

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