

International peace and security

The General Assembly adopted in December 1981 a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States,⁽⁸⁾ affirming that no State had the right to intervene or interfere in the internal or external affairs of other States.

This was the main action emerging in 1981 from the Assembly's annual consideration of issues pertaining to international security, with special reference to implementation of its 1970 Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.⁽²⁾ In a related resolution, the Assembly made recommendations to States and the Security Council on ways of improving the world security situation.⁽⁷⁾ In another action, the Assembly invited States to intensify efforts to implement its 1978 Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.⁽³⁾

Concerning peace and security between neighbouring States, the Assembly called on States to develop good-neighbourly relations and sought governments' views on ways to enhance good-neighbourliness so as to prevent conflicts.⁽⁶⁾

After receiving an inconclusive report from its Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations,⁽¹⁾ the Assembly again urged the Committee to work towards completion of agreed guidelines for United Nations peace-keeping operations and to devote attention to the practical implementation of such operations.⁽⁴⁾

The Assembly proclaimed an International Day of Peace, to be celebrated on the third Tuesday of each September, and invited the Economic and Social Council to consider declaring an International Year of Peace.⁽⁵⁾

Other questions pertaining to international political relations were examined by the Assembly from their legal aspects (p. 1204).

Report: ⁽¹⁾Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, A/36/469.

Resolutions: GA: ⁽²⁾2734(XXV), 16 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p.105); ⁽³⁾33/73, 15 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p.165);

⁽⁴⁾36/37, 18 Nov. 15 1981 (p. 154); ⁽⁵⁾36/67, 30 Nov.

(p. 155). ⁽⁶⁾36/101 (p. 152), ⁽⁷⁾36/102 (p. 144), ⁽⁸⁾36/103 (p. 147); ⁽⁹⁾36/104 (p. 150). 9 Dec.

Implementation of the 1970 Declaration on international security

COMMUNICATIONS. In 1981, as in previous years, many communications from United Nations Member States addressed to the Secretary-General were circulated under the General Assembly agenda item "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". A number of these dealt with disarmament or with specific disputes or situations, including the armed attack against Seychelles (p. 226), the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan (p. 225), other questions concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (p. 358), the Afghanistan situation (p. 232), the Kampuchea situation (p. 239), the Kampuchea-Thailand border (p. 249), the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand (p. 249), China and Viet Nam (p. 250), Guyana and Venezuela (p. 254), and the Western Sahara question (p. 1193). Others, concerned with general aspects of international security, are summarized below.

By a letter of 24 June,⁽¹⁵⁾ the USSR transmitted the text of an appeal from its Supreme Soviet to the parliaments and peoples of the world, adopted on 23 June, declaring that the achievement of peace was the highest goal of the foreign policy of the Soviet State and urging the legislative organs of all countries to support negotiations for the prevention of a new phase of the nuclear missile race. This appeal was supported in a declaration of 25 June by the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic, transmitted on 3 July;⁽⁴⁾ a declaration of 30 June by

the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia, transmitted on 4 August;⁽³⁾ a declaration of 4 July by the National Assembly of Viet Nam, transmitted on 26 August;⁽¹⁶⁾ and a declaration of 7 July by the People's Assembly of Bulgaria, transmitted on 20 July.⁽¹⁾

By a note verbale of 25 June,⁽⁷⁾ Mongolia transmitted a statement by its Government reviewing the international situation and mentioning a proposal made on 26 May by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Khural of Mongolia for the drafting and signature of a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force in Asia and the Pacific. This proposal, which also called for the convening of a conference of Asian and Pacific States to which the five permanent members of the Security Council could be invited, was referred to again in an appeal by the Khural to the parliaments of all countries of the region, adopted on 29 June and transmitted on 15 July.⁽⁸⁾ Further particulars of the proposal were provided in a message dated 21 September from the Chairman of the Presidium, transmitted on 9 October.⁽⁹⁾

Two appeals by the Grand National Assembly of Romania were transmitted. In the first, adopted at a session held on 30 June and 1 July and communicated on 2 July,⁽¹⁰⁾ the parliaments of the States that had signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Helsinki, Finland, 1975) were asked to join in measures of co-operation and disarmament in Europe. In the second appeal, adopted at a session of 27 and 28 November and communicated on 30 November,⁽¹³⁾ the parliaments, Governments and peoples of European countries, the United States and Canada were asked to co-operate in ensuring respect for the right of the European peoples to develop freely on the path to progress, co-operation and peace; in stopping the armaments race; in achieving general disarmament, and first and foremost nuclear disarmament; in strengthening security and co-operation in Europe; and in building a better and more just world. Romania also transmitted, on 4 November,⁽¹²⁾ an appeal for disarmament and peace adopted on 30 October by its Socialist Democracy and Unity Front.

By a letter of 18 September,⁽¹¹⁾ Romania transmitted the text of a message from its President to the participants in the International Symposium "Scientists and Peace", held at Bucharest on 4 and 5 September, and of an appeal by the participants announcing the establishment of an International Action Committee to organize scientific activities, expose the dangers of the arms race, inform the public about them, formulate measures to avoid them and prepare for a world congress of scientists in the service of peace.

By a letter of 5 December,⁽¹⁴⁾ Romania transmitted a communiqué adopted at a Bucharest meeting on 1 and 2 December of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the 1955 Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, setting out their views on the international situation and urging a series of steps towards disarmament.

By a letter of 11 November,⁽²⁾ Bulgaria forwarded excerpts from a speech by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of its Communist Party and President of its State Council, delivered at a ceremonial meeting in Sofia on 20 October dedicated to the 1300th anniversary of the founding of the Bulgarian State, stressing the need for co-operation among Balkan States and proposing a meeting on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area (p. 44).

By a letter of 25 June,⁽⁶⁾ Malta transmitted a declaration on the neutrality of Malta approved by its Government on 14 May, declaring Malta to be a neutral State that would refuse to participate in any military alliance and would not permit foreign military bases on its territory. By a letter of 25 June,⁽⁵⁾ Italy transmitted a declaration of its Government issued on 15 May, welcoming the Maltese declaration, pledging to respect Malta's sovereignty and neutrality, and inviting all other States to do likewise.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December,⁽¹⁸⁾ the General Assembly called on States to help implement the Declaration on international security.⁽¹⁷⁾ It urged them, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, to refrain from any threat or use of force against a State or its rights over its natural resources, to reject situations brought about by such use, to take measures to prevent the disruption of detente, to seek the peaceful settlement of disputes, to start meaningful disarmament negotiations, to support national liberation movements and to proceed to global economic negotiations (p. 380). It requested the Council to examine mechanisms for enhancing its authority and enforcement capacity, and to explore the possibility of holding periodic high-level meetings on conflict prevention. It called on participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to seek substantial results, favoured further efforts to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation, and called for the views of Governments on the latter question.

Other provisions of the resolution concerned the nuclear capability of South Africa (p. 46), the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace (p. 94), and human rights and peace (p. 974).

This resolution, sponsored by 20 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 127 to none, with 20 abstentions, following its approval in the First

Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 93 to none, with 21 abstentions. The original draft was revised by its sponsors before adoption.

Introducing the resolution, Yugoslavia said it reflected the particular attention that the non-aligned countries paid to the question of strengthening international security, as well as their concern over the aggravation of the international situation.

In explanation of its abstention in the vote, Israel stated that much of the text was calculated to encourage confrontation and hostility rather than dialogue and mutual understanding. The United States, also abstaining, said it had serious reservations about the utility of the many resolutions on the subject when the Charter of the United Nations provided the best guidelines for measures to strengthen peace and security; it also objected to calls for support to national liberation movements without recognition of the role of peaceful settlement of disputes.

Albania, stating that it would not participate in the vote, said it had a different opinion about detente from that implied in the text; it did not approve of appeals to permanent members of the Security Council, since they included the super-Powers responsible for world tension; for a similar reason, it did not agree with the idea of high-level Council meetings; it had reservations on the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones; it thought peace and security in the Mediterranean would be better served by countering the manoeuvres and designs of the imperialist super-Powers, particularly with respect to the presence of the USSR and United States navies there; also, it did not accept the resolution's evaluations of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Among those voting for the resolution but with reservations, Austria said the requests to the Security Council did not take full account of the delimitation of functions of different United Nations organs. Finland emphasized that there should be strict compliance with Charter provisions concerning the powers of the Council and the General Assembly. Ireland also had reservations about references touching on the competences of the two organs. France did not consider that the international mechanisms for maintaining peace and security could be questioned as institutions.

Austria stated that it could not support the proposal to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, as long as the concept had not been defined and clarified in discussions with all countries of the region and until their readiness to participate had been ascertained. Finland said the regional arrangements dealt with in the text

could only be arrived at freely among the States of the region concerned and with undiminished security for all. Spain, abstaining in the vote, said it had reservations on viewpoints and terms used in reference to the Mediterranean. Turkey, though it also abstained on the resolution, said the provision on the Mediterranean took account of its own security concerns and came close to its concept.

France and the United States said that the rights of States to dispose of their' natural resources must be exercised with respect for international law.

Reservations were also expressed by France on the paragraph on South Africa's nuclear capability, and by France and the United States on the references to the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

During the general debate on international security, a number of suggestions were made for steps to bring about a more secure world through improved international relations. Bulgaria urged contacts and the beginning of a dialogue to achieve mutually acceptable understandings on key questions, while respecting the principle of equal security and the legitimate interests of the opposing side. The Byelorussian SSR stressed the need to settle conflicts by peaceful means, around the negotiating table. Hungary welcomed efforts to revitalize negotiations and other contacts between the USSR and the United States, and said it intended to continue to establish and broaden contacts with every country, without exception, that was ready for dialogue.

Poland said it was necessary to seek ways of reducing conflicts, to institutionalize various forms of governmental and non-governmental consultations and make them more substantive, to develop forms of co-operation based wherever possible on long-range agreements, and to strive for vital national objectives through negotiation without attempting to impose one's will. Romania considered that there was no conflict that could not be settled by negotiations conducted in a spirit of understanding and mutual respect, and also believed that inter-State relations must be democratized and based on absolute respect for the principles of international law. The Ukrainian SSR favoured an active and thorough dialogue and negotiations in all forms and at all levels, including the highest, aiming at urgent joint action to reduce the threat of war, curb the arms race and ensure world peace.

Cuba stated that security could be strengthened by ending the arms race, eradicating colonialism, radically transforming the structure of international economic relations, ending all acts of aggression, resolving the Middle East conflict

and eliminating the racist apartheid regime. Sri Lanka also had an agenda for strengthening security, which called for completing decolonization, eradicating racism and apartheid, making tangible progress towards general and complete disarmament, dismantling military blocs and alliances, enabling nations to feel secure from foreign domination and aggression and from intervention in their internal affairs, and restructuring international economic relations on a more equitable basis.

In the view of Bangladesh, concerted international economic co-operation, on the basis of an agreed strategy to reduce and eliminate the gap between the developed and developing countries, was a vital pre-condition for the strengthening of international peace and security. Nigeria questioned whether the doctrine of deterrence, or balance of terror, would prove a reliable instrument of control in a crisis.

To foster the preservation of peace and security, said Trinidad and Tobago, all nations should pledge to abide by the principles of the Charter and to accept the authority of United Nations organs. Venezuela stated that respect for, and compliance in good faith with, international agreements concluded by States constituted one of the foundations of peaceful, harmonious coexistence among States.

Cyprus stressed the importance of maintaining order and security through the prevention or suppression of acts of aggression, and suggested that the Assembly hold a special session on international security within the system established by the Charter.

Eastern European States and some others held the United States responsible for a worsening international situation. Czechoslovakia stated that the imperialist forces headed by the United States were striving by military and other means to negate the positive results achieved through détente. Viet Nam said the world situation was characterized by a new recrudescence of aggressiveness by the United States against the security of third world countries and an ever closer collusion between Washington and Beijing. The USSR described its own peace programme, put forward by its Communist Party Congress early in 1981, calling for steps towards disarmament, settlement of disputes in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, and a high-level meeting of the Security Council; it contrasted that programme to that it described as the irresponsible policy of the United States aimed at securing a position of superior force.

In Albania's view, the two imperialist super-Powers-pursuing an aggressive, hegemonic, neo-colonialist policy-were primarily responsible for the dangers jeopardizing peace and

security. China stated that the correct way to strengthen peace and security was for the people of the world to unite and wage a resolute struggle against the hegemonists.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic supported the USSR proposal that a special session of the Security Council be held at the highest level to seek a solution to the most pressing international problems. The German Democratic Republic thought such a meeting would provide an opportunity, by means of constructive dialogue, to reach a decision on a reasonable balance.

Cyprus stated that there was an urgent need to comply with Article 43 of the Charter by creating an international force to give effect to the Council's decisions. Malta welcomed and supported efforts to strengthen the Council. Sri Lanka stated that, while it did not intend to pillory the Council or blame it for the state of the world, careful consideration should be given to ways in which its authority and enforcement capacity could be utilized for the settlement of outstanding issues. Yugoslavia thought the Council should be far more active and efficient in defence of peace and in the search for solutions, and regretted that there was no initiative from the Council to that end.

The Sudan supported the idea of establishing zones of peace in the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America. The concept of zones of peace was also endorsed by Yugoslavia.

Several States, including Czechoslovakia and Hungary, spoke in favour of the creation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reiterated its support for maintenance of the Mediterranean's neutrality, as a sea of peace. Malta said the establishment of such a zone would enable component States to tackle their own problems, free from super-Power interference, and could eventually entail the creation of a political forum for periodic discussion. Yugoslavia also supported the idea, adding that security in that area must be considered in the context of the situation in Europe and the world as a whole.

The USSR said it would welcome the conversion of the Mediterranean from a scene of military and political confrontation into a zone of stable peace and co-operation, through the application of confidence-building measures in the military field, an agreed reduction of armed forces, withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons, renunciation of the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear-weapon countries, and acceptance by nuclear-weapon Powers of the obligation not to use nuclear weapons against a Mediterranean country

which did not permit such weapons to be placed on its soil.

Concerning peace and security in Europe, a number of speakers commented favourably on proposals made to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, meeting at Madrid, Spain, for a further conference on military security in Europe, also discussed during the First Committee's disarmament debate (p. 89). Albania accused the United States and the USSR of plotting in the Balkans to inflame chauvinistic feelings, set the peoples and countries of the area against one another and prevent the development of good-neighbourly relations. Romania supported efforts to develop economic, technical, scientific and cultural co-operation among all European States, without distinction as to social systems, and eventually to free the continent from nuclear weapons.

With regard to Asia and the Pacific, Mongolia outlined its proposal, described in communications to the Secretary-General (p. 141), for a regional conference to conclude a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force. The Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and Viet Nam supported the proposal.

Many speakers commented on aspects of international security also dealt with under separate agenda items. Thus, a number of States—including Cyprus, Malta, Nigeria, Poland and Romania—referred to the close link between disarmament and international security, a connection discussed during the First Committee's disarmament debate (p. 100). Suggestions were made by Bangladesh, Nigeria and Romania to strengthen the role of the United Nations, a topic discussed in greater detail by the Sixth (Legal) Committee (p. 1236).

States directly involved in particular disputes gave their views on those situations, including disputes between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malta over the continental shelf (p. 358) and Guyana and Venezuela over borders (p. 254), as well as the situations between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the United States (p. 360) and between Nicaragua and the United States (p. 255).

Letters and notes verbales (nv): Bulgaria: ⁽¹⁾20 July, A/36/391 & Corr.1 (nv); ⁽²⁾11 Nov., A/C.1/36/11. ⁽³⁾Czechoslovakia: 4 Aug., A/36/422 (nv). ⁽⁴⁾German Democratic Republic: 3 July, A/36/359 & Corr.1. ⁽⁵⁾Italy: 25 June, A/36/348. ⁽⁶⁾Malta: 25 June, A/36/349. Mongolia: ⁽⁷⁾25 June, A/36/365 (nv); ⁽⁸⁾15 July, A/36/388 (nv); ⁽⁹⁾9 Oct., A/36/586. Romania: ⁽¹⁰⁾2 July, A/36/358; ⁽¹¹⁾18 Sep., A/36/528 & Corr.1; ⁽¹²⁾4 Nov., A/C.1/36/8; ⁽¹³⁾30 Nov., A/C.1/36/15; ⁽¹⁴⁾5 Dec., A/36/807-S/14784. (15)USSR: 24 June, A/36/347. ⁽¹⁶⁾Viet Nam: 26 Aug., A/36/456 (nv).

Resolutions: GA: ⁽¹⁷⁾2734(XXV), 16 Dec. 1970 (YUN 1970, p. 105); ⁽¹⁸⁾36/102, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.45-51 (27 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/102

127-0-20 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/761) by recorded vote (93-0-21), 3 December (meeting 51); 20-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1); agenda item 58 (a).

Sponsors: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Egypt, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malta, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security",

Noting with concern that the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security have not yet been fully implemented,

Profoundly disturbed by the escalation of tension in the world, the ever more frequent recourse to the threat or use of force, intervention, interference, aggression and foreign occupation, the continued stalemate in the solution of crises in different regions, the continuous escalation of the arms race and military build-up, the pursuance of the policy of rivalry, the confrontation and struggle for the division of the world into spheres of influence and domination, the persistence of colonialism, racism and apartheid, and the lack of solution of the economic problems of developing countries, all of which endanger international peace and security,

Deeply concerned that the process of relaxation of international tension has reached a point of deep crisis owing to the lack of progress in the settlement of international problems and conflicts and to the stalemate in the process of disarmament,

Stressing the need for the main organs of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of peace and security, particularly the Security Council, to contribute more effectively to the promotion of international peace and security by seeking solutions to the unresolved problems and crises in the world,

Emphasizing that, in its twenty years of existence, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has significantly contributed to the efforts of the United Nations towards the promotion of international peace and security, the democratization of international relations, the development of international co-operation and the establishment of a system of international relations based on justice, sovereign equality and equal security of all States and peoples, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles and policy of non-alignment.

1. Expresses its deep concern over the aggravation of focal points of international tension and crisis in the world, more frequent recourse to force and increasing violations of the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Reaffirms once more the universal and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter as the firm basis of relations among all States, irrespective of size, geographical location, level of development or political, economic, social or ideological systems;

3. Urges all States to abide strictly, in their international relations, by their commitment to the Charter and, to that end:

(a) To refrain from any threat or use of force, intervention, interference, aggression, foreign occupation or measures of political and economic coercion which violate the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and security of other States or their right freely to dispose of their natural resources;

(b) To refrain from supporting or encouraging any such act for any reason whatsoever;

(c) To reject and refuse recognition of situations brought about by any such act;

4. Calls upon all States to contribute effectively to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security;

5. Urges all States, in particular the permanent members of the Security Council, to take all necessary measures to prevent the further aggravation of the international situation and the disruption of the process of detente and, to this end:

(a) To seek the peaceful settlement of disputes and the elimination of the focal points of crisis and tension:

(b) To start serious, meaningful and effective negotiations on disarmament and on the halting of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, on the basis of the recommendation of the General Assembly at its tenth special session;

(c) To contribute to an urgent solution of international economic problems and the establishment of the new international economic order;

(d) To accelerate the economic development of developing countries, particularly the least developed ones;

(e) To proceed without any delay to a global consideration of ways and means for a revival of the world economy and for the restructuring of international economic relations within the framework of the global negotiations;

6. Takes note of the fact that the Security Council has failed to report to the General Assembly on steps taken to implement the provisions of paragraphs 13 and 15 of Assembly resolution 35/158 of 12 December 1960;

7. Requests the Security Council to consider ways and means to ensure the implementation of the provisions of paragraph 5 above as well as to examine all existing mechanisms and to propose new ones aimed at enhancing the authority and enforcement capacity of the Council in accordance with the Charter, and to explore also the possibility of holding periodic meetings of the Council, in conformity with Article 28 of the Charter, at the ministerial or higher level in specific cases, so as to enable it to play a more active role in preventing potential conflicts, and to present the Council's conclusions to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

8. Reiterates the need for the Security Council, particularly its permanent members, to ensure the effective implementation of its own decisions in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations;

9. Considers that respect for and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms in their civil, political, economic, social and cultural aspects contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security;

10. Reaffirms again the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, and urges Member States to increase their support for and solidarity with them and their national liberation movements and to take urgent and effective measures for the speedy completion of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and for the final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid;

11. Calls upon the Security Council to take appropriate effective measures to promote the fulfilment of the objective of the denuclearization of Africa in order to avert the serious danger which the nuclear capability of South Africa constitutes to the African States, in particular to the front-line States, as well as to international peace and security;

12. Reiterates its support for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and expresses the hope that the Conference on the Indian Ocean, which is an important stage in the realization of the objectives of that Declaration, will be held not later than in the first half of 1983 and, to this end, calls upon all States to contribute effectively to the success of that Conference;

13. Calls upon all States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, at Madrid, to take all possible measures and exert every effort in order to ensure substantial and balanced results of that meeting in the implementation of the principles and goals established by the Final Act of the Conference, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975,

as well as the continuity of the multilateral process initiated by the Conference, which has great significance for the strengthening of peace and security in Europe and in the world;

14. Considers that further efforts are necessary for the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation on the basis of the principles of equal security, sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, non-intervention and non-interference, non-violation of international frontiers, non-use of force, peaceful settlement of disputes and just and viable solutions of the existing problems and crises in the area on the basis of the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations, respect for sovereignty over natural resources and the right of peoples to make their own decisions independently and without any outside pressure or intimidation;

15. Calls upon all Governments to submit to this effect, before the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, their views on the question of the strengthening of security and co-operation in the region of the Mediterranean and requests the Secretary-General to submit the report on this question to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session;

16. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Declaration against intervention

The General Assembly, by a resolution of 9 December 1981, approved a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, and requested the widest dissemination of the text to States and organizations.⁽¹⁾

By this Declaration, the Assembly declared that no State or group of States had the right to interfere, in any form or for any reason, in the internal and external affairs of other States. The Declaration spelled out the components of the non-intervention principle in three categories: rights of States, duties of States, and matters which were both rights and duties. Matters dealt

with under rights were sovereignty, independence, national security, permanent sovereignty over natural resources, and information (p. 371). In the category of duties, States were enjoined to refrain from intervention through such means as the use of force in international relations (p. 1205), assistance to mercenaries (p. 1216), propaganda, international economic relations, exploitation of human rights issues (p. 974) and terrorism (p. 1219). Aspects of human rights and self-determination were mentioned under the category of rights and duties. Nothing in the Declaration was to prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes.

This resolution and annexed Declaration, sponsored by Guyana on behalf of United Nations Member States belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, were adopted by a recorded vote of 120 to 22, with 6 abstentions, following approval by the First Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 90 to 21, with 8 abstentions.

Guyana, which chaired the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee that had worked on the text in 1980⁽²⁾ and during the 1981 Assembly session, introduced the text and said the sponsors saw the Declaration as a shield to be used by all States rather than as a sword. Although many delegations had remarked on the frequent instances of intervention and interference in recent times, some had shown a marked reluctance to negotiate on the text. Nevertheless, said Guyana, the States of the Non-Aligned Movement had decided to press for a decision by the Assembly in 1981.

Australia, which voted against the resolution and Declaration, regretted that the sponsors had decided to persist with a text which, while containing much of merit, also included elements causing Australia serious difficulties that might have been overcome, given time for examination and consultation. Austria, also voting against, and Finland, which abstained, doubted the necessity of a new declaration—particularly one which in Austria's view contained a number of highly controversial elements, some of which seemed incompatible with the United Nations Charter, and which Finland saw as interpreting Charter principles selectively and arbitrarily.

Venezuela, voting against, said the text contained incongruities and contradictions, and lacked any reference to unsolved territorial disputes; it should have contained a statement that nothing in the Declaration affected the rights of States under treaties concerning territorial disputes, and that no State should use it to evade the obligation to try to find peaceful solutions envisaged in such treaties.

Also voting negatively, France and the United States opposed the clause on the duty of States to refrain from measures to strengthen military blocs and alliances conceived in the context of great-Power confrontation, on the ground that this provision was at variance with the right of States to individual and collective self-defence; the United States also objected that the text defined rights and duties in vague and sometimes unbalanced language. Reservations on this clause were also voiced by Greece and Turkey, which abstained in the vote on the text as a whole. Fiji, voting in favour, interpreted the clause as not precluding a State from entering into any arrangement commensurate with its genuine security needs. Haiti also voted affirmatively but with the reservation that inequality of geopolitical conditions could impel some States to have recourse to defensive alliances so as to protect themselves against expansionist designs. Ireland, voting against, said the text contained provisions inconsistent with the right of United Nations organs to take collective action to maintain or restore peace and security.

Fiji and Uruguay, voting in favour, voiced reservations on a clause declaring it to be a State's right and duty to support the right of peoples under colonial, foreign or racist domination to wage both political and armed struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence; Uruguay could not accept an attempt to institutionalize recourse to armed force for the attainment of any objective, however noble. Similarly, Ireland could not associate itself with an explicit endorsement of armed struggle in a United Nations declaration.

Objections were also raised to the provision on a State's duty not to use economic assistance or economic reprisals as instruments of political pressure or coercion and to prevent the use of transnational corporations under its control for that purpose. Finland said it would have voted against this provision if it had been voted on separately. The United States said the text purported to define new and hitherto unrecognized duties of States and did not address the issues realistically or equitably.

Objections to the clauses on information and on exploitation of human rights issues were also voiced by Finland, Greece, Ireland and the United States.

Among those which voted in favour, Mexico, though it had doubts about some aspects of the text which seemed to address circumstantial factors rather than general principles, regretted that the absence of a negotiating attitude on the part of some delegations had not made consensus possible. Malta regarded the text as a major step forward and a comprehensive indication of the

preoccupations of the Non-Aligned Movement, but would welcome an improvement in the text at forthcoming sessions to gain wider support. The USSR said the Declaration was positive and constructive on the whole, though the clause on military blocs could have been strengthened by referring to the need to dissolve military alliances, and the reference to military bases conceived in the context of great-Power confrontation could be used by the imperialists to justify deployment of interventionist forces and bases against developing countries.

The Declaration was welcomed by States from Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America. Bhutan stated that the Declaration would provide guidance applicable to all nations, big or small, powerful or weak, in the conduct of their mutual relations. Czechoslovakia regarded the Declaration as an important measure within the framework of efforts to strengthen international security, while Mongolia saw it as an important complement to the Declaration on international security. Guinea viewed the Declaration as a useful legal instrument for the security of States in the current state of international affairs.

Romania said that if there was any reason to reaffirm and develop the substance of the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in a comprehensive declaration, it was precisely because political concepts were still being entertained which overlooked the need for strict respect for that principle. The USSR stated that all those who had no ignoble intentions with regard to the non-aligned and other developing countries must support the Declaration. Yugoslavia observed that the Declaration contained precise definitions of all unlawful acts of intervention and should serve as a standard for assessing such behaviour from whatever quarter it might come.

Commenting on the non-intervention principle, the Congo cited what it viewed as two aberrations whose intended victim was peace and security: the notion of vital national interests outside the national territory of an imperial Power, and the supposed right to intervene in defence of those interests, which was an interpretation of self-defence that was wholly alien to the terms of Article 51 of the Charter on the right of individual and collective self-defence). Also supporting the Declaration, Trinidad and Tobago said that, as a minimum, States should freely recognize each other's rights to national existence and territorial inviolability, so that no State would have the right to invade the territory of another.

Resolution: ⁽¹⁾GA, 36/103, 9 Dec., text following.

Yearbook reference: ⁽²⁾1980, p. 170.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.38, 45, 46-50, 51 (20 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/103

120-22-6 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/761 and Corr.1) by recorded vote (90-21-8). 3 December (meeting 51); draft by Guyana, for Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (A/C.1/36/L.61): agenda item 58 (b).

Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2734(XXV) of 16 December 1970, containing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, containing the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty,

Recalling a/so its resolutions 2625(XXV) of 24 October 1970, containing the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and 3314(XXIX) of 14 December 1974, containing the Definition of Aggression,

Recalling further its resolutions 31/91 of 14 December 1976, 32/153 of 19 December 1977, 33/74 of 15 December 1978, 34/101 of 14 December 1979 and 35/159 of 12 December 1980 on non-interference in the internal affairs of States,

Deeply concerned at the gravity of the international situation and the increasing threat to international peace and security owing to frequent recourse to the threat or use of force, aggression, intimidation, military intervention and occupation, escalation of military presence and all other forms of intervention or interference, direct or indirect, overt or covert, threatening the sovereignty and political independence of States, with the aim of overthrowing their Governments,

Conscious of the fact that such policies endanger the political independence of States, the freedom of peoples and their permanent sovereignty over their natural resources, adversely affecting thereby the maintenance of international peace and security,

Conscious of the imperative need for all foreign forces engaged in military occupation, intervention or interference to be completely withdrawn to their own territories, so that peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist régimes may freely and fully exercise their right to self-determination, in order to enable peoples of all States to administer their own affairs and determine their own political, economic and social systems without external interference or control,

Conscious also of the imperative need to put a complete end to any threat of aggression, any recruitment, any use of armed bands, in particular mercenaries, against sovereign States, so as to enable the peoples of all States to determine their own political, economic and social systems without external interference or control,

Recognizing that full observance of the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of sovereign States and peoples, whether direct or indirect, overt or covert, is essential to the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Approves the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, the text of which is annexed to the present resolution;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the widest dissemination of the Declaration to States, the specialized agencies and other organizations in association with the United Nations, and other appropriate bodies.

ANNEX

Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and interference in the internal Affairs of States

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, that no State has the right to intervene directly or

indirectly for any reason whatsoever in the internal and external affairs of any other State.

Reaffirming further the fundamental principle of the Charter that all States have the duty not to threaten or use force against the sovereignty, political independence or territorial integrity of other States,

Bearing in mind that the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security are founded upon freedom, equality, self-determination and independence, respect for the sovereignty of States, as well as permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems or the levels of their development:

Considering that full observance of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States is of the greatest importance for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Reaffirming, in accordance with the Charter, the right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes.

Stressing that the purposes of the United Nations can be achieved only under conditions where peoples enjoy freedom and States enjoy sovereign equality and comply fully with the requirements of these principles in their international relations,

Considering that any violation of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States poses a threat to the freedom of peoples, the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States and to their political, economic, social and cultural development, and also endangers international peace and security,

Considering that a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States will contribute towards the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Considering the provisions of the Charter as a whole and taking into account the resolutions adopted by the United Nations relating to that principle, in particular those containing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Definition of Aggression,

Solemnly declares that:

1. No State or group of States has the right to intervene or interfere in any form or for any reason whatsoever in the internal and external affairs of other States.

2. The principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States comprehends the following rights and duties:

I

(a) Sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity, national unity and security of all States, as well as national identity and cultural heritage of their peoples;

(b) The sovereign and inalienable right of a State freely to determine its own political, economic, cultural and social systems, to develop its international relations and to exercise permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, in accordance with the will of its people, without outside intervention, interference, subversion, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever;

(c) The right of States and peoples to have free access to information and to develop fully, without interference, their system of information and mass media and to use their information media in order to promote their political, social, economic and cultural interests and aspirations, based, inter alia, on the relevant articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the new international information order:

II

(a) The duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing internationally recognized boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;

(b) The duty of a State to ensure that its territory is not used in any manner which would violate the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity or disrupt the political, economic and social stability of another State; this obligation applies also to States entrusted with responsibility for territories yet to attain self-determination and national independence;

(c) The duty of a State to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force;

(d) The duty of a State to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence;

(e) The duty of a State to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or of any of its institutions

(f) The duty of a State to refrain from the promotion, encouragement or support, direct or indirect, of rebellious or secessionist activities within other States, under any pretext whatsoever, or any action which seeks to disrupt the unity or to undermine or subvert the political order of other States;

(g) The duty of a State to prevent on its territory the training, financing and recruitment of mercenaries, or the sending of such mercenaries into the territory of another State and to deny facilities, including financing, for the equipping and transit of mercenaries;

(h) The duty of a State to refrain from concluding agreements with other States designed to intervene or interfere in the internal and external affairs of third States;

(i) The duty of States to refrain from any measure which would lead to the strengthening of existing military blocs or the creation or strengthening of new military alliances, interlocking arrangements, the deployment of interventionist forces or military bases and other related military installations conceived in the context of great-Power confrontation;

(j) The duty of a State to abstain from any defamatory campaign, vilification or hostile propaganda for the purpose of intervening or interfering in the internal affairs of other States;

(k) The duty of a State, in the conduct of its international relations in the economic, social, technical and trade fields, to refrain from measures which would constitute interference or intervention in the internal or external affairs of another State, thus preventing it from determining freely its political, economic and social development; this includes, inter alia, the duty of a State not to use its external economic assistance programme or adopt any multilateral or unilateral economic reprisal or blockade and to prevent the use of transnational and multinational corporations under its jurisdiction and control as instruments of political pressure or coercion against another State, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations:

(l) The duty of a State to refrain from the exploitation and the distortion of human rights issues as a means of interference in the internal affairs of States, of exerting pressure on other States or creating distrust and disorder within and among States or groups of States;

(m) The duty of a State to refrain from using terrorist practices as state policy against another State or against peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes and to prevent any assistance to or use of or toler-

ance of terrorist groups, saboteurs or subversive agents against third States;

(n) The duty of a State to refrain from organizing, training, financing and arming political and ethnic groups on their territories or the territories of other States for the purpose of creating subversion, disorder or unrest in other countries;

(o) The duty of a State to refrain from any economic, political or military activity in the territory of another State without its consent:

III

(a) The right and duty of States to participate actively on the basis of equality in solving outstanding international issues, thus actively contributing to the removal of causes of conflict and interference:

(b) The right and duty of States fully to support the right to self-determination, freedom and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes, as well as the right of these peoples to wage both political and armed struggle to that end, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter;

(c) The right and duty of States to observe, promote and defend all human rights and fundamental freedoms within their own national territories and to work for the elimination of massive and flagrant violations of the rights of nations and peoples, and, in particular, for the elimination of apartheid and all forms of racism and racial discrimination:

(d) The right and duty of States to combat, within their constitutional prerogatives, the dissemination of false or distorted news which can be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of other States or as being harmful to the promotion of peace, co-operation and friendly relations among States and nations;

(e) The right and duty of States not to recognise situations brought about by the threat or use of force or acts undertaken in contravention of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference.

3. The rights and duties set out in this Declaration are interrelated and are in accordance with the Charter.

4. Nothing in this Declaration shall prejudice in any manner the right to self-determination, freedom and independence of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist regimes, and the right to seek and receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

5. Nothing in this Declaration shall prejudice in any manner the provisions of the Charter.

6. Nothing in this Declaration shall prejudice action taken by the United Nations under Chapters VI and VII of the Charter.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamshiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Swaziland, Turkey.

Implementation of the 1978 Declaration on societies and peace

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. In a report to the General Assembly issued in September 1981 (with later addenda),⁽²⁾ the Secretary-General transmitted replies from 14 Governments on progress in implementing its 1978 Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.⁽³⁾ The report, requested by the Assembly when it adopted the Declaration,⁽⁴⁾ also included a response by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) describing action taken at meetings of educators, activities under the Associated Schools Project in Education for International Co-operation and Peace, the award of a UNESCO Prize for Peace Education and social sciences research relevant to the promotion of peace.

In a letter of 20 February 1981 to the Secretary-General,⁽¹⁾ Poland, the initiator of the Declaration in 1978,⁽⁶⁾ described what it had done to implement the Declaration by teaching a "mentality of peace" in schools; it mentioned the recognition given to the document in various international bodies and suggested internal, regional and multilateral activities by States.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 9 December 1981,⁽⁵⁾ the General Assembly invited States to intensify efforts to implement the Declaration. It reiterated its appeal for concerted action—by Governments, the United Nations, specialized agencies and other organizations—to give tangible effect to the supreme importance and need of establishing, maintaining and strengthening a just and durable peace for present and future generations. It requested the Secretary-General to report again by 1984 on progress in implementing the Declaration.

This resolution, sponsored by 16 nations, was adopted by a recorded vote of 143 to none, with 2 abstentions, following its approval by the First Committee on 3 December by a recorded vote of 114 to none, with 2 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution, Poland stated that far more dedicated efforts were needed to put into effect the concepts and ideals of the Declaration. These included increased co-operation among States, good faith in dialogue and negotiations, increased regional efforts on all continents, greater bilateral co-operation, promotion of good-neighbourliness and mutual respect, and encouragement of specific activities by organizations and individuals.

Abstaining in the vote, the United States saw

what it regarded as two fundamental flaws in the Declaration and the resolution: there was inadequate reference to human rights, and the idea that States should prepare their citizens for life in peace and use information media and schools to achieve what the resolution's preamble referred to as the "moulding of human consciousness" to fulfil the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter was antithetical to free societies, whose Governments were prohibited from attempting to dictate or mould the opinions of their citizens.

Reservations on this preambular phrase were also voiced by some States that voted for the resolution. The United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Community (EC) members, rejected the concept of controlling information sources, and also thought the call in paragraph 2 for action by Governments, the United Nations and specialized agencies might be interpreted as placing them on the same level, whereas the United Nations should exercise a co-ordinating role. The Netherlands thought the preambular phrase seemed to imply state activities that could prejudice the exercise of freedoms by individuals and also believed, as did Austria, that the concept of life in peace must be related to human rights. Poland, on behalf of the sponsors, did not accept a Canadian suggestion that the phrase "positive moulding of human consciousness" be replaced by "encouraging in the human consciousness".

In the general debate on international security, support for the resolution was voiced by the Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia.

Letter: ⁽¹⁾poland, 20 Feb., A/36/119.

Report: ⁽²⁾S-G, A/36/386 & Add.1-3.

Resolutions: GA: ⁽³⁾33/73, 15 Dec. 1978 (YUN 1978, p. 165); ⁽⁴⁾ *ibid.*, sect. III (p. 166); ⁽⁵⁾36/104, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Yearbook reference: ⁽⁶⁾1978, p. 160.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV.45, 46-50, 51 (27 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/104

143-0-2 (recorded vote) Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/761) by recorded vote (114-0-2), 3 December (meeting 51); 16-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.58); agenda item 58 (c).

Sponsors: Afghanistan, Algeria, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines, Poland, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia.

Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace

The General Assembly,

Recalling the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, contained in its resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978,

Taking note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General,

Reaffirming the lasting importance of the preparation of societies for life in peace as part of all constructive efforts at shaping relations among States and strengthening international peace and security,

Aware of the paramount value of positive moulding of human consciousness for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the charter of the United Nations,

1. Solemnly invites all States to intensify their efforts towards the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace by strictly observing the principles enshrined in the Declaration and taking all necessary steps towards that end at the national and international levels;

2. Reiterates its appeal for concerted action on the part of Governments, the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as well as other interested international and national organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, to give tangible effect to the supreme importance and need of establishing, maintaining and strengthening a just and durable peace for present and future generations;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to continue following the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly not later than at its thirty-ninth session.

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Cape Verde, central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United States.

Good-neighbourliness between States

By a resolution of 9 December 1981 on the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States,⁽³⁾ the General Assembly called on States to develop good-neighbourly relations and reaffirmed that good-neighbourliness conformed with the purposes of the United Nations and was founded on the rejection of attempts to establish zones of influence or domination. The Assembly reaffirmed the need to examine good-neighbourliness in order to develop its content as well as modalities to enhance it, and believed the results of that examination could be included at an appropriate time in an international document. It requested Governments to communicate their views and suggestions on

the topic, with a view to preventing conflicts and increasing confidence among States; invited United Nations organizations to continue to inform the Secretary-General of their activities relevant to good-neighbourliness; and requested him to submit a report in 1982 containing such views and suggestions.

This resolution, sponsored by 31 nations, was adopted without vote following its approval in similar fashion by the First Committee on 3 December. The sponsors orally revised paragraph 8 to have the Assembly request that the report contain "an orderly presentation of the views and suggestions received concerning the content of good-neighbourliness, as well as ways and modalities to enhance its effectiveness" rather than simply "a systematic presentation of the views and suggestions received".

Romania, introducing the resolution, said it was not enough to proclaim principles and norms; ways to ensure their application in relations between States must be established and utilized. Romania suggested a number of possible methods to strengthen good-neighbourliness, including the conclusion of friendship treaties and other instruments on the non-use of force, the creation of bodies for consultation and negotiation, and the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation and of demilitarized zones. Such an institutional and juridical framework could prevent disputes or ensure that they did not degenerate into conflicts.

A report of the Secretary-General,⁽¹⁾ requested by the Assembly in 1979,⁽²⁾ contained replies from 27 States with their views and suggestions on good-neighbourliness and ways to enhance it, and from 14 organizations and bodies in the United Nations system on their activities relevant to the development of good-neighbourliness.

In the First Committee debate, Albania stressed the duty of States to cast aside everything that could endanger good-neighbourly relations and said it was especially important to take a firm attitude against attempted interference or intrigue by the super-Powers and other imperialists practising a "divide-and-rule" policy. Yugoslavia viewed national minorities as bridges of friendship, mutual understanding and co-operation among countries and peoples, particularly between neighbours.

Bangladesh endorsed the idea that the principle of good-neighbourliness should be studied further with a view to finding specific modalities for achieving it. China reiterated its view that relations among States and among neighbours should be based on the five principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in inter-

national affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. The Congo stated that, for weak countries that were slow to develop, good-neighbourliness was a symbol of union and thus of strength.

Ecuador believed that a specific reference to the principles of non-use of force and the obligation to settle international disputes by peaceful means should have been included in paragraph 2 of the resolution, calling on States to develop good-neighbourly relations.

Greece classified the elements regulating good-neighbourliness into three phases or categories: the cessation of every act that had a negative effect on good-neighbourliness, the positive steps which a State could take in order to develop good relations with its neighbours and close co-operation for the benefit of all peoples concerned. Guinea listed three principles which West African States had followed in negotiating disputes: giving up the threat or use of force and hostile propaganda, promoting confidence by practical actions, such as avoiding the stationing of troops along frontiers, and maintaining agreements and dialogue at the highest possible level. Turkey stated that good-neighbourliness required a certain stability or a minimum of harmony among the partners, in the absence of which it would be absurd to speak of such a concept.

Mali believed that a legal instrument governing good-neighbourliness should be drafted. Singapore acknowledged the concern that good-neighbourliness did not correspond to any concept in international law or that a legal code on the subject would be broken to suit selfish interests, but felt nevertheless that there were two reasons to start giving the concept some legal content: a well-defined concept of good-neighbourliness would assist in judging rights and wrongs in a world where acts of aggression against neighbouring States had always been justified by some lofty principle, and it was the hallmark of civilized men to regulate their mutual relations according to a set of laws or recognized code of ethics. The United Kingdom, speaking for the EC members, stated that they were not convinced that the notion of good-neighbourliness necessarily corresponded to any existing principles of international law and thought any further work to strengthen and develop the concept should take place in the Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee.

The USSR stated that the motto which best characterized United States policy towards its neighbours was the slogan "Speak softly but carry a big stick", as demonstrated by the overthrow it organized in 1954 of the progressive régime in Guatemala, the 1961 invasion by mer-

cenaries against Cuba and the landing of United States troops in the Dominican Republic in 1965. The United States said it had improved its excellent relations with the two neighbours sharing its open and unguarded borders; a truly good neighbour encouraged the free exchange of people and ideas, and did not require a rigid political orthodoxy of smaller States on its borders or resort to massive armed intervention to enforce that orthodoxy.

Report ⁽¹⁾S-G, A/36/376. & Add.1.

Resolutions: GA: ⁽²⁾34/99, paras. 4-6, 14 Dec. 1979 (YUN 1979, p. 143); ⁽³⁾36/101, 9 Dec. 1981, text following.

Meeting records: GA: 1st Committee, A/C.1/36/PV. 45, 46, 47, 48-50; 51 (27 Nov.-3 Dec.); plenary, A/36/PV.91 (9 Dec.).

General Assembly resolution 36/101

Adopted without vote Meeting 91 9 December 1981

Approved by First Committee (A/36/760) without vote, 3 December (meeting 51); 31-nation draft (A/C.1/36/L.59), orally revised: agenda item 57.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Burundi, Chad, Colombia, Congo, France, Guinea, Indonesia, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the determination of the peoples of the United Nations as expressed in the Charter to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours,

Recalling its resolutions 1236(XII) of 14 December 1957, 1301(XIII) of 10 December 1958, 2129(XX) of 21 December 1965 and, in particular, 34/99 of 14 December 1979,

Bearing in mind that, owing to geographic proximity, there are particularly favourable opportunities for co-operation and mutual advantage between neighbouring countries in many fields and that the development of such co-operation may have a positive influence on international relations as a whole,

Considering that the great changes of a political, economic and social nature as well as the scientific and technological progress which have taken place in the world and led to unprecedented interdependence of nations have given new dimensions to good-neighbourliness in the conduct of States and increased the need to develop and strengthen it,

1. Reaffirms that good-neighbourliness conforms with the purposes of the United Nations and is founded upon the strict observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as upon the rejection of any acts seeking to establish zones of influence or domination;

2. Calls upon all States, in the interest of the maintenance of international peace and security, to develop good-neighbourly relations, acting on the basis of these principles;

3. Considers that the generalization of the long practice and of principles and rules pertaining to good-neighbourliness is likely to strengthen friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter;

4. Reaffirms the need to examine the question of good-neighbourliness in order to strengthen and further develop its content, as well as ways and modalities to enhance its effectiveness;

5. Believes that the results of the examination of good-neighbourliness and of the clarification of its elements could be included, at an appropriate time, in a suitable international document;

6. Requests the Governments that have not communicated their views and suggestions on good-neighbourliness, as well as on ways and modalities to enhance it, with a view to preventing conflicts and to increasing confidence among States, to do so as soon as possible, and invites the Governments that have already communicated such views and suggestions to supplement them if they deem it necessary;

7. Invites the United Nations organs, bodies and programmes, as well as the specialized agencies, within their fields of competence, to continue to inform the Secretary-General of the aspects of their activities relevant to the development of relations of good-neighbourliness between States;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, on the basis of the replies of States and of the views expressed during the thirty-sixth session, as well as of the comments of specialized agencies, a report containing an orderly presentation of the views and suggestions received concerning the content of good-neighbourliness, as well as ways and modalities to enhance its effectiveness;

9. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States".

Review of UN peace-keeping operations

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, established by the General Assembly in 1965,⁽³⁾ held three meetings in 1981, on 17 July and 6 and 26 August. It discussed its mandate, reiterated by the Assembly in December 1980,⁽⁵⁾ which was to work towards the completion of agreed guidelines to govern the conduct of United Nations peace-keeping operations and devote attention to specific questions related to the practical implementation of such operations.

In its report to the Assembly,⁽²⁾ the Committee observed that long-standing basic differences remained and that its task would continue to be difficult, owing to the fundamental nature of the issues involved. It concluded, however, that the importance of the issues was such that its mandate should be renewed.

The Secretary-General submitted to the Committee a report⁽¹⁾ containing the responses of seven Governments to the Assembly's 1980 invitation⁽⁴⁾ that States provide information on experience gained in peace-keeping operations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. By a resolution of 18 November 1981,⁽⁶⁾ the General Assembly took note of the Special Committee's report, repeated its invitations to Member States to provide information on experience gained in peace-keeping operations, and again urged the Committee to work towards completion of agreed guidelines for the conduct of peace-keeping operations and to devote further attention to questions related to the practical implementa-

tion of such operations. The Committee was requested to report in 1983.

This resolution was adopted without vote on the basis of a text submitted by the Chairman of the Special Political Committee (SPC) following informal consultations, and approved by that Committee without vote on 13 November.

Commenting on the text, Jamaica thought it should have been improved by urging the Special Committee to hold substantive meetings and requesting it to submit a comprehensive report explaining the nature of the difficulties and the options it had considered with a view to overcoming the deadlock.

In the SPC debate on this subject, it was generally felt that the peace-keeping role of the United Nations was fundamental to the effective implementation of its Charter. Most delegations expressed regret that, although a certain amount of common ground had been reached, deep-rooted differences had prevented the Special Committee from fulfilling its mandate. It was felt however that, despite the lack of progress, the Committee should not give up its search for agreed guidelines for future United Nations peace-keeping operations.

As in previous years, the debate centred on a small number of issues, including the role of the Security Council and other main organs of the United Nations in peace-keeping operations, and the financing of those operations.

Regarding the role of peace-keeping operations, Lebanon thought they should have diplomatic and political dimensions, since warring parties could not be made to co-operate with an international force without constant political action; moreover, the Security Council's authority must be enhanced, so that peace-keeping resolutions could be implemented and States that defied them could be forced to abide by them.

Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Pakistan maintained that the Council alone had the power of decision with regard to the launching, supervision, financing and command of United Nations peace-keeping operations throughout their duration. Czechoslovakia thought it would be useful for the Council to establish a subsidiary body to assist it in implementing such operations.

India, Ireland and Kenya, on the other hand, while stressing the Council's responsibility in backing or conducting United Nations peace-keeping operations, felt that the Secretary-General should be given the authority and flexibility needed to ensure the effective conduct of the operations. Nepal, too, felt the Secretary-General must have clear authority to direct the day-to-day operations of any such force so that

the United Nations could respond adequately and promptly to emergencies.

Egypt, Greece and India stressed the need for prior consent by the host country before the establishment of United Nations peace-keeping operations. Cyprus, Greece and India added that there must be full respect for the sovereignty of the State on whose territory the operations were being carried out. In this regard, Ireland upheld the principle that a peace-keeping force must have the full co-operation of all parties involved in a dispute, while Israel suggested that, in order for the force to have the confidence of the parties, it should be composed exclusively of troops from countries maintaining normal relations with all the Governments in the area. The Syrian Arab Republic reaffirmed the need for all parties to commit themselves to unconditional co-operation with United Nations peace-keeping forces, and Cyprus stressed that those forces should be allowed to function without hindrance.

Several speakers, including Chile, Cyprus, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, made the point that peace-keeping operations should not be an end in themselves or a substitute for efforts to find a peaceful solution to the underlying causes of conflicts.

Regarding the work programme of the Special Committee, some States continued to favour parallel consideration of issues of principle and practical implementation, while others insisted on seeking prior agreement on guidelines for peace-keeping operations. In the former camp, Japan thought the consideration of practical measures would have an important bearing on current and future operations and would contribute to the completion of agreed guidelines.

On the other hand, Hungary said that, while it was not averse to discussing practical matters relating to peace-keeping, it believed the preparation of guidelines should have priority. The German Democratic Republic said the over-emphasis on so-called practical aspects complicated the solution of the main issue. A similar view was expressed by the USSR, which felt that attempts to divert the Committee's attention from resolving the main issues could play into the hands of those who did not want it to complete its main task; the so-called practical aspects could be worked out in special arrangements concluded under Article 43 of the Charter between the Security Council and potential troop-contributing countries.

Israel thought the usefulness of general guidelines was likely to be limited; they could be effective only if they were adaptable to particular requirements. Jamaica said the guidelines should not be too tightly drawn and should take account

of different circumstances in different areas as well as the need for operational flexibility; it also voiced doubts about continuing the Special Committee and mentioned a special session of the Assembly or an expert group as alternative ways to continue the work on guidelines and other matters.

A number of suggestions were made with a view to improving the efficiency of United Nations peace-keeping efforts. Kenya, Nepal and the United States stressed the need for maintaining stand-by forces or earmarking contingents that could be made available to the United Nations in urgent situations, and Finland, speaking for the Nordic States, pointed out that they had maintained such forces since 1964. Austria and Cyprus suggested that national or regional seminars be conducted under United Nations auspices so that States could share their experiences; Austria also suggested that standards be elaborated relating to the safety and security of peace-keeping units. Morocco observed that peace-keeping operations had to be conducted with extraordinary speed in order to keep pace with events.

Regarding the financing of peace-keeping operations, Chile, Fiji, Finland, Jamaica, Kenya, Nepal and the United States expressed the view that Member States had a collective responsibility for such financing and that, consequently, the costs must be borne by all Members as part of United Nations expenses. Sharing this view, Ireland, Japan and the United Kingdom (for the EC members) regretted that certain countries, in particular some permanent members of the Security Council, had refused to honour their financial obligations with regard to peace-keeping operations; the United Kingdom remarked that this placed an additional financial burden on troop-contributing States. Zaire stated that the financial implications of peace-keeping operations should not serve as a pretext to shirk collective responsibility.

Fiji emphasized that troop-contributing States should be fully, regularly and equitably compensated for their services in order to encourage the participation of small States in peace-keeping operations and to achieve a balanced geographical distribution in the composition of the force. Canada cautioned that delays in the payment of contributions might reduce the capacity of the countries concerned to maintain their contingents and discourage participation by other States. The United States called for the punctual payment of financial contributions so that the troop-contributing countries would not have to bear the financial burden.

Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic

Republic and Hungary reaffirmed the primary role of the Security Council in choosing the method of financing peace-keeping operations. The German Democratic Republic maintained that the aggressor must bear full responsibility with regard to the expenses incurred by such operations, and the Syrian Arab Republic said the victim of aggression could not be required to contribute. Making a similar point, the Lao People's Democratic Republic said that to apportion the costs of the aggression among the members of the international community would be tantamount to legitimizing a criminal act.

Albania expressed the opinion that the negative impact of United Nations peace-keeping operations was due in part to the ineffectiveness of the Security Council and declared that it would never participate in financing such operations.

Reports: ⁽¹⁾S-G, A/AC.121/34 & Add.1; ⁽²⁾Special Committee, A/36/469.

Resolutions: GA: ⁽³⁾2006(XIX), 18 Feb. 1965 (YUN 1964, p. 59); ⁽⁴⁾35/121 para. 2, 11 Dec. 1980 (YUN 1980, p. 182); ⁽⁵⁾ *ibid.*, para. 4; ⁽⁶⁾36/37, 18 Nov. 1981, text following.

Meeting records; GA: SPC, A/SPC/36/SR.29-32 (11-13 Nov.); plenary, A/36/PV.63 (18 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/37

Adopted without vote Meeting 63 18 November 1981

Approved by SPC (A/36/690) without vote, 13 November (meeting 32); draft by Chairman following informal consultations (A/SPC/36/L.16); agenda item 63.

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2006(XIX) of 18 February 1965, 2053 A (XX) of 15 December 1965, 2249(S-V) of 23 May 1967, 2308(XXII) of 13 December 1967, 2451 (XXIII) of 19 December 1968, 2670(XXV) of 8 December 1970, 2835(XXVI) of 17 December 1971, 2965(XXVII) of 13 December 1972, 3091 (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, 3239(XXIX) of 29 November 1974, 3457(XXX) of 10 December 1975, 31/105 of 15 December 1976, 32/106 of 15 December 1977, 33/114 of 18 December 1978, 34/53 of 23 November 1979 and 35/121 of 11 December 1980,

Reaffirming once again the fundamental importance of the maintenance of international peace and security by the United Nations as set out in the Charter of the United Nations,

Reaffirming the determination of the United Nations to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest of Member States,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations,

Noting with regret the difficulties being experienced by the Special Committee in carrying out its mandate,

Emphasizing again that only by a greater demonstration of political will and conciliation can progress be achieved,

1. Takes note of the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations;

2. Repeats its invitations to Member States to report and to provide information on experience gained in peace-keeping operations;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a further compilation of the replies submitted in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

4. Urges again the Special Committee, in accordance with its mandate, to renew its efforts to work towards the completion of agreed guidelines which will govern the conduct of peace-keeping operations of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and to devote further attention to specific questions related to the practical implementation of peace-keeping operations;

5. Requests the Special Committee to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session;

6. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects".

International Day and Year of Peace

On 30 November 1981,⁽²⁾ the General Assembly proclaimed the third Tuesday of September, the opening day of its regular session, as International Day of Peace, devoted to commemorating and strengthening the ideals of peace. It invited Member States, organizations and individuals to commemorate the Day, especially through all means of education. The Assembly also invited the Economic and Social Council to consider declaring an International Year of Peace at the first practicable opportunity and to submit its recommendations to the Assembly in 1982.

This resolution, sponsored by 20 nations, was adopted without vote.

The item entitled "Declaration of a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day" was placed on the Assembly's agenda at the initiative of Costa Rica, contained in a letter of 14 August to the Secretary-General.⁽¹⁾ An accompanying explanatory memorandum stated that the International Association of University Presidents, at its Sixth Triennial Conference (San José, Costa Rica, 28 June-3 July), had endorsed the conclusion that the most effective means of achieving lasting peace was education. Consequently, it had decided to invite the Assembly to declare a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day to serve as a constant reminder of the ardent longing for universal peace.

Introducing the resolution, Costa Rica said the Peace Year should not be a celebration empty of substance; apart from its educational aspect, it should be a year in which tensions were reduced, lives were saved and the arms race did not attain the level of universal madness. Costa Rica had originally proposed the year 1984, but was leaving the choice open in order to abide by guidelines to be decided by the Assembly.

Letter: ⁽¹⁾Costa Rica, 14 Aug., A/36/197.

Resolution: ⁽²⁾GA, 36/67, 30 Nov., text following.

Meeting records: GA, A/36/PV.75, 77 (27, 30 Nov.).

General Assembly resolution 36/67

Adopted without vote Meeting 77 30 November 1981

20-nation draft (A/36/L.29/Rev.1); agenda item 133.

Sponsors: Bangladesh, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Panama, Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, Venezuela, Zaire.

International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace
The General Assembly,

Recalling that the promotion of peace, both at an international and a national level, is among the main purposes of the United Nations, in conformity with its Charter,

Reaffirming that, as set forth in the preamble of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed, that a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of Governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind,

Further recalling that, on the basis of similar considerations, the General Assembly established the United Nations University in 1972 and, more specifically, the University for Peace in 1980, and entrusted other organs and organizations of the United Nations system with the promotion of peace, mainly through education in all its aspects,

Noting with appreciation the initiative taken by the International Association of University Presidents at its Sixth Triennial Conference, held at San José from 28 June to 3 July 1981, to propose the Declaration of a Peace Year, a Peace Month and a Peace Day,

Acknowledging the conclusions of the Conference that it would be appropriate to devote a specific time to concentrate the efforts of the United Nations and its Member States, as well as of the whole of mankind, to promoting the ideals of peace and to giving positive evidence of their commitment to peace in all viable ways,

Considering that, through the declaration and proper celebration of an International Year of Peace and an International Day of Peace, it would be possible to contribute to strengthening such ideals of peace and alleviating the tensions and causes of conflict, both within and among nations and peoples,

1. Invites the Economic and Social Council to consider, at its first regular session of 1982, the possibility of declaring an International Year of Peace at the first practicable opportunity, taking into account the urgency and special nature of such an observance as well as the guidelines for international years and anniversaries adopted by the General Assembly in its decision 35/424 of 5 December 1980, and to submit its recommendations to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the basis of appropriate arrangements for the timing, organization and financing of the Year;

2. Declares that the third Tuesday of September, the opening day of the regular sessions of the General Assembly, shall be officially proclaimed and observed as International Day of Peace and shall be devoted to commemorating and strengthening the ideals of peace both within and among all nations and peoples;

3. Invites all Member States, organs and organizations of the United Nations system, regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, peoples and individuals to commemorate in an appropriate manner the International Day of Peace, especially through all means of education, and to cooperate with the United Nations in the observance of that Day.