Nations to determine the conditions of their own existence, present and future.
79. Fifthly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 enjoins all States to refrain from the threat or use of force against any other State, and to abide by the principles on the basis of which the United Nations seeks to pursue its goal of attaining peace among nations.
80. Sixthly, on the basis of its analysis and flowing logically from the root causes of the problems as identified in draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, the draft resolution underlines the solutions needed for each of the problems and calls upon all States to support United Nations efforts to achieve each solution. It requests all States to continue to render humanitarian assistance to the stricken Kampuchean people, within or outside Kampuchea, on a non-discriminatory basis, and to assist in resettling refugees. Thus, for humanitarian purposes, it separates this problem from its political dimension which it considers irrelevant in the present instance, so far as human needs are concerned. This is like saying that here we have an extreme case of suffering; people are starving and dying from disease. Let us help them immediately, no matter who they are.
81. Seventhly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 requests all States to co-operate in implementing the wish and desire of the world community to succour the Kampuchean people, setting aside political considerations. In this connexion, all concerned are reminded of another set of fundamental principles involved: the human rights of the Kampuchean people who have been ravaged as a result of war.
82. Eighthly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 seeks progress towards a political solution by asking all Powers concerned to withdraw their forces, refrain from interfering or intervening in the internal affairs of Kampuchea, and to give the Kampuchean people an opportunity to choose their own government democratically and to resolve their internal problems for themselves.
83. Ninthly, in an amendment that its sponsors have accepted, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 seeks to cope with the implications of the root causes of the problem by calling upon all States to refrain from any threat or any act or use of force that will further undermine the stability of the region and escalate tensions therein.
84. Tenthly, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 under-
- scores the role that the General Assembly wishes the Secretary-General—and therefore the United Nations—to play in the continuing resolution of the problem, in our belief that the matter is so complex and so fraught with difficulties that it calls for unremitting collective attention on the part of the world community.
85. Eleventhly, and connected to the tenth point, in an amendment accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 wishes all possible avenues towards a complete and satisfactory solution to be explored, including the possibility of convening an international conference on Kampuchea, under United Nations auspices, as a means of implementing the draft resolution and moving mankind towards such a solution.
86. In our view, therefore, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 contains all the elements needed to comprehend the present tragedy of Kampuchea, it causes and consequences and the imperative solutions that analysis suggests. The alternative to a solution is, as we well know, utter chaos, a deepening human tragedy and an inexorable slide towards a wider war.
87. We submit that there is no other way even to approximate an immediate and reasonably long-term solution to the various problems presented to us by the situation in Kampuchea than through our draft resolution, A/34/L.13/Rev.2. Yet it appears that there are some who do not share this view, some who do not share our perceptions and have different assumptions. That is their right. There are some to whom, apparently, the political dimension is paramount and to whom the humanitarian aspect is but an afterthought reluctantly inserted because the universal outcry and consensus has become untenable. That is the case with draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1. These and many other considerations compel us to reject that draft and to commend draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 to all Member States.
88. To begin with, draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 traces the tragedy of Kampuchea and the threats to the peace and stability of neighbouring countries and the rest of South-East Asia to the acts of the genocidal régime that ruled Kampuchea before it was forcibly ousted by the forces of Viet Nam and its Kampuchean ally and puppet, Heng Samrin.
89. Although we hold no brief for Pol Pot, who was as cruel and as murderous to his own people as any ruler could be, we reject this thesis. Plainly, the starvation, the displacement and the suffering of the Kampuchean people are the direct result of invasion and the widespread disruption caused by it. The spillover into neighbouring countries would not have taken place had it not been for the turmoil engendered by war. Furthermore, draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 maintains that armed intervention came about as a result of the exercise of the Kampuchean people's right to self-determination, ostensibly because of their desire to liberate themselves from the yoke of the genocidal régime then holding forth in Phnom Penh. Again, we reject this contention, because the original assumption, which is shared in draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, negates this very contention. That is, if it is true that a tyrannical régime suppressed the Kampuchean people—which in fact we can admit to have been the case—then draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.



I cannot adduce any proof to the effect that the Kampuchean people called upon anybody, external forces included, to liberate them. At the same time—and we underscore this point—we cannot accept any pretext that armed intervention is necessary, justified and desired on the basis of whatever is happening within a country or under a régime. This is to us an extremely important point, one fraught with ominous overtones, for what is to prevent any country from marching into a neighbouring country any time it wishes to do so because it does not like what is happening there? What is to prevent the fatal escalation of this principle, causing other Powers to feel compelled to join in the mêlée when they perceive their interests as being affected by internal events in the country?

90. Draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, after using the principle of justified intervention to account for the turn of events in Kampuchea, does a complete about-turn and resorts to the principle of self-determination in appealing to all States to leave the present situation alone, to let the Kampuchean peoples determine their future course of action for themselves.

91. To us this appears to be a deliberate attempt to maintain the *status quo* and thereby avoid the need to withdraw the external forces that — 200,000 strong — hold the Heng Samrin régime in place. To us this is not a solution, for it would continue to be a violation of the principle of non-interference and the avoidance of force to settle disputes, and it would continue to pose a grave threat of instability to the entire region and the threat of inviting a similar response from other Powers.

92. Draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 also appears to assume that the only other problem in South-East Asia is a problem that exists strictly between Kampuchea and other South-East Asian countries, and should not involve other Powers. On the face of it, this is plausible, were it not for the well-known reality that other Powers are already in fact involved, their interests inextricably interwoven in the problem as it exists. Therefore we submit that the situation in Kampuchea is no longer just a local matter of across-the-border relations between Kampuchea and its neighbours. Nor is the problem a question of a confrontation between ASEAN and the Indo-China grouping. This we reject, and if there is such an implication, as there seems to be in draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 and, more explicitly, in the third proposed draft resolution, A/34/L.38, it is enough to point out that the present situation in Kampuchea was never of ASEAN's doing, nor is it in ASEAN's interest—and much less is it its desire—for Kampuchea to be in such dire straits.

93. No, let us remind ourselves that the dolorous condition is for the most part the result of the falling out among the socialist countries of South-East Asia, not among the States of ASEAN. Indeed, it is superfluous and irrelevant for draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 to express the hope that ASEAN would pursue its goal of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, for it is doing so, and it has never stopped doing so. But precisely the element of instability now threatening all of us in South-East Asia proceeds from the fratricidal strife among those countries, and not among us. Nor does it proceed from our relations with them, for, since 1975, when the war ended in Indo-China, it has been ASEAN's unremitting effort to arrive at a rapprochement and understanding with Viet Nam and all the other

Indo-Chinese States. As far as we are concerned, this is not the problem at hand.

94. Because of this, we consider draft resolution A/34/L.38 defective as it stands, because it suggests that the issue can be reduced to a presumed conflict between two groups of countries in South-East Asia — which is not true — as if the situation in Kampuchea is the result of differences between them — which is not true — and that a regional conference would be needed to set things aright. Furthermore, it is inadequate because it fails to put its finger on the crux of the whole matter, the source of the difficulty: the presence of foreign forces in Kampuchea and the need first of all to withdraw them. To my mind, a regional conference, any conference, would be futile if that prior condition were not fulfilled.

95. The problem is clear. Let us not obfuscate it by evasions and semantic trickery. Let us not allow ourselves to fall into a *cul-de-sac* through the beguiling detours offered by high-sounding words that hide assumptions that are plainly not warranted and that have in mind purposes other than compassion, an urgent need for peace and the desire to free the region from intervention by other Powers.

96. Let us not short change ourselves. Of what use is an exercise such as draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, which ignores reality, speaks in negative terms and merely resolves to let the *status quo* stand unalleviated, unresolved? Is this what we spent hours and money and time bringing forth?

97. There is no longer any question but that we are faced with a human catastrophe that grows by the hour and that requires only one immediate response from all of us: concerted aid that overrides all political objections. Having attended to that, we can then turn our attention to the roots of the disaster, political and governmental, and the clash of power. We do not agree that political considerations take precedence, for of what use is a political victory to the occupants of tombs and cemeteries?

98. Neither do we agree that a human rights justification, as in the universal condemnation of Pol Pot and his régime, should be used as a basis to justify political action such as armed intervention and the conquest of a neighbouring State. For the principles which are enshrined in the United Nations Charter and which are violated by such political action are rooted in the inalienable human rights of peoples, without any qualifications whatsoever, to determine their mode of existence and governance. Any deviation from those principles is unacceptable to us and dangerous. Once the flood-gates are opened, there is no safety for anyone.

99. Our view is that the over-all situation in Kampuchea is so badly muddied and has so deteriorated that clarification is in order, and that the withdrawal of all external forces from the scene is necessary to give the Kampuchean peoples not only a breathing spell, but ultimately the opportunity to reorder their lives and to make the decisions, by themselves, as to what to do to reconstruct their country and rehabilitate the people — that is, those who managed to survive.

100. What we seek in Kampuchea — and what the entire world needs — is a solution that addresses itself

peacefully to the emergency that faces the people and that meets that emergency without delay. What we want is a solution that does not make such people a pawn and a bargaining lever, a solution that liberates not only a people from want, but all other nations in the region from the degrading and perilous role of acting for any other Power or for any other interest besides their own.

101. If the initial steps take place—which we believe draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 will make possible—then we would hope for an interim arrangement under the active auspices of the United Nations, as hoped for by the representative of Singapore, to give the Kampuchean people the working machinery as well as the encouragement with which to undertake the full expression of their will and their collective decision, free from external restraint or interference.

102. I say to all Member States that there is a way out of the present hopelessness that is Kampuchea, a way out and upward to save what remains of the Kampuchean people, a way that will ease our conscience and move us all quickly out of a threatened explosion in South-East Asia. That way is the immediate adoption of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. No other choice is open. We have a duty to state our stand on principle for the sake of all mankind, even if that stand is painful to some of our friends, colleagues and peoples.

103. As we close the debate on this grave issue, let us remind ourselves that our decisions on this matter will reach far into the future. Let not its gravity be lost on any one of us. We are making history with an historic debate. I speak, and all of the sponsors of the draft resolution speak, for the least strong among us. But the implications are such, as present events tell us, that even the strongest may feel the need for decisions such as these. No one is above the actions of others. What may happen to small nations and helpless peoples may happen to others—even to the strongest and the most richly endowed. If it is true that history repeats itself, it is even more true that it is men, and the concrete decisions of men, that see to it that they are not the victims of its repetition. The duty before us is crystal clear. Let us do our duty as men, answerable to all men, responsible to the future of all mankind.

104. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. I shall now call on those Members who wish to explain their votes before the vote. In this connexion, I should like to remind all delegations of the decision taken previously by the General Assembly [4th meeting] that the time allotted to any delegation for an explanation of vote shall be limited to 10 minutes, and that representatives shall make such explanations from their places.

105. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Our explanation of vote before the vote is motivated by a double consideration: first, the divergent views expressed in the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly; secondly, the tragic situation which prevails in Kampuchea and which requires our concerted efforts to give effect to the humanitarian endeavour to help the Kampuchean people and alleviate their sufferings.

106. Our delegation has decided to support draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, which emphasizes the humanitarian aspects of the problem and proposes steps to

remedy the catastrophic situation which the Kampuchean people have to endure. This draft resolution also calls for an end to the armed conflict taking place in the region and the withdrawal of all foreign forces, with a view to a peaceful solution of the conflict. It also emphasizes non-interference in the internal affairs of countries and respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

107. As for draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, we shall vote against it because it embodies principles incompatible with those that should govern relations between nations, namely, principles relating to respect for the sovereignty of peoples, to their right to self-determination and to the preservation of their independence. For example, the draft resolution calls on all States to refrain from any forcible action that deprives peoples of their right to self-determination, their freedom and their independence. That is a strange demand, since it advocates in effect a principle that applies not to the situation that prevails in independent States, but to the situation of peoples weighed down under the yoke of colonialism. The draft resolution also contains a paragraph which urges certain segments of the population to rise up against their Governments and authorizes them to appeal to foreign forces to intervene in such situations. That is a principle which is totally inadmissible because it would open the way to intervention in the domestic affairs of States, particularly the States of the third world, which have already suffered enough in the past from such practices and methods, practices and methods virtually identical to those that are still to be found in certain parts of the world today.

108. With respect to draft resolution A/34/L.38, we have decided to abstain in the voting because it calls for the convening of a regional conference to deal with the tense situations which exist in the region of South-East Asia, a conference which would include the States of ASEAN and Indo-China. We all know that such a conference cannot take place so long as there are radical differences of view about the representation of the people of Kampuchea. The ASEAN group considers that the legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people is the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, whereas Viet Nam and Laos insist that it is the present régime in Phnom Penh. That is why support of draft resolution A/34/L.38 would be tantamount to reopening the debate on the question of representation of Kampuchea in the United Nations and in other international bodies, which in our view would not be in keeping with the actual state of affairs, since that question of representation has been decided by the vote which took place in this Assembly a few weeks ago [4th meeting]. The reopening of the debate would also arouse feelings once more and complicate the situation, which would make it more difficult to carry through the operation of bringing aid to those who need it and who, at the present time, are the international community's main concern.

109. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is about to take a decision on the draft resolutions before it. My delegation would like to make some comments on draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2.

110. In analysing that draft resolution, we note that the countries of ASEAN and the other sponsors are pursuing a well-determined aim. In order to achieve that aim, they are insisting upon three points but omit a

fourth point. On what three points have they insisted? First, the sponsors call upon all parties to the conflict to cease hostilities. What parties are they referring to and what hostilities are they talking about?

111. The People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea has stated on numerous occasions that it is in full control of the whole national territory and that there is no question of another party there, except for the remnants of the Pol Pot gang and other reactionaries, traitors to the Kampuchean nation, still being supported and supplied by Beijing [*Peking*] and the imperialism infiltrated into Kampuchea to sabotage the work of reconstruction of the country.

112. The ASEAN countries call on the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea to stop its mopping-up operations against those bands of pirates, a normal police operation to ensure the security of the country, exactly what takes place in the majority of the ASEAN countries. Such a request is inadmissible for Kampuchea, as it would be for the ASEAN countries. At the present time, the armed conflict of which the ASEAN countries speak only exists in the propaganda services of the enemies of Kampuchea.

113. Secondly, the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 call for a political solution to enable the people of Kampuchea to choose their own government democratically. These sponsors speak of Kampuchea as though it were a leaderless country and they assume the right to decide—I repeat, decide—this, that or the other for the people of Kampuchea. We are perfectly justified in asking the ASEAN countries and the other sponsors of the draft resolution what they mean by a political solution. Are they asking the People's Revolutionary Council to negotiate with the reactionary agents of colonialism, imperialism and expansionism of the great nations in order to allow them, once more, to betray the patriotic cause of the Kampuchean people? What would be the attitude of the Governments of the ASEAN countries if they were asked to negotiate with secessionist groups in their own lands for the purpose of reaching a political solution?

114. Thirdly, the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 call for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces, that is Vietnamese forces, from Kampuchea. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea have made it clear that the presence of Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea concerns only those two sovereign States and threatens no one. If the Chinese expansionists and their imperialist allies stop their activities of interference aimed at disturbing the peaceful life of the Kampuchean people and if they respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Vietnamese army will immediately withdraw from Kampuchea.

115. I come now to the point on which the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 have said nothing. I refer to the crime of genocide committed by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique. Their silence concerning that crime of genocide is most meaningful, as they are trying to make public opinion believe that that clique and its protectors in Beijing have no responsibility for the catastrophic situation that the country is currently going through, in spite of the extraordinary efforts being made by the

people and the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea since the beginning of this year.

116. The aim of the ASEAN countries, of Beijing and of imperialism is to impose the genocidal régime on the people of Kampuchea once more. Draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 exposes that unavowed and unavowable aim. The four points mentioned above have their logic. In order to give the impression that so-called Democratic Kampuchea still exists, armed conflicts have had to be concocted, in order subsequently to ask for their cessation and to demand a political solution between two or three parties, one of which would be the Fascist Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique. But knowing that those butchers of the Kampuchean people have no chance of taking power again since they have been vomited out by the people of Kampuchea, the above-mentioned points have had to disguise themselves under the cover of respect for the principles of the Charter and of international law in order to call for the immediate withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea, or under the cover of indiscriminate humanitarian assistance, in order to supply the Pol Pot clique.

117. The General Assembly should be made to know that the ASEAN countries, despite all their statements of good will, co-operated in varying degree with the aggressors during the American war, just as they are now allowing themselves to be drawn into following the enemies of the Kampuchean, Lao and Vietnamese peoples. As far as the Kampuchean people is concerned, the General Assembly will recall that, after the coup d'état of 1970, the ASEAN countries supported Lon Nol, the agent of imperialism, against the then Government of patriotic resistance, and now they are supporting the Pol Pot clique, an agent of Beijing against the People's Government of President Heng Samrin.

118. It is, unfortunately, the consistent policy of the ASEAN countries to side with the aggressors and their agents against the just cause of the peoples of the countries of Indo-China.

119. Taking into account the considerations that I have just expressed, my delegation thinks that draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 is not a realistic document. Therefore it will vote against it.

120. Before concluding, I should like to clear up a misunderstanding detrimental to my delegation arising from the statement made to the General Assembly yesterday afternoon by the representative of New Zealand [65th meeting]. In that statement, the representative of New Zealand wittingly or unwittingly made a mistake when he said that draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 had been submitted by Viet Nam. It is common knowledge that the draft was submitted by the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. This is irrefutable proof of the confusion reigning in the mind of the representative of New Zealand. That would be of no importance if the delegation of New Zealand had not been among the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. But the delegation of New Zealand is in fact one of the main sponsors of that draft resolution. That incident has led us to ask ourselves if the representative of New Zealand had not also, wittingly or unwittingly, introduced even more serious elements of confusion into draft resolution

A/34/L.13/Rev.2 when he was helping to draft it, because that requires even greater efforts of intellectual concentration than are needed for the simple reading of the names of countries on the list of speakers yesterday afternoon. However that may be, my delegation, out of courtesy, does not ask for an apology following that unfortunate incident. I invite all the Members of this Assembly to show great circumspection with regard to draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2.

121. Mr. CHANDERNAGOR (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, proposed by about 30 countries, for the following reasons.

122. This draft resolution has two basic aspects: one of a humanitarian nature, the other of a political nature.

123. As far as the humanitarian aspect is concerned, France has already completely associated itself with the appeal that has been made to all to come to the aid of the civilian population of Kampuchea. We took part in the Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the People of Kampuchea, convened on 5 November by the Secretary-General of our Organization. The Minister for Foreign Affairs wanted to demonstrate the French Government's interest in that Conference by taking part personally.<sup>4</sup> I shall therefore not dwell on that point.

124. As for the political aspect of this draft resolution, the principles to which it refers are those of the Charter of the United Nations. On two occasions already in the Security Council, the French delegation has indicated that in no circumstances can it accept the violation of the territorial integrity of a State, and consequently its occupation by foreign forces.

125. France is not unaware of the responsibility of the Pol Pot régime for Kampuchea's present situation. We have no hesitation in stating, therefore, that our present position is not intended to support any particular State, and that it indicates no animosity towards any other.

126. My country hopes to enjoy relations of friendship and co-operation with all States of the region, regardless of their régime. However, these relations can develop as fully as is desirable only in an atmosphere of peace and stability. In this connexion, it is necessary that Kampuchea regain its place as a sovereign State in South-East Asia as a whole, setting up the institutions of its choice under the direction of its freely-elected leaders, and without the presence of foreign troops.

127. In keeping with the Charter, France is in favour of the peaceful and negotiated settlement of conflicts. In Kampuchea an entire people is slowly dying; the tension which is kept alive by the persistent military activities there threatens peace in the whole region. It is imperative that a political solution be found as soon as possible. In our view, the text prepared by ASEAN contains precisely those provisions that would make possible the establishment of an atmosphere conducive to dialogue.

128. France's position in this matter does not stem

from any partisan spirit; it is prompted only by our feelings of concern, friendship and compassion for Kampuchea and its people.

129. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): Three draft resolutions—A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/34/L.13/Rev.2 and A/34/L.38—have been submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration under item 123 of the agenda.

130. In its statement on this matter during the general debate [65th meeting], the Albanian delegation put forward the views and position of its Government on the situation in Cambodia and in South-East Asia. At this stage of our work and by way of explaining our vote, the Albanian delegation will briefly reiterate some of the considerations on which our position on the draft resolutions to which I have referred is based.

131. As we have already stated, the Albanian people and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania have staunchly supported the struggle of the peoples of Indo-China against American imperialism and all their enemies. We support the right of these peoples to live in freedom and independence and to ensure their sovereignty and full territorial integrity. We have condemned the interference of foreign Powers in the countries of that region and the aggressive hegemonistic policy that has been pursued by the imperialist super-Powers, to the detriment of the interests of the Indo-Chinese peoples.

132. We condemn the aggression which has been unleashed by China against Viet Nam, as well as all other such acts of aggression. Peoples must be free to determine their own destinies, without any threats against them and free from any interference on the part of foreign Powers. The theories of inflicting punishment or teaching lessons are imperialist practices; they are a threat to peoples and, as such, merit condemnation and denunciation. We support the right of each of the peoples of Indo-China, like any other people in the world, to settle its own affairs. Our attitude has been, and remains, that Viet Nam and Cambodia should themselves resolve their differences by means of negotiation, without having to resort to the use of force. We hold the view that it is up to the people of Cambodia to solve the internal problems of that country. The Pol Pot régime was a barbaric one that practised genocide. The Cambodian people and revolutionaries have the right to rid themselves of such a régime and to set up the government they desire. No one is entitled to impose upon the Cambodian people a solution not in harmony with their wishes and interests.

133. That is the line of conduct that we have defended and that we shall continue to defend; we cannot support or accept any other solution to this problem.

134. Having said that, the delegation of Albania wishes to state that it will not participate in the vote which will be taken on the draft resolutions mentioned above.

135. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho): In explaining my delegation's vote before the voting on draft resolutions A/34/L.13/Rev.2 and A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, allow me to observe that Lesotho has adopted a purely humanitarian approach to the question under consideration. We have done so in conformity with the

<sup>4</sup> See document SG/CONF.1/SR.1, paras 6-12.

principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Member States of the United Nations, to which principle Lesotho strictly adheres.

136. We have further tried to avoid passing judgement on the legality or illegality of the régime associated with that country. We in Lesotho believe that the people of Kampuchea are the ones best qualified to determine their own form of government. We have thus refrained from tampering with the political aspects of the problem of which Kampuchea and, indeed, all other Member States of the United Nations are seized.

137. In the light of these observations, my delegation finds the content of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 more in line with our humanitarian concerns with regard to the situation in Kampuchea. We shall therefore associate ourselves with this draft by registering a positive vote.

138. My delegation regrets, however, that it has found draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 lacking in this humanitarian thrust. A lot remains unsaid in that draft resolution. For this reason, my delegation has failed to comprehend the real purpose of that draft resolution and will therefore abstain from voting on it.

139. We remain convinced, however, that the search for a lasting and peaceful solution to the problem of Kampuchea remains an international concern. The suffering of thousands of innocent people in Kampuchea weighs heavily on the conscience of mankind. This is the challenge to which we should address ourselves.

140. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 because that draft ignores the following realities in Kampuchea.

141. In the first place, the Pol Pot clique was the first deliberately to launch armed attacks against Viet Nam and continued to do so throughout the past four years, thus turning these attacks into a large-scale war of aggression against the south-western part of our country.

142. Secondly, the leaders in power in Beijing [*Peking*] gave full support to Pol Pot in order to use him as an instrument of their expansionist policies in the countries of Indo-China and of South-East Asia.

143. Thirdly, the Kampuchean people, under the leadership of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea, rose up and overthrew the genocidal régime of Pol Pot. Viet Nam, in response to the appeal of the people of Kampuchea, went to their assistance. It was a legitimate act in keeping with the law of the Charter and of the United Nations.

144. Fourthly, the Government of Heng Samrin has control over the administration of the whole country and is mobilizing the entire people to rebuild the country from a state of ruin never before known in history. Certain dispatches of Western news agencies have estimated that the destruction was more terrible than that caused by the B-52 in Kampuchea. As reported in the *New York Times* of 13 and 14 November 1979, United States Congress-men and correspondents visited the area and saw the ruins left by the Pol Pot régime and they saw, too, that a new life was beginning there.

145. Fifthly, the Government of Heng Samrin is co-operating effectively with international organizations in dealing with the famine in Kampuchea and is making enormous efforts to create the best possible conditions for receiving and distributing the food that is being sent in for the population. A great number of representatives of international organizations, such as UNICEF, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the World Food Programme, have publicly recognized that fact.

146. Sixthly, who must be held responsible for the incidents on the Thailand-Kampuchea border? The Government of the United States itself, which expressed its regret at the very recent outburst of shooting between Thai units and the Ieng Sary armed band near the border of Kampuchea. Yet the representative of the United States dared to claim that Viet Nam was responsible for the shooting across the border.

147. Furthermore, in the statement made yesterday in this Assembly, the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mr. Sourinho, reported the Prime Minister of Thailand as saying that he "excluded the possibility of the invasion of Thailand by Vietnamese troops" [65th meeting, para. 34].

148. Therefore it is not a question of there being an armed conflict and a threat of its extension, as stated in draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. The situation of conflict and instability that exists at present in Indo-China and in South-East Asia derives from only one source, namely, the retaliatory policies of the expansionists and imperialists who, having failed miserably in their policies of aggression and expansion, are now trying to carry out their policy of aggression in a different guise and to destroy the solidarity and friendship among the countries of the region. This explains the collusion in the implementation of their present policy, their use of the mass media to unleash a campaign of slander against Viet Nam in the international arena; and all the while, they threaten new aggression and interference in the internal affairs of the three countries of Indo-China.

149. Meanwhile, they are trying by every means at their disposal to revive the remains of the Pol Pot Fascist clique and to support the other reactionaries, in order to sabotage the work of peaceful reconstruction of Kampuchea.

150. Even here, in the United Nations itself, they have resorted to all sorts of manoeuvres to enable the representatives of those who are guilty of genocide and have been condemned to death by the Kampuchean people to usurp the place that rightfully belongs to the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea.

151. For all these substantive reasons, we are against draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, which attempts to undermine the situation in Kampuchea in the way which we have already condemned. It is deplorable that the members of ASEAN allowed themselves, although to a different degree, to fall into line with Beijing and Washington, requested the inclusion in the agenda for this session of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea", and submitted a draft resolution which takes no account of the truth or the realities in Kampuchea today and is designed to serve the evil designs of the imperialists and the expansionists of Beijing to interfere in the internal affairs of

Kampuchea, just as that people is beginning to lead a normal life again.

152. Once again, my country appeals to the international community to redouble its vigilance against the perfidious manoeuvres and actions of those who are trying to undermine the just cause of the Kampuchean people and of the peoples of the other countries of Indo-China. This is not merely a problem of stability in South-East Asia. This is not merely a political problem, it is also a problem of conscience.

153. In the light of the responsibilities with which history has confronted us, I appeal to all delegations present to vote against the draft resolution submitted by the countries of ASEAN and to support draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1.

154. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the following documents: draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 and draft resolution A/34/L.38. At the 62nd plenary meeting, on 12 November, the representative of Malaysia requested that priority in voting be given to draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. Three delegations have asked to speak on points of order, and I shall now call on them.

155. Mr. B. C. MISHRA (India): This is not so much a point of order as a motion in regard to the voting, and I hope you will allow me to make this statement, Mr. President.

156. Now that draft resolutions A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 and A/34/L.13/Rev.2 are about to be put to the vote, I think it is opportune to make a short statement regarding draft resolution A/34/L.38 submitted by India.

157. Representatives will recall that, when introducing the Indian draft resolution in this Assembly on 12 November [63rd meeting], I emphasized that this document was in no way designed to supplant either of the two substantive draft resolutions that had already been submitted. We stated that our draft resolution was complementary to the substantive drafts and was meant to make possible the provision of a forum for dialogue among the States of South-East Asia in order to alleviate the tensions prevailing in that region and to resolve the humanitarian needs of the people of Kampuchea. Several delegations which have participated in the current debate have also emphasized the need to adopt practical means to achieve a peaceful political settlement.

158. We remain convinced that the draft resolution put forward by the countries of ASEAN and Viet Nam, respectively, will not result in a political settlement; nor will they help to resolve the humanitarian problems of South-East Asia in general and of Kampuchea in particular. The Indian draft resolution has been submitted in a sincere effort to promote a dialogue in order to facilitate a political settlement among the countries of South-East Asia. I am happy to inform this Assembly that our draft resolution has received the support of Viet Nam, which is one of the principal parties concerned.

159. On the other hand, as was stated this morning by

the representative of Thailand [66th meeting] on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2, the ASEAN countries will oppose the Indian draft. The reasons given by the representative of Thailand do not seem, to us, to be very logical.

160. The first was that the Kampuchean problem was not one between the ASEAN countries and the Indo-Chinese States; nor was it of exclusive concern to the countries of South-East Asia. The fact that this item has been inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly at the request of the ASEAN States [A/34/191, annex] and that representatives of ASEAN have repeatedly referred in their statements to the state of military tension that apparently prevails on the Thai-Kampuchean border has led my delegation to believe that this problem, if not of exclusive, is at least of primary concern to them. How mistaken can one be?

161. The second reason given was that the conference envisaged in the Indian draft did not allow for all the parties involved to take part in it. We should like to ask which parties other than the countries of South-East Asia are directly involved in the problem. The ASEAN countries have stated that the problem is of concern to the entire international community. Perhaps they have in mind a conference of the United Nations membership as a whole. If that is so, we wonder what we have been doing in this hall over the past three days.

162. The third reason for ASEAN's opposition to the Indian draft resolution is that the envisaged conference is to discuss all issues and that it is too broad in scope. Further, it was said that the Indian draft does not specifically address itself to the situation in Kampuchea. Moreover, it has been contended that our draft "tends to create an appearance of confrontation between the ASEAN and the States in Indo-China" [see 66th meeting, para 133]. In this context, I should like to inform the Assembly that, during informal consultations over the past two days, India offered to amend the relevant portions of its draft resolution to meet that point. In accordance with the amendment that we offered to the ASEAN delegations, operative paragraph 1 of the Indian draft would have read as follows:

*"Urges the States of South-East Asia to hold a conference to discuss the situation in Kampuchea and the resulting tensions in South-East Asia, as also other relevant questions, and to make all efforts to create an atmosphere conducive to peace, stability and co-operation in the area."*

Unfortunately, even that amendment was unacceptable to the ASEAN countries.

163. The fourth and, fortunately, the last reason given by ASEAN for its opposition to the Indian draft was that it was no longer complementary to the ASEAN draft, since A/34/L.13/Rev.2 now envisaged the possibility of convening an international conference, not merely a subregional conference on Kampuchea. I should like to state categorically that in the first place, in our opinion, the latest revision of draft resolution A/34/L.13, which includes the possibility of an international conference, was made for tactical reasons, in order to enable representatives of ASEAN countries to suggest that the Indian draft had now become redundant and that there was no reason to consider it.

164. Secondly, the international conference provided for in A/34/L.13/Rev.2 would invite the further involvement of outside Powers in the affairs of South-East Asian nations—which would complicate even more the achievement of a solution.

165. Thirdly, by rejecting the idea of a regional conference and proposing an international conference, the ASEAN States are admitting that they are not able to solve the problem amongst themselves, without outside big-Power involvement.

166. Finally, the idea of an international conference contained in the ASEAN draft resolution is linked to the implementation of the recommendations contained in that text. It will soon be obvious from the voting pattern that the proposed international conference would not be acceptable to all the principal parties directly concerned.

167. To conclude, we had hoped that all the parties most directly concerned would have found it possible to accept our proposal for initiating a dialogue amongst themselves to resolve the grave problems obtaining in South-East Asia. We did not canvass our proposal with any delegations other than those of members of ASEAN and Viet Nam. We felt that their agreement to it was of paramount importance. I must, however, thank a large number of delegations which have formally or informally extended their support to us. But, as I said earlier, although Viet Nam has accepted our proposal, unfortunately this morning the ASEAN countries, speaking through the representative of Thailand, rejected our modest but constructive initiative for a valid dialogue.

168. Since we maintain the most cordial relations with the ASEAN countries and have no wish to embarrass them in any way, I should like to inform this Assembly that India will not press for a decision on its draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.38.

169. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): The rules of procedure provide that proposals be voted on in the order in which they were submitted. Unfortunately, the normal course of the proceedings is being upset by the request to give priority to one of them, that is, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. That request is neither logical nor fair.

170. Rule 91 of the rules of procedure stipulates unequivocally:

“If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the General Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted.”

Therefore the principle underlying rule 91 requires that the draft resolutions be voted on in the order in which they were submitted. That rule is both fair and wise, based on an objective criterion. From experience we know how difficult it is to take decisions in this Organization when there is no such criterion and when different—in many cases, diametrically opposed—interests are involved.

171. We are, of course, aware that rule 91 envisages the possibility of the General Assembly deciding otherwise. But it is clear to all of us that that is an exception to the main principle. If one is to resort to that excep-

tion, one must have serious reasons. Are there really such reasons in existence? The arguments that have been advanced in support of the request to abandon the principle are, to say the least, artificial, rather strange and have no foundation in the rules of procedure.

172. It has been argued that draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 must be given priority on the assumption that a number of its sponsors initiated the request for the inclusion of the item on the agenda of the thirty-fourth session. In addition, it has been argued that the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 opposed the inclusion of the item on the agenda and, consequently—if one may say—they ought to be penalized for their attitude by having their draft resolution deprived of its natural and legitimate priority by virtue of the rules of procedure.

173. Moreover, there is no rule which can support the contention that taking the initiative for the inscription of an item on the agenda carries with it certain rights with respect to the submission of draft resolutions, least of all the right to priority. The initiators of an item cannot and do not enjoy a monopoly of the item. Once an item is inscribed on the agenda, all Member States have equal rights in submitting draft resolutions. It is hardly necessary to say that the position of a number of Member States against the inclusion on the agenda of what is now agenda item 123 does not place those States in an inferior position with respect to the procedural question of priority. The fact that those Member States are among the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1 and that they took a most active part in the debate shows that they regard the question under consideration in a most serious manner. The arguments and actions of the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 can hardly be understood as anything other than an attempt to impose upon the Kampuchean people and its sole legitimate Government, the People's Revolutionary Council, by means of procedural machinations, unacceptable decisions which are far from healing the situation.

174. For all those reasons, the Bulgarian delegation opposes the request to give priority to draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 and will vote against that request if it is put to the vote.

175. Mr. KOH (Singapore): My colleagues and I, who represent the delegations of the countries of ASEAN, have listened carefully and attentively to the statements just made by our colleague, the Ambassador of India, as well as by the representative of Bulgaria.

176. Mr. President, I crave your permission to make a brief reply in order to set the record straight.

177. On behalf of my ASEAN colleagues and on my own behalf, I should like first of all to explain why the ASEAN delegations have not found it possible to support the Indian draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.38 or the amendment suggested to operative paragraph 1 proposed to us yesterday evening by Ambassador Mishra.

178. The thrust of the Indian draft resolution A/34/L.38 is that a conference of South-East Asian States should be held. The ASEAN countries cannot accept this proposal for two reasons. First, it assumes that the conflict in Kampuchea and the plight, viewed in humanitarian terms, of the people of Kampuchea are of interest only to the countries of South-

East Asia. As we have just heard from our colleague from Lesotho, the plight of the people of Kampuchea is a matter of humanitarian concern to people all over the world and not just those of the countries of South-East Asia.

179. Even with respect to the political aspect of the question of Kampuchea, the issues involved are ones of universal concern and interest. These issues raise cardinal principles embodied in our own Charter, such as those of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, non-intervention and non-use of force.

180. The first reason why the ASEAN countries have not looked with favour on the Indian proposal to convene a conference of South-East Asian countries is that we do not accept the proposition that the question of Kampuchea is of interest only to the region of South-East Asia.

181. The second reason is that the present formulation of operative paragraph 1 seems to imply that there is a conflict between the ASEAN countries, on the one hand, and the countries of Indo-China, on the other. The truth is that the basic conflict in Kampuchea is not a conflict between Viet Nam, on the one hand, and the ASEAN countries, on the other. The conflict is between Viet Nam, on the one hand, and the people of Kampuchea, on the other. The ASEAN countries are situated close to the area of conflict, but they are not direct parties to the conflict. That is the second reason why we have not been able to accept the proposal of our colleague from India.

182. In the second revision of our own draft resolution, A/34/L.13/Rev.2, we have included a new operative paragraph 12, which

*“Also requests The Secretary-General to explore the possibility of holding an international conference on Kampuchea as one of the means for implementing the present resolution”.*

We believe that that approach is wiser than the proposal of India for the following reasons.

183. First, before convening any conference it is obvious, is it not, that the ground should be carefully prepared. Draft resolution A/34/L.38 contains no provision for any preparatory mechanism. On the other hand, operative paragraph 12 of our draft resolution entrusts the responsibility for preparing for a conference on Kampuchea to our esteemed Secretary-General. In our view, there is no better person to whom to entrust this responsibility. The Secretary-General would naturally have to consider carefully which would be the parties to be invited to the conference. For example, he would have to study carefully whether the participants should be confined to those from South-East Asia. Among other things, he would have to ask himself if . . .

184. The PRESIDENT: I truly apologize to my colleague and friend the representative of Singapore for interrupting him. I have been trying to be as flexible as possible, but he is now explaining his position with respect to a draft resolution which, in the light of the statement made by the representative of India, is in fact no longer before the Assembly. Indeed, I was almost prompted to interrupt the representative of India during his statement because he was speaking at length. But then, ultimately he explained the rationale behind his statement by indicating that he was intervening in the debate so as to facilitate the work of the Assembly with

regard to the conduct of the Assembly's proceedings, particularly in respect of the voting.

185. I am afraid that, if I allow the representative of Singapore to continue to speak in that way, he would then actually be explaining his vote; that would really go beyond the provisions of the relevant rules of procedure. So I appeal to him to conclude his statement. After which we shall proceed with the voting.

186. Mr. KOH (Singapore): I shall conclude my statement. You will of course appreciate, Sir, that I would not have asked to reply to Ambassador Mishra had he not spoken in the way he did and had he not made certain imputations about my colleagues and me which we do not accept.

187. I shall conclude by saying that the question of the parties to be invited to the conference is obviously a matter of judgement. One has to consider whether there are any extra-regional Powers involved in the conflict and, if so, whether it is possible to solve the problem without inviting them.

188. Another defect which we found in draft resolution A/34/L.38 is that it does not address itself to the central issue in the whole debate which is the presence of foreign forces in Kampuchea.

189. For these reasons, my colleagues and I have not found it possible to support draft resolution A/34/L.38. We should, however, like to express our appreciation to our colleague from India for not insisting on a vote on his draft resolution.

190. The PRESIDENT: The representative of India wishes to speak and I should like to point out that he can speak only with respect to the conduct of the vote. To be more precise, at this point I shall recognize only a representative who has a specific comment in respect to the proposal made by the representative of Malaysia and now opposed by the representative of Bulgaria. A representative may speak only in that context. Otherwise, we shall reopen the debate or start again on explanations of vote. As Members are aware, all representatives are perfectly entitled to exercise the right of reply at the end of the consideration of the item, at the end of the meeting. On that understanding, I shall allow the representative of India to speak.

191. Mr. B. C. MISHRA (India): I am grateful to you Sir, for allowing me to speak. Would you kindly clarify for me whether I was out of order in giving reasons for not pressing for a vote on the draft resolution sponsored by India. If I was not out of order, then where does the question arise of a right of reply at this point, before the voting? And if there is a right of reply given to one delegation, surely my delegation also has the right of reply before the voting takes place.

192. I should like you, Mr. President, to rule on whether I was out of order in explaining the reasons why I was not pressing for a vote on the draft resolution sponsored by India.

193. The PRESIDENT: I think it is quite clear from the statement that I made earlier that the representative of India was in order because of the manner in which he concluded his statement.



194. As you will have noted from my interruption of the representative of Singapore, I felt that his statement, in the light of the statement made by the representative of India, more or less constituted a right of reply. I therefore had to interrupt him and I am grateful to the representative of Singapore for having cut his statement short at that point.

195. We shall now proceed to take a decision on the proposal of the representative of Malaysia that priority should be granted in the voting to draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Bahrain, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Finland, Guinea, India, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Zambia.

*The proposal was adopted by 85 votes to 32, with 23 abstentions.*

196. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has granted priority in voting to draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2. A decision will therefore now be taken on that draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, China,

Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Dominican Republic, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Panama, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 21, with 29 abstentions (resolution 34/22).*

197. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Senegal to speak on a point of order.

198. Mr. KANE (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has pronounced itself in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 by a comfortable majority. The sponsors of that text, as well as all those who are concerned over the fate of the Khmer people, are very gratified that the international community, in full awareness of its responsibilities, has thus decided to devote some attention to the present and the future of the people of Kampuchea. The adoption of this resolution, to our minds, makes it unnecessary for us to vote on draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1.

199. In fact, as we see it, there is a contradiction between the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly and draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1. I shall not dwell upon the arguments in favour of this position, because they have been adduced throughout the debate. In our eyes, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 attaches great importance to the famine which is at present rife in Kampuchea and which necessitated, as representatives will recall, the convening of a special conference to gather funds to save the Kampuchean people which was on the point of simply disappearing from this earth. Draft resolution A/34/L.7 completely overlooks that problem and the revised text — A/34/L.7/Rev.1 — speaks only vaguely of it. Draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 refers to the armed intervention in the domestic affairs of Kampuchea;

whereas not a word of this serious problem, this violation of one of the principles of the Charter, is mentioned in draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1.

200. Draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 calls, in its operative paragraph 7, for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea; whereas draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, remains totally silent on that point. It could not be otherwise because one of the sponsors of that draft is precisely the aggressor and occupying country, Viet Nam.

201. Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 calls upon all parties to the conflict to cease all hostilities forthwith. Draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 claims that there are no hostilities at all in Kampuchea, and thus attempts to have us accept as a fait accompli the occupation of Kampuchea by Viet Nam.

202. In so doing, it merely confirms the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Phnom Penh that is contained in document A/34/672.

203. Furthermore, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 is concerned that the Kampuchean people exercise sovereignty, and stipulates in operative paragraph 10:

“Resolves that the people of Kampuchea be enabled to choose democratically their own government, without outside interference, subversion or coercion.”

204. Draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 supports the view that the *de facto* régime of Heng Samrin has been chosen by the people of Kampuchea, whereas on the contrary it has, as we know, been installed by foreign intervention.

205. Finally, draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 entrusts the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in its operative paragraphs 11 and 12, with tasks that are both precise and important, and more particularly that of exercising his good offices in order to contribute to a peaceful resolution of this grievous problem.

206. These are the arguments that motivated the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 to request that the General Assembly take no decision on draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, in order that it may proceed logically and in keeping with rule 91 of the rules of procedure.

207. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Senegal has formally proposed that the General Assembly not proceed to take a decision with respect to draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1.

208. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): The delegation of Poland cannot but express its utmost dismay at the proposal made by the representative of Senegal. It goes without saying that we reject the allegations concerning draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1, of which my delegation is a sponsor.

209. What a pity it is that, in the absence of substantive supporting arguments, the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2 have chosen to have recourse to procedural tricks in flagrant violation of the spirit of the

Assembly's work and of rule 91 of the rules of procedure. From the very beginning of our deliberations, draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 has had an unquestionable priority in the vote to be taken on the item under consideration. That priority was deliberately disregarded by the sponsors of the other draft, who, in order to impose their arbitrary view upon the Assembly, have even resorted to an act of piracy by incorporating in their draft, at the very last minute—in their ill will and in a very distorted context—some of the ideas set forth the other day in a draft resolution submitted by the delegation of India.

210. The motion not to vote upon a draft resolution submitted by a representative group of States is an arbitrary attempt to impose upon the Assembly the views of one side only. It has nothing to do with the democratic principles its sponsors so often rejoice in evoking. The draft resolution now before us is indeed most pertinent to the situation in Kampuchea.

211. Moreover, this is not the first time the Assembly has had more than one draft before it on a specific item under consideration. To mention only one example, tomorrow we shall be voting on as many as 16 draft resolutions concerning the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. Shall we take it that after the first resolution on *apartheid* has been voted upon tomorrow, the representative of Senegal, an African country, will come before us to apply the same logic he has just used in fighting the draft my delegation is sponsoring? Or is it merely expediency and convenience that have guided him today? Draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 has been sponsored by 19 States. It is moderate in tone and politically balanced, which can hardly be said about the text we have already voted on today. The text of the draft resolution before us addresses itself to the very crux of the matter, to the real—and not the trumped up—aspects of the situation in Kampuchea. That is why, on humanitarian as well as on political grounds and because of important procedural principles and United Nations practice, in accordance with the requirements of fairness and in the interest of the merits of the problem—and particularly in the interests of peace in Indo-China and South-East Asia—we resolutely oppose the motion not to vote upon draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1 and insist on proceeding to a vote on that document. Any other decision would be a dangerous precedent, harmful and prejudicial not only to the merits of the question under consideration, but also—and I shall say above all—to the prestige of this very Organization and to the possibilities of its effective work.

212. Mr. PATRICIO (Mozambique): At this stage of our voting process, we are once again facing, with regard to the voting process on the second draft resolution concerning the item under discussion, the same manoeuvres resorted to in this body a short while ago. This reveals, as far as we are concerned, the aim of the imperialist forces to impose a false reality on the international community with regard to the so-called situation in Kampuchea, in which debate we do not have the participation of the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea because of the actions of those same forces. We demand, contrary to the formal proposal of the representative of Senegal, a vote on draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1, which was the first to be proposed, relates to the item under discussion, states the real position in the

region—a position we consider irreversible—and presents positive and constructive proposals for the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom, neutrality and stability in the region.

213. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Senegal has formally moved that the General Assembly take no decision on draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add. 1, in the light of the decision the Assembly has just taken. This motion has been formally opposed by the representatives of Poland and Mozambique.

214. We shall now vote on the motion of the representative of Senegal to the effect that the General Assembly shall take no decision on draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bolivia, Botswana, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zambia.

*The motion was adopted by 62 votes to 36, with 38 abstentions.*

215. The PRESIDENT: In view of the decision just taken, The General Assembly will take no action on draft resolution A/34/L.7/Rev.1 and Add.1. I shall now call upon those delegations that wish to explain their votes after the vote.

216. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Only a few days ago, a great number of delegations assembled in this hall to pledge their contributions to alleviate the famine, misery

and deprivation of the Kampuchean people. At the Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the People of Kampuchea, the Government of Finland already expressed its views on humanitarian assistance for the victims of this tragedy.<sup>5</sup>

217. For the last three days the General Assembly has debated the substantive item on the situation in Kampuchea inscribed in the agenda of this session at the initiative of the ASEAN countries. The debate, as well as the votes taken at its conclusion, clearly show that the Assembly is deeply divided on this issue. While there has been an overwhelming emphasis on the urgent need for a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the draft resolutions presented on the subject have met with strong objections by the parties to the dispute as well as by the major Powers that wield influence in the region. Therefore none of the drafts presented appeared to us susceptible of promoting a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

218. Acting on the basis of Finland's policy of neutrality, the Finnish delegation has therefore abstained in all the votes taken on the question of Kampuchea. We regret that the deep divisions on this issue may prolong the conflict and thus the suffering of the Kampuchean people.

219. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The Romanian delegation has held discussions with sponsors of the draft resolutions and with other delegations in order to arrive at a compromise draft that would lead to a political settlement of the situation in Kampuchea. Since such a solution was not arrived at, Romania felt that it should not participate in the vote on any draft resolution as, in our view, what now matters most is to find a way that will allow us to overcome the present situation and to end the fighting in Kampuchea and the suffering of the Kampuchean people; any action must be based on respect for the principles of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, and on letting the Kampuchean people solve their own problems freely.

220. What is most important now is that every effort be made, through negotiations, to arrive at a political solution guaranteeing independence, national sovereignty, and peace for all the States of Indo-China, barring all foreign military forces and any type of intervention, thus creating in that region an atmosphere of peace, good neighbourliness and co-operation that will redound to the benefit of the people concerned and serve the interests of peace and international understanding.

221. May I express Romania's hope that all the parties concerned will do all in their power to put an end to the fighting, to arrive at a political solution based on respect for the fundamental rights contained in the Charter, namely the rights to sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States and non-use or threat of use of force.

<sup>5</sup> See document SG/CONF.1/SR.2, para 39.

222. We feel that this is a requirement in the policy of détente, peace and international co-operation.

223. Mr. THOUNN PRASITH (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): At the end of this important and historic debate, which for three days now has claimed the attention of the international community and focused it upon the tragic situation in my country, a debate that has taken place in an atmosphere of seriousness and responsibility, as commanded by the situation, the Assembly has taken an historic decision through its overwhelming vote in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.13/Rev.2.

224. All peace-loving and justice-loving peoples throughout the world who vest their hopes in the Charter of the United Nations are very gratified at this decision of our Assembly which, in the face of the present grievous circumstances in my country, clearly intends to defend and make prevail the noble ideals and principles of the Charter and to oppose any manoeuvre on the part of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to place the international community before a fait accompli in Kampuchea — in other words, any manoeuvre to legalize and legitimize its acts of aggression and its genocide in Kampuchea.

225. Over and above that desire, the General Assembly clearly means to help Member States, especially the small and weak ones, to safeguard their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity against any expansionist attack by hegemonism, whether global or regional, and thus preserve, in South-East Asia and throughout the world, the peace and security which are so seriously threatened by the war of aggression and genocide being waged by Viet Nam in Kampuchea.

226. This act of justice is a political and humanitarian act of the highest calibre which redounds to the honour of the United Nations because it contributes directly to defending the survival of the people and nation of Kampuchea and the fundamental national rights of a Member State that is a victim of a war of aggression. It shows clearly that in no case, and under no pretext, will the international community accept or condone any aggression or foreign intervention in the internal affairs of

State and that it categorically rejects recourse to the law of the jungle in international relations. On behalf of the people and Government of Kampuchea, our delegation would like to reiterate its appreciation and its profound gratitude to the Assembly and to peace-loving and justice-loving countries which, through their noble action, have made it possible for justice and law to triumph over force and aggression. It is our sincere hope that, through immediate implementation of the decision taken by the Assembly, our people will be able once again to live in peace, in independence and in freedom and that peace and security throughout the world will be safeguarded.

227. We wish to sincerely thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, for all the noble efforts he undoubtedly will make to this end.

228. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The General Assembly has just adopted by an overwhelming majority the draft resolution sponsored by the countries of ASEAN and 25 other countries and rejected the Vietnamese draft resolution. This fully demonstrates that the international community stands for justice and is firmly opposed to Viet Nam's armed aggression against Kampuchea, and strongly demands the immediate withdrawal of all Vietnamese aggressor forces from Kampuchea. This is the key to a solution of the Kampuchean question at present. Since the General Assembly has adopted an explicit resolution on this issue, the Vietnamese authorities must implement forthwith the said resolution in its entirety by immediately withdrawing all their forces from Kampuchea. It is also our earnest hope that the Secretary-General will take effective measures to urge the Vietnamese authorities to withdraw all their forces from Kampuchea so as to enable the Kampuchean people to decide their own future and destiny free from outside interference, thus making positive contributions to defending the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kampuchea and safeguarding peace and security in the whole of South-East Asia.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*