

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Friday, 15 November 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KORHONEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 79: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 78: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

- (a) **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (continued)**
- (b) **REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**
- (c) **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO) (continued)**

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC.2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/40/SR.34
21 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

85-57673 86688 (E)

/...

122 P.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 79: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/40/L.16-L.28)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the draft resolutions on agenda item 79, issued as documents A/SPC/40/L.16, L.17, L.18, L.19, L.21, L.22, L.23, L.24, L.25, and L.26. He noted that document A/SPC/40/L.24 had been reissued for technical reasons, and that documents A/SPC/40/L.27 and L.28 contained the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions in documents A/SPC/40/L.17 and L.26 respectively.

2. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that his country would continue to co-operate with UNRWA in various fields, but believed that the Agency's mandate should be renewed without any political linkage.

3. The ritual expression, in draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.16, of deep regret for the non-implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), a text which had been adopted nearly 40 years ago in entirely different historical circumstances, was unacceptable to his delegation. Israel would continue to provide accommodation of better quality to refugees in the Gaza district, despite the demand expressed in draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.20 that it should abandon its efforts to do so. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.21, which demanded the resumption of ration distribution to Palestine refugees, was sponsored by wealthy Arab States which had reduced their own contributions to UNRWA. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.22, in stating that inhabitants of the territories occupied since 1967, had an inalienable right to return, was based not on consideration of the interests of those inhabitants but on the policy of rejection. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.23 ran counter to the basic tenets of international law, since property rights within the borders of a sovereign State were exclusively subject to domestic law. The request contained in draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.26 for the establishment of a university for refugees in Jerusalem was absurd, in view of the existence of a large number of renowned educational institutions, both Jewish and Arab, in that city. It was for the same reason that his delegation was unable to support draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.19, which contained a reference to the proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds".

4. The text of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24 bore exactly the same title as last year's unjustified and unwarranted General Assembly resolution on "Protection of Palestine refugees" (39/99 I), and contained identical opening paragraphs, despite the fact that Israeli forces had left Lebanon in the course of the past year. Subsequent paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, while expressing the same deep concern for the security of the Palestine refugees, referred, not to the situation in Lebanon, but to that in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories. He asked whether the representative of Pakistan, who had introduced that draft resolution, was aware of the concern which had been expressed by the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People in document A/40/339 of 23 May 1985 over tragic developments in and around the Palestinian refugee camps in Beirut, after the withdrawal of Israeli

/...

(Mr. Barromi, Israel)

forces from the area. Security Council resolution 564 (1985) of 31 May 1985 had expressed similar concern. There was little doubt that the principal cause of such concern was action by Syria, whose forces, in conjunction with Lebanese forces, had killed some 2,000 refugees and wounded over 6,000 in refugee camps in Lebanon. The representative of Pakistan, however, chose instead to repeat the wording of last year's resolution in preambular paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, substituting the phrase "in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem" for "in occupied southern Lebanon". It was clear to the many visitors to Judea, Samaria and Gaza that the outrages which had allegedly occurred in the previous year in southern Lebanon were not being re-enacted in exactly the same way in those territories. His delegation believed that the drafting of the document had been slovenly, and that it and the other draft resolutions submitted by Pakistan and Bangladesh should be rejected.

5. Mr. ABOUASSI (Lebanon) said that, in response to the points raised by the representative of Israel in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, his delegation wished to state that the Palestinian civilian and military presence in Lebanon, and the violence which had involved Palestinians and Lebanese together, had resulted from Israeli acts of aggression. He expressed the hope that the talks currently being held under Syrian sponsorship would lead to a stable and lasting peace in Lebanon and make it possible to restore the rule of law throughout the country. Despite Israel's claim to have withdrawn its forces from southern Lebanon, United Nations forces and the Government of Lebanon continued to consider that no such withdrawal had taken place. Violence in the Middle East was likely to continue if Israel persisted in blocking efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the region.

6. Mr. NAQVI (Pakistan) said that the scandalous attack made by the representative of Israel did not deserve serious rebuttal. The Committee was currently studying certain proposals relating to the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA. Other problems relating to the region could be raised in the appropriate forums at their appointed times. The reference by the representative of Israel to the letter from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People did not take into account other more representative elements of his letter. Finally, Israel's claim with regard to the presence or otherwise of Israeli occupation forces in the region could be verified by reference to the reports of United Nations forces in that area.

7. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that his remarks had addressed the subject under discussion, namely the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA. The Near East included both Lebanon and Syria, and Palestine refugees were to be found in both those countries. With regard to selectivity, he had quoted verbatim the words of the Chairman on massacres in Beirut and other areas. He defied the representative of Pakistan to substantiate the allegations against Israel contained in draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24.

/...

8. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee was ready to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/SPC/40/L.16 to L.26.

9. It was so decided.

10. Mr. WOLLTER (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the financial situation of UNRWA made it imperative to maintain strict priorities, foremost among which should be the educational and health care needs of the refugees. The resumption of the general ration distribution as requested in draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.21 would, without sufficient financial resources, endanger the most important activities of the Agency, and the Swedish delegation would therefore vote against that draft resolution. His delegation would abstain on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.22 because it appeared to rule out negotiations or discussions on the means by which Palestinians displaced as a result of the 1967 war might return to their homes. It would also abstain on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.23 because it believed that claims by Palestine refugees in respect of property or compensation should be dealt with in the context of a comprehensive solution to the Middle East question. It would abstain on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, despite its concern for the security and legal and human rights of the Palestine refugees, in view of the sweeping and contradictory language in several paragraphs of the draft and the fact that the text did not appear to address the security situation of those refugees most in need of protection. It was also inappropriate to demand that the Secretary-General should "guarantee" the safety of refugees in circumstances where he had no means to do so. His delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.25, but wished to point out that it interpreted the wording used in paragraph 1 as an affirmation of Israel's responsibility to refrain from transferring and resettling Palestinian refugees against their will.

11. Mr. FALTZ (Luxembourg), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community, said that the Ten remained committed to the safety, security, legal and human rights of all Palestinian refugees. However, they had difficulty in understanding why draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, which had traditionally related to the specific situation of Palestine refugees in Lebanon, now appeared to have a more general application. The impression given was that the situation of Palestine refugees in Lebanon was less grave than that in other occupied territories, although the report of the Commissioner-General and his statement before the Special Political Committee demonstrated that the opposite was true. With regard to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the Ten felt that it was important not to detract from the responsibility of Israel, as the occupying Power, to provide protection to the civilian population. Certain other passages in the draft resolution contained extreme generalizations which the Ten would have difficulty in supporting.

/...

12. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.16.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

13. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.16 was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

14. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.17 was adopted without a vote.

15. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.18 was adopted without a vote.

16. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.19.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy,

/...

Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaya, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

17. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.19 was adopted 126 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

18. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

/...

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

19. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.20 was adopted by 126 votes to 2.

20. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.21.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Portugal, Spain.

21. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.21 was adopted by 105 votes to 19, with 3 abstentions.

22. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.22.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia,

/...

Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

23. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.22 was adopted by 106 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

24. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

25. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.23 was adopted by 103 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

26. A recorded vote was taken on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Chile, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire.

27. The seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24 was adopted by 91 votes to 17, with 18 abstentions.

28. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde,

Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

29. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24 was adopted as a whole by 96 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions.

30. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.25.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda,

/...

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

31. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.25 was adopted by 126 votes to 2.

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.26.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

33. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.26 was adopted by 126 votes to 2.

34. Mr. IRTEMCELİK (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, it had certain reservations with regard to the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24. Nevertheless, Turkey's support for those paragraphs was a reaffirmation of its concern and sincere sympathy for all Palestine refugees wherever they might be.

/...

35. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24 should not be interpreted as implying any change in its position concerning the plight of the Palestine refugees. On the contrary, Austria remained firmly committed to the need to protect the Palestine refugees and safeguard their human rights. Similar draft resolutions adopted in previous years had referred to the situation of Palestine refugees in Lebanon. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, however, applied in general to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The specific references in the seventh preambular paragraph were either a repetition of those contained in General Assembly resolution 39/99 I or were based on paragraph 35 of the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/40/13), both of which referred to the situation in Lebanon.

36. Mr. RIZIK (United States of America) said that his country was pleased to have had the opportunity to reaffirm its support for the work of UNRWA by sponsoring draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.16 and to join the consensus on draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.17 and L.18. His delegation supported draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.19 because it provided a practical way of meeting some of the needs of the refugees. He did not, however, support the extraneous reference in paragraph 5 to the proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds". His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.26 on the University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds" for Palestine refugees because that was a purely political project and would not meet the educational needs of the refugees.

37. The United States had voted against draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.20 and L.22, which were highly polemical, one-sided and harshly condemnatory of Israel, and draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.23 because it prejudged the issues of refugee repatriation and compensation, which could be best settled through direct negotiations among the parties concerned. His delegation strongly supported the efforts of the Commissioner-General to make the most efficient use of the scarce resources of UNRWA. Accordingly, it had been unable to support the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.21, which aimed at narrowing the Commissioner-General's discretionary powers.

38. The United States had also voted against draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, which included an unacceptable, one-sided condemnation of Israel in complete disregard for the truth. Such exercises in empty polemics only aggravated the problems facing the Agency. Furthermore, a resolution charging the Secretary-General with guaranteeing the safety, security and rights of the Palestine refugees in the occupied territories would raise practical and legal problems with respect to the possibility of conflicting jurisdictional authorities.

39. His Government could not support paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.25, which would exclude any programmes which might seek to improve the quality of life of the refugees pending an overall political settlement. Such programmes might include new housing programmes for the refugees outside existing camps, undertaken voluntarily by the refugees themselves and co-ordinated with UNRWA.

/...

(Mr. Rizik, United States)

40. His delegation's votes on the draft resolutions reflected his Government's desire to see UNRWA continue its important humanitarian work pending a definitive solution to the problems in the area. Nevertheless, there was nothing to be gained by adopting draft resolutions which would not help achieve the Agency's stated objectives. Such draft resolutions served only to aggravate an already difficult situation, prejudged issues which were best left to direct negotiations between the parties concerned, and, in some cases, actually prevented the taking of measures which would directly benefit the Palestine refugees. Lastly, it was hoped that UNRWA would be able to continue its humanitarian work and receive the broad-based support of the international community.

41. Ms. LUOSTARINEN (Finland) said that her country was deeply concerned at the need to ensure the security of the Palestine refugees and supported all measures to improve the protection of the refugees. Finland had been unable to support the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, which was unbalanced and inaccurate and overlooked the serious security problems of Palestine refugees in parts of Lebanon that were not occupied. If paragraphs 1 and 3 of that draft resolution had been put to a vote, her delegation would have abstained because it did not feel that it was the responsibility of the Secretary-General to guarantee the security of the refugees when he had no means to do so and because the wording of paragraph 3 was sweeping and inaccurate. Lastly, with regard to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.24, it was her delegation's understanding that the damage referred to was that specified in the Agency's claim submitted to the Government of Israel amounting to approximately \$US 4.4 million.

42. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the statement made by the Zionist spokesman was another attempt to evade responsibility for the crimes committed by Israel. The international community, however, would never allow that country to shirk its responsibility, which had been specified in numerous General Assembly resolutions. His delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions and wished to state that no references in the draft resolutions implied any readiness on the part of his Government to recognize the Zionist entity or the status quo imposed by force in the Palestinian territories and the occupied Arab territories.

43. Mr. NAZZARI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. Nevertheless, the relief programmes should not be considered a permanent solution to the Palestinian question, and all practices which prevented the Palestine refugees from exercising their right to voluntary repatriation to their homeland should be condemned. Although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.16, the sponsor of that draft resolution had hypocritically pretended to support the Palestine refugees, while that country's support for the Zionist entity was well known. Lastly, his delegation had reservations concerning all references to the Zionist régime as "Israel".

44. Mr. RODRIGUEZ MEDINA (Colombia) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote, it would have voted in favour of all the draft resolutions.

/...

45. Mr. TERZI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) expressed satisfaction at the adoption of the draft resolutions, which showed the unanimity of the international community in its concern for the Palestine refugees. The best solution to the Palestinian problem would be the speedy repatriation of Palestine refugees. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.18, which had been unanimously adopted, dealt with assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities. In that connection, it was sad to note that at the same time that the United Nations had been considering the question of the displaced Palestine refugees, the Fascist Israeli occupying authorities, on 13 November, had razed 5,000 residences in the Palestine refugee camps in the Jericho area. That act was an affront to the work of the United Nations and was a further demonstration of the racist Zionist ideology.

46. He expressed concern that the other refugee camps in the vicinity of Jerusalem, Ramallah, Nablus, Hebron and Bethlehem might meet with the same fate. The Israelis claimed that those residences were uninhabited. If that was so, there was no reason why Palestinian refugees could not be settled in those camps and avail themselves of the services of UNRWA until they were enabled to return to their homes in occupied Palestine. Lastly, it was hoped that the United Nations would clarify why the Israeli occupying forces had committed such a crime against the Palestinian people and why the Secretary-General had remained silent in that regard.

AGENDA ITEM 78: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (continued) (A/40/21)
- (b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/617 and 841)
- (c) REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (continued) (A/40/667)

47. Mr. ABDULLAH (Indonesia) said that information and communication had rightly become a major preoccupation of the United Nations. As a member of the Committee on Information since its inception, his country had tried to make a contribution to strengthening the Department of Public Information (DPI) and harnessing the United Nations system to the service of information and communication and to the promotion of a new, more just and more effective world information and communication order.

48. His delegation regretted that the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Information (A/40/21) had not been adopted by consensus. Although the recommendations on a new world information and communication order were controversial, there was no question as to the need for such an order, for the developing countries remained dependent on information systems which did not correspond to their development goals. His delegation therefore supported recommendations 5 and 7 made by the Committee in its report. It also drew attention to recommendations 8, 12 and 17, which were generally in accordance with Indonesia's policies. In particular, the developed countries and the United Nations system should give full support to the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC).

/...

(Mr. Abdullah, Indonesia)

49. The delegation welcomed the improved co-operation between the United Nations and the non-aligned countries and considered that DPI and UNESCO should plan to integrate communication networks and regional centres. It hoped that DPI would expand its work with the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies. Recommendations 43 to 48, concerning the United Nations information centres, correctly emphasized their role in the establishment of a new world information and communication order. He assured DPI of his Government's readiness to assist the information centre which had opened at Jakarta in August.

50. Recommendation 38, concerning Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Arab territories, had aroused much controversy. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and a supporter of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, his Government did not understand how anyone could contest a call to DPI to co-operate with United Nations organs in the discharge of their duties in that area.

51. He reaffirmed his country's support for UNESCO, particularly in its work to establish a new world information and communication order; his delegation endorsed the call for greater co-operation between DPI and UNESCO and the rest of the United Nations system in support of UNESCO's information and communication activities.

52. Mr. MUTO (Japan) regretted that, for the first time, the Committee on Information had been obliged to decide a matter by vote, rather than by consensus; the point of disagreement had been the question of a new world information and communication order. That was the more unfortunate as UNESCO, at its recent General Conference, had adopted, by consensus, a resolution which had stipulated that the establishment of such a new order should be seen as an evolving and continuous process. His delegation firmly believed that that decision, taken at a world conference with high-level representation, should be reflected in the decisions taken in other United Nations forums, including the General Assembly.

53. Japan well understood the desire of the developing countries to remedy the disparities between themselves and the developed countries with regard to the flow of information. Nevertheless, his delegation felt compelled to stress that the problem could not be rectified through State intervention or international control of the flow of information. Among all fundamental human rights, freedom of expression, freedom of information and freedom of the press were of the greatest importance. It would be a violation of those rights for a State to prescribe to the media what should or should not be reported or to impose any conditions on the freedom of the press. Moreover, experience had shown that the integrity of a nation and the development of a society were best promoted when people were free to receive information from a variety of sources and when both the private and public sectors were free to disseminate information. The disparities between developed and developing countries should be corrected by expanding the capabilities of developing countries to disseminate and to receive information. It was therefore essential that developing countries should strengthen human resources in that regard and expand their communications infrastructures and that there should be

/...

(Mr. Muto, Japan)

co-operation in the field of information and communication. Japan was actively participating in bilateral financial and technical co-operation efforts with developing countries and had contributed regularly to the IPDC programme.

54. Criticism of the United Nations had tended to focus on areas where the Organization had not been able to perform its role effectively. The Department of Public Information must seek to deflect such criticism by emphasizing the achievements of the United Nations in a broad range of areas ranging from peace-keeping, to refugee relief, to international co-operation for economic and social development.

55. DPI must increase its efforts to ensure that its information activities were well-balanced and impartial. That task was by no means easy. His delegation believed that that situation should be taken into account by the relevant United Nations bodies when they considered resolutions and recommendations and that the opinions of smaller groups should be respected.

56. While demands on DPI continued to increase, the resources available to it remained at the same level. It was therefore essential that DPI should make the most efficient use of those resources, and, in that regard, his delegation supported the Department's efforts in monitoring and evaluating its own work. The Department's support to the Committee on Information in connection with the distribution of taped radio programmes was a good example of such efforts, which should be expanded to many other areas of activities.

57. His delegation firmly believed that the proposed restructuring of the Radio and Visual Services Division would enhance efficiency and should not require additional financial resources. He welcomed the suggestion that implementation of the proposal should be delayed for one year in order to prepare the way for a smooth transition.

58. His delegation had noted with concern that the Committee on Information was adopting an increasing number of recommendations for the initiation of new projects or the expansion of existing programmes. His delegation was convinced that three criteria should be applied in accepting new proposals, namely: first, that any new undertaking should be truly necessary; second, that the cost of the project should be kept to a minimum; and third, that DPI should make a careful cost/benefit analysis and study the relative priorities of projects. It might be necessary to delete less urgent projects, however worthwhile they might be.

59. Mr. KOTSEV (Bulgaria) said that the mass information media must play a role in uniting the efforts of all peoples to eliminate the threat of war, curb the nuclear arms race and ensure peace and progress, as well as helping to restore confidence in international relations. They must draw attention, in particular, to the consequences of extending the arms race into outer space and to the falseness of the concept of a "perfect defence". It was unfortunate that some Western countries were using the information media for militaristic propaganda and to conceal their ambitions for strategic superiority.

/...

(Mr. Kotsev, Bulgaria)

60. The media were also being used for psychological warfare against the socialist and some developing countries and the national liberation movements. The broadcasts of a number of Western radio stations were notorious in that respect. Ratification by all States Members of the United Nations of the 1936 Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace would be an important step forward, and it was regrettable that some Western European countries had declared the Convention null and void. His country had always favoured the dissemination of balanced and objective information, and it would welcome the adoption by the United Nations of principles governing the conduct of the mass media to ensure that they served the cause of peace, the easing of tensions, and international co-operation.

61. Many countries remained victims of information imperialism. The United Nations and UNESCO had failed to bring about any improvements in the situation because of the wish of some States to maintain their monopoly over the information services of the developing countries and their opposition to the establishment of a new world information and communication order. His country would continue to support the efforts to establish such an order and believed that the United Nations and UNESCO could take concrete measures for information decolonization. Bulgaria had demonstrated the importance which it attached to UNESCO by hosting the twenty-third General Conference. It would continue its support of UNESCO, especially against the attempts of certain States to use blackmail to extract political concessions.

62. As a member of the Committee on Information, his country regretted that the Committee had been unable to adopt its recommendations by consensus, and it hoped that a more constructive approach would prevail in future. The documents before the Special Political Committee accurately reflected United Nations public information activities and the work of DPI in particular. DPI should continue to concentrate on such questions as the threat of nuclear war, the arms race, the militarization of outer space, the restoration of confidence among States and the restructuring of international economic and information relations. Once again, however, his delegation had to draw attention to the underrepresentation of the Group of Eastern European States in DPI. The situation was unacceptable and must be corrected.

63. Ms. GROOMS (United States of America) said that it was the view of her delegation that the right of the individual to seek, receive and impart information and opinions without interference, as outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was a fundamental human right. The United States consequently opposed all practices which violated that right, whether jamming, censorship or constraints on journalists. The right covered any information which the individual might happen to want, whether the source was domestic or foreign and whether or not the information was agreeable to the Government of the country in which the citizen lived.

64. That position was in contrast to the views of those who said that a new world information and communication order must promote a new concept of access to information, based on the following principles: regulation of the right to

/...

(Ms. Grooms, United States)

information by preventing abusive uses of the right of access to information; definition of appropriate criteria to govern truly objective news selection; and regulation of the collection, processing and transmission of news and data across national frontiers. It was clear that, while some aspects of a new world information and communication order would encourage increased communication capabilities and the fostering of more information voices, other aspects advocated increased governmental controls over information content and fostered restrictions on information judged by governmental entities to be unbalanced, false or incomplete.

65. Some had argued that the establishment of such a new order would not impinge on the free flow of information. In the Committee on Information, however, western-sponsored recommendations based on the free flow of information had been rejected. Clearly, some advocates of a new world information communication order would encourage Governments to do what could not really be done, namely, to define truth. Giving a Government, or anyone else, the power to dictate what was "true" only provided inordinate power to dictate. Protection lay, not in deciding truth, but in enabling as many voices as possible to pursue truth and to report their findings to others. The cause of lasting peace was served by a world of many voices able to communicate to the broadest possible segment of the world's populace without interference.

66. Her delegation hoped that in future all nations would respect the provisions of the 1984 resolution of the World Administrative Radio Conference establishing a world-wide monitoring process and, in that connection, had been pleased to note that, during the previous two weeks, modest gains had been achieved in the areas of radio jamming and access to local news. Pravda had published most of an interview with President Reagan and subsequently the President's radio address to the Soviet people could be heard in the Soviet Union on at least some of the frequencies used by the Voice of America. Her Government welcomed those decisions by the Soviet Government and believed that the cause of mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries could be significantly advanced by letting the Soviet people hear directly from the President of the United States.

67. The recommendations of the Committee on Information had failed to receive the support of even one member of the Western Group. It was understandable that the developing world should wish to develop its communication and information infrastructures. That endeavour, however, required financial and technical assistance from the developed countries. If the discussion on a new world information and communication order followed a path that prevented the support of the entire developed world, that would only delay the changes so eagerly sought by the developing world. Her delegation believed that the Special Political Committee should concentrate on areas of agreement in order to narrow, rather than widen, the differences between the Groups.

68. Regarding the definition of a new world international and communication order, her delegation considered that any draft resolutions referring to such a new order must include the phrase "seen as an evolving and continuous process", and hoped that the Committee could put the matter to rest once and for all.

/...

(Ms. Grooms, United States)

69. The continued tendency of the Special Political Committee and of the Committee on Information to consider political issues that were debated at length elsewhere in the United Nations was also a matter of special concern to her delegation. In certain cases, issues on which it was well known no consensus existed had been carried over to the Special Political Committee, even if separate resolutions of the General Assembly on those issues already existed. The question arose why such disputes were brought into the Special Political Committee, as they only added to the areas of disagreement, thus making consensus impossible.

70. Regarding the possible financial implications of the two draft resolutions, her delegation had noted with appreciation that the recommendations presented by the Group of 77 to the Committee on Information had no financial implications. The General Assembly, however, in paragraph 10 of its resolution 39/98 A, had recommended additional resources for DPI commensurate with the increase in its activities. Such language could lead to budget increases for DPI which her delegation could not countenance. She therefore hoped that during the current budget year, fiscal prudence would once again prevail. In that connection, her delegation welcomed the statement by the Under-Secretary-General that no growth was foreseen in the proposed budget for DPI.

71. In conclusion, she wished to restate her delegation's support for the continuing efforts of DPI to evaluate and monitor its activities and its strong belief that the department should be the focal point of United Nations information activities.

72. Mr. LAGORIO (Argentina) said that the concept of freedom of information and communication had been enshrined in article 14 of the Argentine Constitution, which stipulated the freedom of citizens to disseminate their opinions without prior censorship. His delegation therefore held firmly to the inalienable principle of the freedom of opinion and expression as set out in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Any new order must incorporate the specific principle that, within each country, the right of the individual to express himself freely must be safeguarded against any form of censorship while, externally, the fundamental principle must be that of the free flow of information based on the legal equality of States and respect for the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

73. During the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, there had been many references to the economic crisis afflicting not only the developing world but also many developed nations. The information media should pay greater attention to the reality of that situation and to the strenuous efforts which the developing countries were making in order to achieve a better standard of living. Through DPI, the United Nations could contribute to those specifically economic themes which were of special importance to the developing countries. A new world information and communication order must therefore be based on the principle of a more just and fair dissemination of information which would be of particular benefit to the least privileged countries.

/...

(Mr. Lagorio, Argentina)

74. His delegation welcomed the information contained in the report of the Director-General of UNESCO (A/40/667) to the effect that IPDC was continuing to pursue its programmes and projects, which were of particular importance to the developing countries. His delegation was nevertheless concerned at the lack of funds for IPDC and hoped that that problem might be overcome so that the Programme could become an additional instrument for enhancing the communication capabilities of the developing countries.

75. His delegation firmly supported the work and decisions of UNESCO, and wished to reiterate that his Government attached priority to the agency's programmes.

76. His delegation, together with others, had, during the previous session, been concerned at the possible consequences of the proposal to restructure the Radio and Visual Services Division. He accordingly welcomed the statement contained in the Secretary-General's report (A/40/841) that the proposal would not entail any additional cost nor any shortfall in proposed programme delivery. His delegation therefore hoped that, if the decision was taken to implement the programme on 1 January 1987, it would be implemented in such a way as to protect the interests of the Division's staff as well as the principles of more effective management and tighter administrative control.

77. His delegation also welcomed the proposal to reopen the Information Centre in Jakarta on 20 August last and supported the proposal to open Information Centres in Cotonou and Warsaw, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 39/98 A.

78. It was no secret that substantial differences had prevented consensus during the latest session of the Committee on Information. Urgent and imaginative solutions must be found. His delegation would therefore work to identify consensus formulas which would take account of the interests and aspirations of all delegations. A new world information and communication order lacking the participation of all interested nations would be a contradiction.

79. Mr. KAZAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the mass information media had an important role to play in ensuring peace for future generations. It was regrettable, therefore, that they did not everywhere approach that task with due responsibility. The foreign-policy propaganda organs of a number of Western States, for example, engaged in systematic disinformation, stirring up enmity among States and aggravating the international situation. They were engaging in militarist propaganda on an unprecedented scale and waging psychological warfare against the socialist and many non-aligned countries.

80. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries believed that ideological differences should not be allowed to undermine the relations among States. It was of course impossible to eliminate the ideological struggle between different social systems, but agreement could be reached on the rejection of the use of measures condemned by international law for the purposes of ideological diversions or disinformation. The overwhelming majority of peoples was in favour of restructuring international information relations in the interests of each

/...

(Mr. Kazakov, USSR)

individual country and of peaceful co-operation among all countries. Such a restructuring would include the adoption of principles outlawing all kinds of harmful propaganda and increasing the responsibility of the information media and journalists to ensure objectivity in their reporting. The first steps had already been taken, notably with the adoption of the 1978 UNESCO Declaration, which could serve as the basis for the establishment through the United Nations of a new world information and communication order.

81. Most countries were agreed that the present international information system worked against the interests of the majority of States. The exchange of information between capitalist and developing countries, for example, was monopolized by a few information corporations belonging to the leading imperialist Powers. It was therefore understandable that the developing countries should fight to end the domination of Western information agencies and the imbalance in the flow of information. The desire of the imperialist States to maintain their monopoly was the main obstacle to the restructuring of the system. Reports from the twenty-third General Conference of UNESCO indicated that certain States were continuing to use blackmail to prevent UNESCO from taking progressive new directions in its work. His delegation condemned such attempts and believed that the General Assembly must again affirm its appreciation of UNESCO's activities.

82. His country was sympathetic to the communication unions set up by developing countries to end the domination of imperialist information monopolies and strengthen their national information media. Soviet information agencies were developing equal and mutually advantageous relations with the information unions of the developing countries and with many other States and would give them all possible support. A small group of countries headed by the United States was using appeals for avoidance of "confrontation" and "over-politicization" in the Committee on Information and the Special Political Committee to block any attempts to put an end to information imperialism. The establishment of a new world information and communication order was in fact a political issue, and it would be naïve to expect sovereign States to sacrifice their convictions for the sake of an atmosphere of "harmony". His delegation believed that all channels, including information, must be used for the attainment of the Organization's goals. That was precisely the purpose of the recommendations of the Committee on Information, and it was regrettable that some delegations had violated the principle of consensus in their adoption.

83. His delegation noted with satisfaction the information contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/40/617) on the work of DPI, but felt that the Department sometimes still took an unbalanced approach in its reporting of some aspects of the Organization's activities. At the latest session of the Committee on Information, the Soviet delegation had drawn attention to the unsatisfactory representation of the socialist countries in DPI. Despite the assurances given, no progress had been made on that issue.

84. In advocating the establishment of a new and just information order, his country was seeking no advantage for itself. Its goal was to create the conditions

/...

(Mr. Kazakov, USSR)

in which every country was fully sovereign in its political, economic and information affairs.

85. At the thirty-third meeting of the Special Political Committee, the representative of the United States had given the impression that his country's policy on Afghanistan amounted to no more than innocent reading of the Koran. However, it had emerged from a press conference for local and foreign journalists held in Kabul on 5 November that a CIA group had set up counter-revolutionary bands at the beginning of September and had unlawfully entered Afghan territory. Two CIA men, including the group's leader, had been killed in a clash at the end of September. A number of documents, films, maps and notebooks had been discovered which showed that the CIA had been directly involved in the destruction of an Afghan civil aircraft in which 52 persons had lost their lives. CIA operatives had instructed Afghan bandits in the use of modern weapons and had organized diversionary activities and the collection of intelligence. Letters had been found which gave specific instructions for the organization of acts of subversion. Clearly, the United States policy was not merely a question of reading the Koran.

86. The United States media had described the killing of the leader of the CIA group as the death of a journalist martyr who had been doing his duty in the collection of objective information. But those same media had not printed a single word about the revelation at the Kabul press conference of the true purpose of his trip to Afghanistan. If such an approach to the truth meant the free flow of information, it was difficult to see what term the United States would use to describe the manipulation of public opinion.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.