

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1471st
 MEETING**

Friday, 2 December 1966,
 at 11.15 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 98:</i>	
<i>Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (concluded)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (concluded)</i>	275
<i>Organization of work (continued)</i>	
<i>Question raised by the representative of Guinea concerning a draft resolution submitted under agenda items 93 and 31 (continued)</i>	278

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 98

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (concluded) (A/6399, A/C.1/L.369, A/C.1/L.385-387)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/C.1/L.369, A/C.1/L.385-387)

1. The CHAIRMAN called on representatives who wished to explain their votes before the voting began.

2. U SOE TIN (Burma) said that Burma had no foreign military bases on its soil, since it followed a policy of peace and friendship with all nations and avoided any entanglement with Power-bloc politics. It recognized the sovereign right of independent States either to enter into military alliances for collective security or to permit foreign military bases in their territory for purely defensive purposes. However, it believed that alliances which involved foreign military bases were more likely to create distrust, tension and conflict than to bring security to any region.

3. Unfortunately, the debate had been conducted along "cold war" lines, and the rigid positions taken by the two sides had prevented the adoption of any compromise draft which would have admitted of further constructive steps for the eventual elimination of foreign military bases. It might, therefore, be more helpful to the disarmament efforts of the United Nations and the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament if the First Committee adopted no substantive draft resolution at the present time. His delegation would, however, vote for the three-Power procedural draft resolution (A/C.1/L.387), which would refer the matter to the Eighteen-Nation Committee for further consideration.

4. Mr. WONG (Singapore) said that the military base in Singapore was being maintained with his Government's consent to ensure his country's security. His Government would never allow it to be used for aggression and would do away with it as soon as there were effective alternative safeguards.

5. Singapore favoured the elimination not only of foreign military bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and not only of those established by any Power bloc, but of all military bases established by any country in another country against the other country's will. The Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964, had declared that the maintenance or future establishment of foreign military bases or the stationing of foreign troops on the territories of other countries against the expressed will of those countries was a gross violation of sovereignty and a threat to freedom and international peace. It had also declared that the existence or future establishment of bases in dependent territories which could be used for the maintenance of colonialism or for other purposes was indefensible. Singapore fully endorsed those views. However, elimination of bases was a complex problem which required greater deliberation and consideration, and his delegation would therefore support the proposal (A/C.1/L.387) to transmit the records and documents of the First Committee and the General Assembly to the Eighteen-Nation Committee for further study.

6. Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) said that the question of military bases was already on the agenda of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, within the context of general and complete disarmament. His delegation believed that it would be best to examine the question in that context, taking into account the points of view expressed in the First Committee, so long as they were constructive and realistic. The Eighteen-Nation Committee had to deal with important and urgent problems, such as the conclusion of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of underground nuclear tests, and a cut-off of fissile material production for military purposes. Its proceedings must not be hampered by polemical debate. It was on that understanding that his delegation would vote in favour of the three-Power draft resolution.

7. Mr. KANE (Senegal) said that in his delegation's view military bases on foreign soil could be condemned only in two cases: when they were established against the will of the Governments and peoples concerned and when they served as a staging point for possible aggression or interference in the internal affairs of the host State or of neighbouring States. Any draft resolution which called for

the elimination of all foreign military bases without exception would infringe the sovereign rights of States and therefore violate Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter. For that reason his delegation could not support the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.369) unless its operative paragraph 1 was improved and unless its scope was enlarged so as to include Europe. It would vote in favour of the first of the Togolese amendments (A/C.1/L.385) and the third of the Liberian amendments (A/C.1/L.386).

8. His delegation would support the three-Power draft resolution. However, if it was adopted, it might be better for the First Committee to take no action on the other draft resolutions.

9. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) said that all members of the Committee agreed that the question of foreign bases was of considerable political and military significance and formed an integral part of the disarmament problem. The natural place for a productive discussion of the question was therefore the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

10. Israel had no foreign military bases on its soil, but he feared that those nations which did maintain such bases would not be encouraged to eliminate them by the atmosphere of the First Committee's debate on the question. The Committee's proceedings had included polemics and baseless allegations which obscured the essence of the problem and would have to be cleared away when the Eighteen-Nation Committee examined the record.

11. While it supported the three-Power draft resolution, his delegation hoped that it would not be interpreted as prescribing an order of priority to the Eighteen-Nation Committee, which should be left free to decide the proper place of the question of foreign military bases among the important disarmament issues on its agenda.

12. Mr. OKOBOI (Uganda) said that his delegation's reservations regarding the USSR draft resolution had been largely eliminated by the Togolese and Liberian amendments. At the same time, it found that the Liberian version of operative paragraph 1 had more substance than the Togolese version, and it therefore intended to ask for a separate vote on the second Togolese amendment.

13. On the other hand, it was in general agreement with the Liberian amendments, except for the first, which would insert a new first preambular paragraph. His delegation would abstain on that, since it believed that the establishment of a foreign military base in the territory of an independent State presupposed the consent of that State.

14. His delegation had read the three-Power draft resolution with keen interest and, especially in the light of the Italian representative's statement, it would support it.

15. Mr. SISSOKO (Guinea) said that in the discussion of the various disarmament items his delegation had laid particular emphasis on the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as essential in the interest of international peace and security. Since a more

careful and detailed analysis of the question would be possible if it was referred to the Eighteen-Nation Committee, his delegation would support the proposal in the three-Power draft resolution.

16. Mr. NSANZE (Burundi) said that, although there were no foreign bases in his country, his Government opposed the presence of such bases on the soil of sovereign States as a violation of national sovereignty. The presence of foreign troops in the Portuguese colonies was a matter of particular concern; and the cases of Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and South West Africa should also be borne in mind.

17. His delegation would have been prepared to vote for the USSR draft resolution, but if the countries directly concerned—the countries of the "third world"—considered that the most appropriate solution would be to refer the matter to the Eighteen-Nation Committee, it would accept that solution.

18. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) said that his delegation would support the USSR draft resolution, because it would help to solve an urgent problem of particular importance to small countries. His country's special concern was understandable, in view of the illegal establishment of the Guantánamo base by the United States against the wishes of the Cuban Government and people. The base was used for acts of aggression and subversive activity and his Government was determined to demand the return of that usurped territory in the proper place and at the right time.

19. His delegation could not support the three-Power draft resolution, as it would merely postpone the solution of the problem.

20. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said she had hoped that the Soviet representative would inform the Committee whether he would press for a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.369. Since that had not been done, her delegation wished to make certain changes in its amendments (A/C.1/L.386) in order to take the Committee's views into consideration.

21. The first preambular paragraph proposed in the first amendment should be changed to read:

"Believing that foreign military bases should never be established in the territory of the independent States of Asia, Africa, America and Europe against the sincere and freely expressed wishes of the peoples directly concerned,".

The preambular paragraph proposed in the second amendment should be changed to read:

"Believing further that foreign military bases can be used for military intervention in the internal affairs of peoples, for suppression of their struggle for independence and freedom and for dangerous activities which threaten world peace,".

The text proposed in the third amendment for operative paragraph 1 should be changed to read:

"Invites States with military bases established in the territory of independent States to eliminate these bases and never to establish others unless the hosts countries in exercise of their sovereign rights favour the establishment or retention of bases in their territories;".

The new operative paragraph 2 proposed in the fourth amendment should be changed to read:

"Requests States with military bases in dependent territories of Asia, Africa, America and Europe immediately to close down such bases."

22. Mr. LEKIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation attached great importance to the elimination of foreign military bases, as it had made clear at the Belgrade and Cairo Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in 1961 and 1964 respectively. The debate in the First Committee on the question had demonstrated once again that what was involved was a major problem affecting contemporary international relations and that one of the immediate tasks must be to explore ways and means for finding a real solution to the problem. While the Yugoslav delegation fully appreciated the legal aspect of the problem, it believed that its political significance should be given the greatest emphasis. Such bases had become an anachronism, and they were obviously a negative factor in international relations. It was with those considerations in mind that Yugoslavia had joined with India and the United Arab Republic in submitting draft resolution A/C.1/L.387.

23. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation would vote for the Liberian amendments to the USSR draft resolution and for the three-Power draft resolution.

24. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) recalled that at the 1469th meeting, after introducing the three-Power draft resolution, he had made two motions under rule 132 of the rules of procedure. The first had been that priority should be given in the voting to the three-Power draft resolution, and the second that, if it was adopted, the Committee should decide not to vote on the other proposals before it.

25. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that he did not share the view that the three-Power draft resolution should be given priority simply because it was hoped that, if it was approved, the Soviet draft resolution would not be put to the vote.

26. The CHAIRMAN noted that in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure a Committee should vote on two or more proposals relating to the same question in the order in which they had been submitted, unless it decided otherwise. He would therefore ask the Committee to vote on the United Arab Republic's motion that priority should be given to the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.387).

The motion was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN put the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.387) to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of any objection he would take it that, in view of the approval of the three-Power draft resolution, the Committee

had decided not to vote on the USSR draft resolution and the amendments thereto.

29. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation wished to vote on the USSR draft resolution, which its sponsor had not withdrawn.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that in that case he would ask the Committee to vote on the motion that the USSR draft resolution should not be put to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 99 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

31. Sir Harold BEELEY (United Kingdom), explaining his vote, said that the generally satisfactory conclusion of the debate on the item was due in part to the sense of realism the Soviet delegation had displayed. For the second time in two years that delegation had decided not to press for a vote on a draft resolution concerning military bases when the text had been criticized by the representatives of many States on the three continents to which it referred. His delegation had voted in favour of the three-Power draft resolution because it thought that it would offer a satisfactory means of concluding the debate and also because it was ready to consider the question of bases in the context of disarmament at the appropriate time. Its vote did not, however, imply endorsement of the wording of the second preambular paragraph, where the question was described as being of paramount importance. It was not the view of his delegation that the question of foreign military bases should be given priority over such questions as the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the limitation and reduction of existing nuclear forces and the banning of underground nuclear tests.

32. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) said that he had abstained in the voting on the three-Power draft resolution because he had reservations with regard not to the transmission of the records of the debate to the Eighteen-Nation Committee, but to the title of the item. The title failed to take into account two pertinent circumstances: the existence of foreign military bases on other continents and the distinction between dependent and independent territories. He wished also to express his delegation's view that the debate had been neither constructive nor enlightening.

33. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the seriousness of the debate testified to its significance and to the urgent need to ensure the elimination of foreign military bases. The Soviet Union intended to continue striving for the achievement of that disarmament measure in the interests of peace. The United Kingdom representative's approach had been technical and based mainly on arithmetical calculations, rather than political. The second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which had just been approved showed why the socialist countries and the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America would continue to work for the elimination of foreign military bases on the three continents.

34. Mr. BONDOC (Philippines) said he had abstained not because his delegation thought that the question

of foreign military bases was of less than primary importance but because in its view the question should be examined within the context of general and complete disarmament and the discussion should include all such bases rather than those in Africa, Asia and Latin America only.

35. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) appreciated the concern for the preservation of peace and tranquillity in the "third world" which had been shown during the debate. However, the absence of peace in any part of the world affected all mankind and his delegation had therefore felt that the title of the item should include Europe. His position during the latter part of the debate had been dictated by the consideration that, since it was the Soviet representative who had proposed both the item and draft resolution A/C.1/L.369, it would have been better to leave it to him to decide whether the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

Organization of work (continued)

QUESTION RAISED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF GUINEA CONCERNING A DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED UNDER AGENDA ITEMS 93 AND 31 (continued)

36. The CHAIRMAN summed up the position at the end of the 1470th meeting. It was now for the Committee to decide whether rule 124 of the rules of procedure should be applied in the case of the vote that had been taken at the 1470th meeting on the Guinean representative's proposal that the Committee should immediately consider a draft resolution submitted under agenda item 93, which had now been submitted under agenda items 93 and 31 together (A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1).

37. Mr. CHURCH (United States of America) recalled that at its 1430th meeting the Committee had decided to consider first the six items on its agenda relating to disarmament, followed by item 96. It had also decided to consider at a later stage an order of priority for the remaining items on its agenda. Those decisions had been reached after careful consultations and had been accepted by the delegations of the United States and the USSR alike. The Soviet representative had himself suggested that the Korean question should be discussed immediately after the Committee had concluded its consideration of the items to which it had already decided to accord priority.

38. At the 1470th meeting, the Committee had considered a proposal—supported by the Soviet representative—to take up immediately one aspect of item 93. As item 93 was not one of those to which the Committee had given priority at its 1430th meeting, the proposal was clearly tantamount to reconsideration of a decision the Committee had already taken. Under rule 124 of the rules of procedure, it could not be adopted unless it obtained a two-thirds majority. The numerical result of the vote on the proposal had, in fact, been 38 in favour and 37 against, with 26 abstentions.

39. The Soviet representative had tried to convince delegations that there was no precedent for applying rule 124 in the present case, and that the rule was

applicable only to proposals relating to substance. He was wrong on both counts.

40. The rules of procedure did not make a distinction between substantive and non-substantive proposals. They did distinguish between proposals, on the one hand, and motions of a particular character, such as those mentioned in rule 117, 120 and 122, on the other. But rule 124 was applicable even to such motions. In any case, the order of priority of items on the Committee's agenda had been established year after year on the basis of proposals. At the 1428th meeting the Hungarian representative had said he wished to "propose" a certain order of priorities for the items and had used the word "proposal" six more times in the course of his statement. At the 1430th meeting, the Chairman had likewise used the word "proposal" to refer to the order of priority the Committee had eventually adopted. In a similar discussion at the seventeenth session, the Soviet representative had himself objected to a "proposal" by Canada regarding the order of business, and had submitted a "counter-proposal". At the same session the Romanian representative had described the order of priority of items on the Committee's agenda as not merely a procedural, but basically a political, issue.

41. It was equally wrong to say that there was no precedent for applying rule 124 to a so-called "non-substantive" proposal. At the 1625th meeting of the Fourth Committee, at the current session of the General Assembly, the Chairman of that Committee had applied rule 124 to a proposal to reverse a decision to hear a petitioner. At the 1208th meeting of the First Committee, at the sixteenth session, the Chairman had ruled that a proposal to postpone consideration of the Algerian item, which involved changing the order of discussion previously decided, required a two-thirds majority. At the 652nd meeting of the Second Committee, at the fifteenth session, when the United States delegation had proposed a change in the priority assigned to various agenda items, a similar ruling had been made. And at the 1305th and 1325th meetings of the Third Committee, at the twentieth session, the Chairman had said that an alteration of the agreed programme of work would require a two-thirds majority. There were many other precedents that he could cite.

42. If in the present case the Committee decided not to apply rule 124, the United States and other delegations holding similar views would immediately introduce another draft resolution under items 93 and 31 and would ask priority for it. There would then be a long discussion before a decision could be taken.

43. In the interests of good order and mindful of the precedents, the Committee should apply rule 124 in the present case as well.

44. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) observed that the United States representative had referred only to Soviet proposals and attitudes. But the proposal for immediate consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 had been made by the Guinean delegation, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution. The proposal had been purely procedural, and he deeply

regretted that it should be used as a pretext for "cold war" or other political controversies.

45. After further discussion, in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) and Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) took part, Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure and asked the Chairman to put to the vote the question of the applicability of rule 124 of the rules of procedure to the proposal made at the 1470th meeting by the representative of Guinea.

46. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) opposed the motion for closure of the debate. She believed that the question

of the applicability of rule 124 in the present case should be fully discussed.

47. Mr. OULD HASSEN (Mauritania) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure, he would put to the vote first the motion for adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 58 votes to 27, with 11 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.