

U.S. PARTICIPATION  
IN THE UN  
1973



03/ And/ 270

REFERENCE COPY  
RETURN BY HAND TO:  
IO:REFERENCE & DOCS  
RM B-239 STATE DEPT

TWENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT ON  
U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE U.N.

FOR 1973

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

THE 28TH ANNUAL REPORT ON UNITED STATES  
PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS



SEPTEMBER 19, 1974.—Message and accompanying papers referred to  
the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

39-880

WASHINGTON : 1974



*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to send to the Congress the 28th annual report on United States participation in the work of the United Nations.

This report, covering Calendar Year 1973, encompasses the wide range of activities carried on by the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations. It demonstrates the growing conviction of United Nations members that many problems of international concern are best resolved through multilateral action, utilizing the machinery of mature international institutions.

In the fall of 1973 the United Nations demonstrated once again its ability to foster peace by the crucial role it played in the Middle East. Following the outbreak of war, the Security Council arranged a cease-fire and deployed United Nations troops to supervise disengagement agreements between Israel and Egypt and, later, between Israel and Syria. We cannot know what might have happened in the absence of such United Nations action. However, it is clear that the efforts of the United Nations, combined with bilateral diplomacy, are still crucial to promoting a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East dispute.

One area of increasing concern is the production and distribution of adequate supplies of food. Our concern with feeding the world can no longer be limited to relief activities in aid of victims of natural disasters. Population growth and better living standards have increased the total demand for food which in turn has increased the demand for energy sources and fertilizer. The pressure of these interlocking demands has pushed against limited supplies and caused spiraling prices. This is a worldwide problem requiring worldwide action for its solution. Secretary Kissinger proposed to the United Nations General Assembly in September 1973 that the organization sponsor a World Food Conference. The General Assembly acted favorably on this proposal and the Conference will be held in Rome in November 1974. The United States also took an active participation in the preparation for the first United Nations Conference on World Population, convened in Bucharest in August 1974.

The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which convened an organizational session in December 1973, is another example of how the United Nations can be utilized to attack contemporary world problems. The goal of the Law of the Sea Conference is a comprehensive international convention to govern man's use of the oceans. We need new understandings to govern international navigation, rational management of the ocean's living and non-living resources, and the protection of the life-sustaining processes of the marine environment. Success in the efforts to resolve conflicting claims over ocean jurisdiction would remove a major and growing source of conflict from the international arena.

The regular economic and social activities of the United Nations' family of organizations continued to absorb over 90 percent of its funds and personnel during 1973. In addition to the traditional operational programs, many special conferences during the year provided opportunities for nations to enlarge their understanding of and work toward consensus on such major international economic and social issues as development assistance, the role of multinational corporations, commodity agreements, and the economic rights and duties of states. Perhaps the most important series of negotiations were those held to carry out the first biennial review and appraisal of the progress toward the goals of the Second United Nations Development Decade. In these negotiations delegations from all parts of the world worked for months to formulate a report that refined the broad measures necessary to improve the world's economic and social situation. The United States played a leading role in these negotiations.

Unfortunately, not all international problems dealt with by the United Nations were successfully approached in 1973. For example, it is generally believed in the United States that terrorism against innocent third parties, including the hijacking of aircraft, is a matter of international concern that calls for international solutions. The divergence of political views among member states, however, has made it impossible to agree on either a general definition of terrorism or a remedy for it. Despite the limit thus placed on the effectiveness of the United Nations forum in dealing with the problem, a start was made in 1973 with the adoption by the General Assembly of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, Including Diplomatic Agents. On the other hand, neither the International Conference on Air Law nor the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, which met simultaneously, made progress on measures to improve security for aircraft passengers.

An important part of the United Nations record in 1973 was the admission to membership of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, and The Bahamas—admissions the United States supported. The United Nations has thus become still more representative of the world community.

Our participation in the United Nations reflects our fundamental belief that to assure a peaceful world it is necessary to cooperate with other nations in a multilateral framework on mutually agreed upon activities. This report records the successes and failures, the hopes and frustrations of many of those activities. Above all it records what we tried to accomplish through the United Nations to further the many interests that our citizens and our country share with the world community.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 19, 1974.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
*Washington, August 21, 1974.*

The PRESIDENT,  
*The White House.*

THE PRESIDENT: Under the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress), the President transmits annually to the Congress a report on United States participation in the United Nations. A report on the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies for the year 1973 has therefore been prepared.

As in previous years, the report is a detailed survey of the Government's participation in the work of the UN system of organizations.

I recommend that you approve the report for transmittal to the Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

Enclosure: Report on United States Participation in the United Nations.





---

---

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE U.N.  
REPORT BY  
THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS  
FOR THE YEAR 1973

---

---



# CONTENTS

---

	Page
List of Abbreviations.....	xvii
<b>PART I. POLITICAL AND SECURITY AFFAIRS</b>	
Peaceful Settlement.....	3
Middle East.....	3
Pre-War Security Council Deliberations.....	3
April Meetings on Lebanese Complaint.....	3
Summer Meetings on General Situation.....	4
August Meetings on Lebanese Complaint.....	5
October War.....	6
Security Council Action for a Cease-Fire.....	6
Creation of UNEF.....	7
UNEF Financing.....	9
UNTSO Enlargement.....	10
Middle East Peace Conference.....	11
General Assembly Consideration Deferred.....	12
UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.....	12
U.S. Position.....	12
U.S. Draft Resolution.....	12
Saudi Arabian Draft Resolution.....	13
Resolutions on Displaced Persons and Israeli Actions in Gaza.....	14
"Palestinian Rights" Resolution.....	14
UNRWA Finances.....	15
Pledging Conference.....	15
UN Conciliation Commission for Palestine.....	16
Human Rights in Occupied Territories.....	16
Special Committee's Report.....	16
General Assembly Action.....	17
Cyprus.....	18
Intercommunal Talks.....	18
Arms Control and Deconfrontation.....	18
Security Council Meetings.....	19
UNIFICYP.....	20
Security Council Meetings in Panama.....	20
Cuban Complaint Against Chile.....	21
Korea.....	22
Southern Africa.....	25
Portuguese Guinea.....	25
Apartheid.....	26
South African Credentials Challenged.....	27
Participation of Liberation Movements.....	27
Resolutions on Apartheid.....	27
Disarmament and Arms Control.....	30
Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.....	30
Chemical Weapons.....	30
Soviet Draft Convention.....	30
Japanese Working Paper.....	31
Nonaligned Working Paper.....	31
Comprehensive Test Ban.....	33
Conventional Weapons.....	34
Adoption of Report.....	35

	Page
Disarmament and Arms Control—Continued	
General Assembly	35
U.S. Statement	35
Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race	37
World Disarmament Conference	37
General and Complete Disarmament	38
Napalm and Other Incendiary Weapons	39
Chemical and Biological Weapons	40
Suspension of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Tests	41
Latin American Nuclear-Free Zone	42
Indian Ocean Peace Zone	42
Reduction of Military Budgets	43
Outer Space	45
Working Group on Remote Sensing	45
Legal Subcommittee	46
Registration of Space Objects	46
Exploration and Use of the Moon	47
Scientific and Technical Subcommittee	48
Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites	48
Outer Space Committee	50
General Assembly	51
Law of the Sea	53
Seabed Committee	53
U.S. Proposals	54
Trend of the Debate	56
General Assembly	56
Third UN Law of the Sea Conference: First Session	57
Officers and Committees	58
Rules of Procedure	58
General Political Problems	59
Membership	59
Federal Republic of Germany and German Democratic Republic	59
The Bahamas	60
Khmer Representation	61
U.S. Position	61
Assembly Action	62
Credentials Committee Report	63
Peacekeeping	64
Working Group	64
General Assembly	66
Strengthening International Security	67
Strengthening Role of the United Nations	68
 <b>PART II. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND HUMAN RIGHTS AFFAIRS</b> 	
Economic and Social Council	73
Inter-Agency Coordination	74
World Food Conference	75
Progress on the Second Development Decade	76
International Development Strategy	76
First Biennial Review and Appraisal	76
Reactions to the Review and Appraisal	77
Mid-Term Review and Special Assembly Session	78
Economic Activities	79
Economic Commission for Europe	79
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East	81
Economic Commission for Latin America	82
Economic Commission for Africa	83
Economic Commission for Western Asia	84
United Nations Development Program	85
Policy and Advisory Bodies	85
Field Organization	86
Financing	86
Development Assistance	86
New Program Directions	87
UN Regular Program	88
UN Volunteers	88
Capital Development Fund	89

	Page
Economic Activities—Continued	
UN Industrial Development Organization.....	89
Program Activities.....	90
Industrial Development Board.....	90
Second General Conference of UNIDO.....	91
Long-Range Strategy.....	92
UN Conference on Trade and Development.....	92
Economic Rights and Duties of States.....	93
Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences.....	93
Containerization.....	94
Commodity Consultations.....	94
Multilateral Trade Negotiations.....	95
Conduct of International Business.....	96
Transfer of Technology.....	96
Restrictive Business Practices.....	97
Appointment of New Secretary General.....	97
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.....	97
Commodity Trade.....	99
Wheat.....	100
Coffee.....	101
Sugar.....	101
Cocoa.....	102
Population.....	102
Preparations for Conference and Year.....	102
Fund for Population Activities.....	103
Social Issues.....	104
Drug Abuse Control.....	104
Commission and ECOSOC.....	104
General Assembly.....	105
Fund for Drug Abuse Control.....	106
Specialized Agencies.....	106
Disaster Relief.....	107
Sahelian Drought.....	108
Relief Operation in Dacca.....	109
UN High Commissioner for Refugees.....	109
Legal and Political Protection.....	109
Special Project on the Asian Subcontinent.....	110
Material Assistance Program.....	110
Europe.....	111
Asia.....	111
Latin America.....	111
Middle East.....	112
Africa.....	112
Finances.....	113
Cooperation with Other UN Bodies.....	114
General Assembly Action.....	114
UNICEF.....	114
Program Activities.....	115
Financial Support.....	116
Administrative Matters.....	117
Social Development.....	117
Experience in Achieving Social Change.....	117
Unified Approach to Development Analysis and Planning.....	118
Implementation of the International Development Strategy.....	119
Migrant Workers.....	120
Adoption Law.....	120
Needs and Aspirations of Youth.....	121
Question of the Elderly and Aged.....	122
Crime Prevention and Control.....	123
House, Building, and Planning.....	124

	Page
Science, Technology, and Research.....	124
UN Environment Program.....	124
Governing Council.....	124
General Assembly.....	126
Effects of Atomic Radiation.....	127
Science and Technology for Development.....	129
Committee on Science and Technology for Development.....	129
Advisory Committee.....	130
ECOSOC.....	130
General Assembly.....	130
Natural Resources.....	131
Fund for Natural Resources Exploration.....	132
UN Water Conference.....	132
Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources.....	133
Geothermal Symposium.....	134
UN Institute for Training and Research.....	134
United Nations University.....	136
Statistical Activities.....	137
Working Group on Programs and Coordination.....	137
Conference of European Statisticians.....	138
Seminar on Statistical Organization.....	138
World Fertility Survey.....	138
Other Subjects.....	138
Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.....	139
Elimination of Racial Discrimination.....	139
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.....	139
Convention on Apartheid.....	140
Exploitation of Labor.....	141
Human Rights of Non-Citizens.....	142
Human Rights in the Middle East.....	143
Expert Studies.....	144
Political Rights.....	144
Equality in the Administration of Justice.....	144
Right to Leave and to Return.....	145
Persons Born Out of Wedlock.....	146
War Criminals.....	146
Religious Intolerance.....	147
Human Rights in Armed Conflicts.....	148
Protection of Journalists.....	148
High Commissioner for Human Rights.....	148
Human Rights and Scientific and Technological Developments.....	150
Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.....	150
Specialized Agencies and the IAEA.....	151
World Bank Group.....	151
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Development Association.....	151
International Finance Corporation.....	153
International Monetary Fund.....	153
Food and Agriculture Organization.....	155
World Food Situation.....	155
World Food Security.....	155
Proposal for a World Food Conference.....	156
International Agricultural Adjustment.....	157
Establishment of Commission on Fertilizers.....	157
Actions of the FAO Conference and Council.....	157
Development Assistance.....	158
Other Programs.....	158
Publications.....	160
World Food Program.....	160
International Labor Organization.....	162
International Labor Conference.....	162
Finances.....	162
Resolutions.....	163
Governing Body.....	163
International Labor Office.....	165
Technical Assistance.....	165

## XIII

## Specialized Agencies and the IAEA—Continued

	Page
UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.....	165
Executive Board.....	165
Technical Assistance Activities.....	166
Education.....	166
Natural Sciences.....	167
Culture and Communication.....	169
Restitution of Works of Art to Countries Victims of Expropriation.....	169
U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.....	170
World Health Organization.....	171
World Health Assembly.....	171
Program Activities.....	172
Smallpox.....	173
Human Environment.....	173
Cholera.....	173
Malaria.....	173
Drug Control Activities.....	174
Onchocerciasis.....	174
International Civil Aviation Organization.....	174
Aircraft Hijacking and Sabotage.....	174
Legal Committee.....	175
Assembly and Conference on Air Law.....	175
ICAO Council.....	176
19th Assembly.....	176
Conference on Economics of Route Air Navigation Facilities and Airports.....	176
Joint Financing Conference.....	177
Facilitation Division.....	177
Regional Air Navigation Meetings.....	178
Technical Assistance Activities.....	178
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.....	178
International Telecommunication Union.....	180
Administrative Council.....	181
Plenipotentiary Conference.....	181
Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference.....	181
Other Permanent Organs.....	182
Technical Assistance.....	182
Universal Postal Union.....	183
International Postal Communications Matters.....	183
Organizational, Personnel, and Financial Matters.....	183
Technical Assistance.....	184
World Meteorological Organization.....	184
World Weather Watch.....	184
Global Atmospheric Research Program and the Atlantic Tropical Experiment.....	185
Hydrology.....	185
Atmospheric Pollution.....	185
Finances.....	185
International Atomic Energy Agency.....	186
Safeguards.....	186
Nuclear Energy and the Environment.....	187
Nuclear Power and Reactors.....	188
Isotopes and Radiation Sources.....	188
Nuclear Information.....	189
Technical Assistance.....	189
Budget.....	189
Organizational Matters.....	190

XIV

PART III. TRUSTEESHIP AND DEPENDENT AREAS

	Page
Trusteeship System-----	194
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands-----	194
Visiting Mission-----	195
U.S. Report-----	195
Council Report-----	197
Political Status Negotiations-----	198
Committee of 24-----	199
Trust Territory of New Guinea-----	199
Council Report-----	200
Committee of 24-----	200
General Assembly-----	200
U.S. Territories-----	201
Guam and American Samoa-----	201
U.S. Virgin Islands-----	201
General Assembly Action-----	202
Namibia-----	203
UN Contacts with South Africa-----	203
Security Council Consideration-----	204
General Assembly Consideration-----	205
Portuguese Territories-----	207
Southern Rhodesia-----	208
Security Council-----	208
Zambian Complaint of Rhodesian Aggression-----	209
Second Meeting on Zambian Complaint-----	210
Sanctions Committee Report-----	211
Sanctions Committee's Subsequent Work-----	213
General Assembly-----	213
Other Questions-----	214
Other Territories-----	214
General Resolutions-----	216
Third Committee Resolution-----	216
Fourth Committee Resolutions-----	217
Plenary Resolutions-----	219
Puerto Rico-----	220

PART IV. LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

International Court of Justice-----	225
Cases-----	225
Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v. Iceland; Federal Republic of Germany v. Iceland)-----	225
Application for Review of Judgment No. 158 of the U.N. Administrative Tribunal-----	226
Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France; New Zealand v. France)-----	227
Trial of Pakistani Prisoners of War (Pakistan v. India)-----	227
General Assembly-----	228
International Law Commission-----	228
State Responsibility-----	228
Succession of States in Matters Other Than Treaties-----	229
Most-Favored-Nation Clause-----	229
Program of Work-----	229
General Assembly Action-----	230
Protection of Diplomats-----	230
International Terrorism-----	232
International Trade Law-----	233
Sale of Goods-----	233
Payments-----	233
Legislation on Shipping-----	234
Arbitration-----	234
Multinational Enterprises-----	234
General Assembly Action-----	235
Definition of Aggression-----	236
Human Rights in Armed Conflicts-----	237
Host Country Relations-----	239



XV

PART V. BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

	Page
UN Financial Situation.....	243
UN Budget.....	245
Program Budgeting.....	245
Budget Level for 1974.....	246
Currency Instability.....	247
Chinese and Arabic Languages.....	248
Scales of Assessment.....	248
International Civil Service Commission.....	250
Personnel.....	251
General Assembly Consideration.....	251
Employment of Americans.....	252
U.S. Contributions to the U.N. System (Table).....	252

APPENDIXES

I. Address by the Secretary of State Before the 28th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, September 24, 1973.....	253
II. Principal Organs of the United Nations.....	258
General Assembly.....	258
Security Council.....	260
Economic and Social Council.....	260
Trusteeship Council.....	261
International Court of Justice.....	261
Secretariat.....	262
III. United States Missions.....	262
IV. United States Representatives.....	263
General Assembly.....	264
Security Council.....	266
Trusteeship Council.....	266
Economic and Social Council.....	266
Specialized Agencies and IAEA.....	269



ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT FORMS

AEC—U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

AID—U.S. Agency for International Development.

ACABQ—Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

ACASTD—Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

ACC—Administrative Committee on Coordination.

Committee of 24—Special Committee on the Situation With Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

CCD—Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

ECA—Economic Commission for Africa.

ECAFE—Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

ECE—Economic Commission for Europe.

ECLA—Economic Commission for Latin America.

ECOSOC—Economic and Social Council.

ECWA—Economic Commission for Western Asia.

FAO—Food and Agriculture Organization.

GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

HEW—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

IAEA—International Atomic Energy Agency.

IBRD—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

ICAO—International Civil Aviation Organization.

ICRC—International Committee of the Red Cross.

IDA—International Development Association.

ILO—International Labor Organization.

IMCO—Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

IMF—International Monetary Fund.

IOC—Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.

ITU—International Telecommunication Union.

NASA—U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

OAS—Organization of American States.

OAU—Organization of African Unity.

OECD—Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

UNCITRAL—UN Commission on International Trade Law.

UNCTAD—UN Conference on Trade and Development.

UNCURK—UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

UNDP—UN Development Program.

UNEF—UN Emergency Force.

UNEP—UN Environment Program.

UNESCO—UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

UNFICYP—UN Force in Cyprus.

UNFPA—UN Fund for Population Activities.

UNHCR—Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

UNICEF—UN Children's Fund.

UNIDO—UN Industrial Development Organization.

UNITAR—UN Institute for Training and Research.

UNROD—UN Relief Operation in Dacca.

UNRWA—UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

UNSCEAR—UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation.

UNTSO—UN Truce Supervision Organization.

UPU—Universal Postal Union.

WFP—World Food Program.

WHO—World Health Organization.

WMO—World Meteorological Organization.



---

---

PART I.  
POLITICAL AND SECURITY AFFAIRS

---

---



UN consideration of world political problems is divided among the Security Council, the General Assembly, and a wide range of subordinate bodies.

The UN Charter gives the Security Council the primary responsibility in the UN system for the maintenance of international peace and security and assigns a special role to the five permanent members—the United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., China, and France. Decisions on substantive matters require the concurring votes of the permanent members. The Council, which is organized so that it is able to function continuously, is empowered to take various actions in connection with the pacific settlement of disputes or with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. Among the more important bodies established by the Security Council are the UN Force in Cyprus, the second UN Emergency Force in the Middle East, and the Rhodesian Sanctions Committee.

The General Assembly may consider any matter within the scope of the UN Charter, including questions of international peace and security, although it may not make recommendations on disputes or situations while the Security Council is dealing with them, unless requested to by the Council. The General Assembly meets annually during the fall (in 1973, from September 18 to December 18) and at other times in special circumstances. The Assembly divides its sessional work among seven main committees of the whole. Some of the major subsidiary bodies concerned with political matters and stemming from General Assembly resolutions are the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, and the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (see Part III).

The question of the Middle East dominated Security Council deliberations during 1973. Of its 77 meetings during the year, 38 were devoted to this problem, as against only 10 in 1972. The most notable aspect of this activity came in the wake of the October war. After an initial period in which effective action by the Council proved unattainable, agreements were carefully negotiated, first between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and then in the Security Council. On the basis of three resolutions, the Security Council, in concert with the Secretary General, arranged a cease-fire, dispatched an enlarged military observer group, deployed UNEF between Israeli and Egyptian forces, and provided for the start of negotiations aimed at a just and durable peace.

Other Council meetings dealt with Cyprus, peace and security in Latin America, a Cuban complaint against Chile, a Zambian complaint against Southern Rhodesia (see Part III), and the admission of new members (the two German states and The Bahamas). The meetings on Cyprus extended the mandate of UNFICYP, one of the most successful UN peacekeeping operations. The meetings on Latin America, focusing largely on the Panama Canal Zone, were held in Panama City during March. The United States felt compelled to cast its third veto when a draft resolution put forward at these meetings ignored legitimate U.S. interests.

The United Nations filled an important gap in its membership with the admission in 1973 of the two German states. Another divided country, Korea, was the focus of a debate which culminated in a consensus on the dissolution of UNCURK and the commitment of remaining problems to the process of negotiation between South and North Korea.

On many political issues, the automatic adherence of a large number of countries to positions adopted at nonaligned forums, regardless of the merits of a given case, often presented the United States with complicated negotiating problems. This situation was particularly evident on the question of Khmer representation in the United Nations with many countries taking a position that would have led to interference by the United Nations in the internal affairs of a member state. Fortunately, on this question the Assembly decided, by a narrow margin, to postpone any action until the 29th session.

On African issues, however, the nonaligned majority adopted almost at will resolutions calling for action against unpopular minority regimes in southern Africa, legitimizing insurgent groups, and giving increased international status to liberation movements. While the United States sympathized with many of the objectives of the non-aligned majority, it could not support resolutions calling for actions inconsistent with its understanding of the Charter and international law.

The United States played an active role in the Security Council's Rhodesian Sanctions Committee, demonstrating its interest in the enforcement of sanctions despite the existence of the Byrd provision which allows U.S. importation of strategic minerals from Southern Rhodesia in violation of Security Council resolutions.

The United States was active on a number of other political issues. For example, Secretary Kissinger in his address to the Assembly on September 24 indicated the possibility of new approaches to the development of peacekeeping guidelines. This, as well as additional experience gained as a result of the formation of the new UNEF, gave added impetus for eventual agreement in the Peacekeeping Committee. The United States also engaged in thorough discussions on disarmament matters. Several of these issues, including those looking toward possible limitations on chemical weapons and a comprehensive nuclear test ban, had received priority attention at the 1973 sessions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. When disarmament was subsequently considered in the General Assembly, the United States cosponsored a resolution endorsing the beginning of preparations for a review conference on the Nonproliferation Treaty and joined in the unanimous adoption of a resolution establishing an



*ad hoc* committee to examine government views on the question of convening a world disarmament conference. The United States abstained on several resolutions, including those on a comprehensive test ban, the use of napalm and other incendiaries, an Indian Ocean zone of peace, and reduction of military budgets, because it considered them inadequate or premature, but it endorsed the positive elements in many of them.

U.S. Representatives made significant contributions in UN space organs with respect to both the potential and the problems involved in the use of satellites for the remote sensing of the earth and for direct television broadcasting. Some progress was made toward an agreement on the registration of space objects, as well as on a treaty concerning the moon.

Intensive negotiations continued during the year in preparation for the third UN Law of the Sea Conference. The United States submitted draft articles on fisheries, the coastal seabed economic area, marine pollution, marine scientific research, and dispute settlement. It also proposed the provisional entry into force of the international regime for the deep seabed and asserted its willingness to consider provisional application of fisheries articles and perhaps other aspects of a law of the sea treaty. The Conference held its first, organizational, session in New York in December.

## PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

### MIDDLE EAST

In the aftermath of the October Middle East war, bilateral and multilateral efforts toward a permanent settlement made the outlook for peace in the Middle East at the end of 1973 the most promising in 25 years. During the Middle East crisis the United Nations was able to exercise effectively its Charter responsibilities with respect to the restoration of international peace and security. The creation of the UN Emergency Force by the Security Council and the General Assembly's decision to finance it through the assessment of each member state reaffirmed the principle of collective responsibility for international peacekeeping.

#### *Pre-War Security Council Deliberations*

*April Meetings on Lebanese Complaint.*—Following a spate of terrorist actions by Palestinian extremists, Israel launched a commando attack on April 10 on alleged headquarters and hideouts in the Beirut area for Palestinian terrorists. On April 12, Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

The Council met on this issue seven times between April 12 and April 21 and adopted two resolutions. On April 21, by a vote of 11 to 0, with 4 abstentions (P.R.C., Guinea, U.S.S.R., U.S.), the Council adopted a resolution dealing directly with the Lebanese complaint. The resolution condemned the repeated military attacks against Lebanon by Israel and Israel's violation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty, called upon Israel to desist from such action, and expressed deep concern over all acts of violence that endanger or take innocent human lives.

Explaining the U.S. vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador John Scali, asserted that the resolution fell short of rejecting terrorism as forcefully as other forms of international violence. In previous statements on the issue, Ambassador Scali had made a strong appeal for an unequivocal UN condemnation of international terrorism and for a settlement of the Middle East dispute on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 of November 22, 1967.

The second resolution, sponsored by Egypt and adopted without objection on April 20, was an effort to deal more generally with the Middle East situation. In it the Security Council requested the Secretary General to submit a full report on UN efforts pertaining to the Middle East situation since June 1967 and decided to hold meetings to consider the report. The U.S. Representative expressed some reservation about the usefulness of the proposed Security Council review, but assented because of the importance of the Middle East situation.

*Summer Meetings on General Situation.*—The Secretary General submitted a comprehensive report to the Security Council on May 18. The report was a historical survey of UN efforts to deal with the Middle East situation, including the maintenance of a cease-fire, the status of Jerusalem, and the problem of Palestinian refugees. The report described in depth efforts of the Secretary General's Special Representative, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring (Sweden), to aid the parties in promoting a settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 242.

The Security Council met 10 times between June 6 and June 14 and 3 times between July 20 and July 26 to consider the Middle East situation. Representatives of 33 countries participated in the debate and all of the parties to the Middle East dispute presented their positions. In his statement before the Council on June 14, the U.S. Representative emphasized that these meetings presented an opportunity to create circumstances in which the Arabs and the Israelis might at last engage in a genuine negotiating process. Underscoring that the existing situation was neither natural nor permanent, Ambassador Scali strongly reaffirmed all of the provisions of Security Council resolution 242. He called attention to President Nixon's statement to Congress that no other crisis area of the world had a higher priority than the Middle East for the United States during the second term of his administration. Noting that security means more than territory, Ambassador Scali said that negotiations among the parties must reconcile the issues of sovereignty and security. He urged the Council to encourage and facilitate negotiations which could begin with an agreement on some Israeli withdrawal in the Sinai and a reopening of the Suez Canal within the context of an extended cease-fire.

On July 24 eight nonpermanent Security Council members circulated a draft resolution which, *inter alia*, (1) deeply regretted that the Secretary General and his Special Representative had been unable to report significant progress in implementing resolution 242, (2) strongly deplored Israel's continuing occupation of the territories held as a result of the 1967 conflict, (3) expressed serious concern at Israel's lack of cooperation with the Special Representative, (4) sup-

ported the Special Representative's aide memoire of February 8, 1971,<sup>1</sup> (5) declared that no changes should be introduced or recognized in the occupied territories that might obstruct a peaceful and final settlement, and (6) called upon the parties to extend full cooperation to the Secretary General and his Special Representative in their continued efforts to promote a just and peaceful solution of the Middle East problem.

The United States informally proposed several amendments to the draft resolution with the aim of balancing the provisions concerning Israeli withdrawal with the provisions of resolution 242 linking withdrawal to a permanent peace and the right of all states concerned to live within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

The sponsors did not accept the suggested U.S. changes, and the original eight-power draft resolution was defeated on July 26 by a U.S. veto. The vote was 13 in favor to 1 against (U.S.), with China not participating.

After the vote Ambassador Scali explained U.S. objections to the draft resolution, stating: "If this resolution had passed, it would have changed fundamentally, it would have overturned Security Council resolution 242. It would, in other words, have undermined the one agreed basis on which a settlement in the Middle East could be constructed. That is why my government felt compelled to veto the resolution." He expressed disappointment that the principal U.S. amendments were not accepted and said if they had been the resolution would have preserved "the essence and balance of resolution 242—agreement, peace, withdrawal, and secure and recognized boundaries—which . . . remain the only hope if ultimately there is to be a just and lasting peace in the Middle East."

*August Meetings on Lebanese Complaint.*—On August 10, a civil airliner carrying 76 passengers en route from Beirut to Baghdad was intercepted by Israeli fighter aircraft over Lebanese territory and forced to land in Israel. Lebanon requested an urgent Security Council meeting on August 11. The Security Council met five times between August 13 and August 15. Israel defended its action, which was designed to apprehend a radical Palestinian leader, as a measure to combat terrorism. With the support of the U.S.S.R., Egypt and Iraq called for sanctions against Israel.

<sup>1</sup> On February 8, 1971, Ambassador Jarring presented identical aide memoire to Egypt and Israel requesting them to make certain commitments to him simultaneously, subject to the eventual satisfactory determination of all other aspects of a peace settlement, including in particular a just settlement of the refugee problem. He proposed, *inter alia*, that Israel commit itself to withdraw its forces to the former international boundary between Egypt and the British Mandate of Palestine, on the understanding that satisfactory arrangements were made on security and freedom of navigation matters important to Israel. He also proposed that Egypt make a commitment to enter into a peace agreement with Israel. Such an agreement would include explicit undertakings, on a reciprocal basis, on the termination of all claims or states of belligerency; respect for and acknowledgement of each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence; respect for and acknowledgement of each other's right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; the responsibility to ensure that hostile acts do not originate in and are not committed from within their respective territories against the other party; and an agreement to refrain from interference in each other's domestic affairs. In its reply Egypt stated it would be ready to enter into a peace agreement with Israel, and would make the commitments requested by Jarring. Israel replied that it viewed favorably Egypt's readiness to enter into a peace agreement with Israel, that it would withdraw to "the secure, recognized and agreed boundaries to be established in the peace agreement," but stated categorically that it would not withdraw to the pre-June 1967 lines. Israel called for negotiations without prior conditions to cover the points listed in the documents, with a view to concluding a peace agreement. Discussions under Jarring's auspices made no further headway.

In his statement before the Council on August 14, Ambassador Scali deplored Israel's action as a violation of Lebanese sovereignty, of the UN Charter, and of the rule of law in international civil aviation. He declined to accept Israel's justification for the act, stating that such means are outside the law and likely only to provoke counteraction. He urged all states, individuals, and political groups in the area to refrain from action that would imperil the lives of innocent people and the safety of international travel, and emphasized that there could be no double standard; one law must apply for all.

Following intensive negotiations, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution on August 15 which, *inter alia*, condemned the Government of Israel for its action, called on Israel to desist from acts that violate Lebanon's sovereignty, and called upon ICAO to take the resolution into account when considering adequate measures to safeguard international civil aviation.

### *October War*

*Security Council Action for a Cease-Fire.*—Early in the morning of October 6, the United States was informed that Syria and Egypt had initiated attacks against Israel in the Golan Heights and across the Suez Canal. Following consultations with Israel, Egypt, the permanent members of the Security Council, and the Secretary General, the United States on October 7 requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

Early on October 8, before the Security Council met, the Foreign Ministers of Syria, Israel, and Egypt made statements on the war to the 28th General Assembly. Israel charged that Egypt and Syria had committed premeditated and unprovoked aggression on Israel's most sacred holiday, the Day of Atonement, and called for a cease-fire and a return to the *status quo ante bellum*. The Israeli Foreign Minister asserted that negotiations were the only means of altering the cease-fire lines which resulted from the June 1967 war. Egypt and Syria accused Israel of initiating hostilities and claimed to be acting in self-defense, blaming Israeli expansionist policy for the failure to reach a lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. Egypt called for unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, declared that cease-fire lines with Israel had ceased to exist, and said that Israel had tried to freeze the cease-fire into the permanent occupation of Egyptian territory.

The Council convened in the afternoon of October 8 but failed to call for a cease-fire because of disagreements among the members on the question of withdrawal of forces. The U.S. Representative opened the debate by explaining that the gravity of the situation compelled the United States to exercise its responsibility, as a permanent member of the Security Council, to request a meeting. Ambassador Scali emphasized that the purpose of the Security Council meeting was not to assess responsibility but to help promote a solution to the problem which had precipitated the third major Middle East war within 25 years. He suggested that the Council should apply the following principles: (1) military operations must be halted; (2) conditions must be restored in the area that would be conducive to a permanent settlement of the Middle East dispute; and (3) the instruments and principles already accepted as a basis for a settlement of the Middle East dispute must be preserved and respected.

The U.S.S.R. supported the Arab states; called for observance of existing Council decisions, particularly withdrawal from occupied territories under Security Council resolution 242; and concluded that without a clear-cut statement by Israel of its readiness to withdraw from all occupied territories, there could be no constructive Council decision on the Middle East.

The P.R.C. supported the Arab states and the Palestinians and blamed the United States and the U.S.S.R. for the crisis, the United States for supporting Israel and the U.S.S.R. for failing to support the Arabs. Throughout the Security Council deliberations, the P.R.C. urged the Arabs to continue their struggle to liberate their lands from Israel. However, China decided not to participate in votes on Security Council resolutions on the Middle East, thus placing on record its opposition to the proceedings without vetoing Security Council action.

The Council met 13 times between October 8 and December 15 on the Middle East crisis. A cease-fire resolution was not adopted until October 22, following Secretary Kissinger's visit to Moscow to discuss the increasingly dangerous situation in the Middle East with Soviet leaders. Resolution 338, cosponsored by the United States and the U.S.S.R., and adopted by a vote of 14 to 0, with China not participating, became the basis for subsequent efforts to settle the dispute.

The resolution (1) calls for an immediate cease-fire in place, (2) calls for implementation of resolution 242 of November 1967 in all its parts, and (3) "decides that, immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East."

The cease-fire failed to take hold and on October 23 the Security Council adopted another resolution, again cosponsored by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., reaffirming the cease-fire and requesting the Secretary General to dispatch UNTSO observers to supervise the cease-fire between Israel and Egypt.

*Creation of UNEF.*—Still the cease-fire failed to take hold. On October 24, Egypt requested a Security Council meeting and announced that Egyptian President Sadat had proposed in identical letters to the United States and the Soviet Union that they each dispatch peacekeeping forces to enforce the cease-fire. Certain communications from the Soviet Union and U.S. awareness of the alerting of certain Soviet military units indicated an apparent willingness on the part of the U.S.S.R. to respond unilaterally to Egypt's proposal. The United States declined to participate in such a force and placed its own armed forces on a state of increased alert, making it very clear that it opposed the unilateral introduction of the forces of any permanent Security Council member into the Middle East.

Late in the evening of October 24 the eight nonaligned members of the Security Council (Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, and Yugoslavia) submitted a draft resolution proposing the establishment of a UN Emergency Force (UNEF). At an October 25 press conference, Secretary Kissinger stated: "If the Security Council wishes, the United States is prepared to agree to an international force, provided it does not include any participants from the permanent members of the Security Council, to be introduced into the area as an additional guarantee of the cease-fire." The Secretary un-

derscored U.S. support for Security Council resolution 338 and the need for the dispatch of a UN observer force to report and establish responsibility for cease-fire violations which were compounded by the problem of demarcation of the cease-fire line at the Egyptian-Israeli front where the lines were extremely confused.

On October 25, by a vote of 14 to 0, with China not participating, the Council adopted the resolution of the nonaligned states which, in its final form, (1) demanded that immediate and complete cease-fire be observed; (2) decided to set up immediately a UNEF excluding from its composition the permanent members of the Security Council and requested the Secretary General to report within 24 hours on the steps taken to this effect; and (3) requested the Secretary General to increase the number of UNTSO observers on both sides of the cease-fire lines.

The U.S. Representative wholeheartedly supported the resolution and pledged U.S. aid in facilitating the transportation of UNEF contingents to the Middle East.

Within 24 hours the Secretary General presented a report to the Security Council making recommendations on the mandate and organization of UNEF. On October 27, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution (China not participating) approving the Secretary General's report and establishing UNEF for an initial period of 6 months. UNEF's mandate was to supervise the implementation of the cease-fire and the return to positions occupied on October 22, to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of the fighting, and to cooperate with the ICRC in its humanitarian endeavors in the area. UNTSO was to cooperate with UNEF in the fulfillment of these tasks.

The Force was placed under the command of the United Nations, vested in the Secretary General, under the authority of the Security Council. The Secretary General appointed Major General Ensio Siilasvuo (Finland) interim Force Commander with the consent of the Security Council.

All matters affecting the nature or continued effective functioning of UNEF were to be referred to the Security Council for its decision. In a statement before the Security Council on October 27, Ambassador Scali declared that this provision assured that the withdrawal of UNEF would take place only when the Security Council so decided.<sup>2</sup>

UNEF was to be a force of about 7,000 troops, and was to be composed of national contingents selected in consultation with the Security Council and the parties concerned, bearing in mind the principle of equitable geographic representation. It would be provided with defensive weapons only and was not to use force except in self-defense, the definition of which included resistance to forceful attempts to prevent it from discharging its duties.

The preliminary cost estimate for UNEF was \$30 million for a period of 6 months, with the costs to be borne by UN members as apportioned by the General Assembly under Article 17 of the UN Charter.

<sup>2</sup> The first UN Emergency Force had been created by the General Assembly in 1956, with the consent of the parties, to supervise the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egypt and was stationed on the Egyptian side of the border to serve as a buffer between the two countries. It had been withdrawn in May 1967 when the Egyptian Government withdrew its consent for the Force's stationing on Egyptian territory.

As an interim measure, the Secretary General instructed the peace-keeping contingents from Austria, Finland, and Sweden (and a few days later from Ireland), stationed in Cyprus with UNFICYP, to proceed immediately to Egypt to begin UNEF's mission. By October 28, the first contingents for UNEF, totalling 585 troops, had arrived. Senior UNEF representatives participated in negotiations which took place on the 101st kilometer of the road from Cairo to Suez between high level military representatives of Egypt and Israel on the observance of the cease-fire and humanitarian questions.

Meanwhile, at UN Headquarters intensive Security Council consultations took place on the composition of UNEF, an issue of particular concern to the United States, U.S.S.R., nonpermanent Security Council members, and the parties. On November 2, the President of the Security Council read a consensus statement, from which the P.R.C. disassociated itself, instructing the Secretary General to consult Ghana, Indonesia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Canada, and Poland with a view to dispatching contingents from these countries to UNEF. Canada and Poland were to be responsible for logistic support and at least two other African countries as yet unnamed were to send contingents to UNEF in order to improve its geographical representation. The Council also instructed the Secretary General to report regularly on his efforts toward this end.

The U.S. Representative expressed gratification over the consensus but emphasized that equitable geographic representation must be consistent with the overriding importance of having an effective Force. All of the countries named in the consensus, as well as Senegal, Austria, Ireland, Finland, and Sweden, agreed to dispatch contingents. By the end of December there were approximately 5,000 UNEF troops.

The United States acceded to requests from the United Nations to provide initial airlifts of UNEF troops and equipment on a nonreimbursable basis. By December 31, the United States had airlifted troops and some equipment from Peru, Panama, Finland, Ireland, Indonesia, and Austria. The United States also agreed to provide a large proportion of UNEF's equipment requirement on a reimbursable basis.

*UNEF Financing.*—On November 23 the General Assembly's Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) approved by a recorded vote of 105 (U.S.) to 2 (Albania, Libya), with 4 abstentions (Algeria, Portugal, South Africa, Syria), a resolution sponsored by Brazil and 36 other states appropriating \$30 million for the first 6 months of UNEF and deciding on a special system of assessment for it.

The \$30 million is apportioned so that (1) the five permanent members of the Security Council (U.S., U.S.S.R., U.K., P.R.C., France) are assessed a total of \$18,945,000; (2) a second group of 23 named economically developed states are assessed a total of \$10,434,000; (3) 25 named less developed countries are assessed a total of \$15,000; and (4) the remaining 82 members are assessed a total of \$606,000. Within each group the assessments are made in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for 1974-76. For the permanent members this means each assessment rate is about 15.6% higher than it would be at the regular rate, with the U.S. 6-month share being \$8,668,100 or 28.894% of the total. The 23 named developed countries are assessed at their regular rate; the 25 named less developed countries at 10% of their regular rate; and the remaining 82 at 20% of their regular rate.

If UNEF is continued a further 6 months the expenses, not to exceed \$5 million a month, will be apportioned according to the same scheme. The resolution also invites voluntary contributions to UNEF in cash, services, and supplies.

The P.R.C. did not participate in the vote and maintained its position that it would not contribute to UNEF.

Two amendments, one put forward by the U.S.S.R. and the other by Yemen (San'a) and Cuba, threatened to topple the delicate balance of the 37-power draft. The Yemen-Cuban amendment would have provided that states whose economy suffered "because of the military aggression and occupation of their territories" (by which the sponsors meant Egypt, Syria, and Jordan) be exempt from contributing to the costs of UNEF. The Soviet amendment would have kept the same top and bottom assessment groups, but would have provided 5 rather than 2 intermediate groups and levied a much higher proportion of the total against western states. The U.S.S.R. also announced its support of the Yemen-Cuban amendment.

After intensive debate, both amendments were withdrawn by their sponsors, who pledged support for the 37-power draft, just before the vote.

Although the United States initially would have preferred, and so advocated, that UNEF be financed under the regular scale of assessments, it recognized at an early stage that there was very little support for this position. Moreover, the United States recognized that since the permanent members of the Security Council have special responsibilities under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security they might have to accept financial burdens greater than those imposed under the regular scale. Further, although the 37-power draft did not take cognizance of all U.S. views, it did endorse the principle of the collective responsibility of all members for the maintenance of international peace and security.

On December 11, the General Assembly adopted the resolution as recommended by its Fifth Committee by a recorded vote of 108 (U.S.) to 3 (Albania, Libya, Syria), with 1 abstention (Portugal).

*UNTSO Enlargement.*—The UN Truce Supervision Organization was established by the Security Council in 1948 as the staff of the UN Mediator in Palestine, appointed by the General Assembly. UNTSO's present mandate derives largely from a Security Council resolution adopted on August 11, 1949, which relieved the Mediator of his responsibilities, and *inter alia* requested the Chief of Staff of UNTSO to report to the Security Council on the observance of the cease-fire as defined by the four Armistice Agreements concluded by Israel with Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria. Following the June 1967 war, the Security Council adopted a resolution calling for "full cooperation with the Chief of Staff of UNTSO and the observers in implementing the cease-fire." Since June 1967, UNTSO observers have been stationed on both sides of the Israeli-Egyptian and Israeli-Syrian lines, and on the Lebanese side of the Israeli-Lebanon armistice line. Jordan has not participated in UNTSO since the 1967 war lest the presence of the UN observers appear to confer recognition on the 1967 line as a permanent border.

Until 1973, UNTSO observers were only from Western Europe, Latin America, and the United States. (For several years eight American observers had been stationed with UNTSO.) In late October the



U.S.S.R. unilaterally dispatched 70 observers to join UNTSO and assist in implementing the cease-fire. UNTSO did not accept them, and the Secretary General, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. entered into extended consultations on the number of additional observers that would be integrated into UNTSO. In compliance with the October 25 Security Council resolution requesting an increase in the number of UNTSO observers (see above, p. 8), the Secretary General in late November arranged for the deployment of 77 additional observers, bringing the total to 298. As part of this expansion he requested both the United States and the Soviet Union to make available 36 observers each, thus bringing the number of American and the number of Soviet military personnel to the level provided by the country (Sweden) providing the largest component of UNTSO. These observers were fully integrated into UNTSO under the direct command of the Chief of Staff.

*Middle East Peace Conference.*—Under Security Council resolution 338 of October 21, immediate negotiations between the parties were to take place “under appropriate auspices.” The United States and the U.S.S.R. negotiated with the parties the modalities of a peace conference to be held in Geneva. Aware of these negotiations, the Security Council in a private meeting on December 15 adopted a resolution co-sponsored by all of its nonpermanent members which (1) expressed the hope that the peace conference would make speedy progress toward a just and durable peace in the Middle East, (2) expressed confidence that the Secretary General would play a full and effective role at the conference, and (3) requested the Secretary General to keep the Council suitably informed of developments in negotiations at the peace conference. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 10 to 0, with 4 abstentions (France, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.), and China not participating. Although not opposed to the provisions of the resolution, the United States abstained because there were still some negotiations under way with the parties regarding invitations and other aspects of the Geneva conference.

On December 18 the Secretary General informed the President of the Security Council that he had received letters from the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the arrangements for the convening of the Conference on the Middle East under UN auspices. The identical letters informed the Secretary General of the readiness of the parties concerned to participate in the Peace Conference, which would begin on December 21 under the cochairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union. The letters also requested the Secretary General to preside over the opening phase of the Conference and make available a representative who would keep him fully informed as the Conference proceeded.

The Conference convened at Geneva in open session on December 21 presided over by the Secretary General. Israel, Egypt, and Jordan attended as parties to the dispute while the United States and U.S.S.R. participated as cochairmen. Syria had been invited but did not attend. The Conference decided in closed session on December 22 to continue its work through the establishment of working groups, including a military working group to consider the disengagement of forces. These groups were to report their findings and recommendations to the Conference, which would continue on an ambassadorial level and reconvene at the foreign ministers level as needed.

*General Assembly Consideration Deferred*

Because of the Security Council's consideration of the Middle East war, the annual debate in plenary session on "The Situation in the Middle East" did not take place at the 28th General Assembly. At its last meeting, on December 18, the President announced that extensive consultations revealed that, given the recent developments in the Middle East, there was a general sentiment not to take up the question. However, the General Assembly reserved the right to resume the session if circumstances warranted consideration of the item. Therefore, the 28th session of the General Assembly was suspended rather than declared closed.

*UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*

By May of 1973, dollar devaluation and inflation had reversed the improvement in UNRWA's finances achieved in 1972. At the end of 1973, despite extra contributions from several countries, including the United States, UNRWA once again faced the prospect of having to make severe reductions in its services in order to offset mounting deficits.

The Special Political Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered UNRWA and associated topics at 12 meetings between November 5 and 20. On its agenda were the report of the UNRWA Commissioner General, Sir John Rennie, the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, the report of the UN Conciliation Commission for Palestine (PCC), and reports of the Secretary General on implementation of earlier resolutions. The debate, participated in by nearly 70 delegations, extended to virtually all aspects of the Arab-Israeli question in addition to humanitarian assistance to the refugees. As in the past, the "Palestine Arab delegation" and a representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization also spoke without this constituting recognition of the delegation or organization in question.

The Assembly adopted six resolutions. Five of these—on the UNRWA Working Group, humanitarian assistance to persons displaced in 1967, UNRWA's general role and financial difficulties, Israeli measures in the Gaza Strip, and Palestinian self-determination—paralleled resolutions of the 27th General Assembly. The sixth resolution, calling for additional contributions to UNRWA from UN members with high per capita incomes and referring specifically to the United States, was unprecedented.

*U.S. Position.*—Speaking on November 7, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Mark Evans, pointed out the obligation of the United Nations to the refugees. He called upon UN members, especially affluent ones who had done little in the past, to increase their contributions. He noted that the United States would continue its large contribution to UNRWA in the hope that other nations would do likewise.

*U.S. Draft Resolution.*—The United States introduced on November 16 a draft resolution that (1) noted with deep regret that repatriation or compensation of the refugees as provided for in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 adopted by the 3d General Assembly on December 11, 1948, had not been effected; (2) expressed thanks to the Commissioner General and his staff and to the specialized agencies and private organizations for their work in assisting refugees; (3) noted with regret that the PCC was unable to find a means of achieving progress in the

implementation of resolution 194, and requested it to continue its efforts and to report thereon not later than October 1, 1974; (4) directed attention to UNRWA's continuing financial position; (5) noted with concern that contributions to UNRWA continued to fall short of the funds needed to cover essential budget requirements; and (6) called upon all governments urgently to make "the most generous efforts possible" to meet UNRWA's needs.

The Committee approved the resolution on November 20 by a vote of 112 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention, and the General Assembly adopted it on December 7 by a vote of 121 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions.

*Saudi Arabian Draft Resolution.*—On November 12 Saudi Arabia introduced amendments (revised several times) to the U.S. draft resolution, which called specifically upon the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany for much larger contributions. On November 16 it withdrew the amendments and submitted a separate draft resolution whose preambular paragraphs, in its final form, noted (1) the inability of many UN members to contribute to UNRWA, (2) the preference of others to contribute directly to the Palestinian refugees, (3) the reduction to 25% of the U.S. assessed contribution to the regular UN budget "on the understanding that the United States will endeavor to maintain and possibly increase its voluntary contributions," and (4) the deep interest in the Middle East of some states, particularly the Federal Republic of Germany. In its operative paragraphs the resolution expressed gratitude to past generous contributors to UNRWA and appealed to UN members, especially those with per capita income of \$1,500 or more, to increase their contributions.

The Committee approved the resolution on November 20 by a recorded vote of 67 to 3 (U.S.), with 43 abstentions. When the General Assembly considered the resolution in plenary session on December 7, the Federal Republic of Germany introduced an amendment deleting its name from the resolution. The amendment was approved by a vote of 64 (U.S.) to 28, with 28 abstentions. The resolution as amended was then adopted by a vote of 81 to 3 (U.S.), with 41 abstentions.

Explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador William E. Schauffele, Jr., said:

"[This resolution] can be of no help to UNRWA. It encourages others not to give, and asks those already giving the most to give more! This strange resolution poses the very grave danger that overall financial support will decrease, rather than increase! We hope this is not the intent of the resolution, but our analysis of it leads us to that conclusion."

He noted that the United States genuinely desired to help UNRWA and that the resolution the United States had introduced focussed on financial matters, called upon all governments to contribute generously to UNRWA, and particularly urged contributions from governments that had not contributed in the past and increased donations from those that were already contributors. He also said that those contributing directly to the Palestinian refugees continued to have a moral obligation to join in a common UN cause—the financial support of UNRWA.

*Resolutions on Displaced Persons and Israeli Actions in Gaza.*—On November 8 Sweden introduced a resolution eventually sponsored by 19 states from all regions of the world. Virtually identical with resolutions adopted each year since 1967, it called for temporary emergency humanitarian assistance to persons displaced by the 1967 hostilities and appealed to governments, organizations, and individuals to contribute to UNRWA to enable it to carry out its duties in this respect. The Committee approved the resolution on November 16 by a vote of 117 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 7 by a vote of 122 (U.S.) to 0, with 2 abstentions.

The Special Political Committee had before it reports by the Secretary General on Israeli compliance with two resolutions of the 27th General Assembly calling for the return of persons displaced in 1967 and the cessation of certain Israeli actions in the Gaza Strip. Each report consisted essentially of a note verbale from the Permanent Representative of Israel and comments by the Commissioner General of UNRWA. With respect to the return of persons displaced in 1967, the note verbale reported, *inter alia*, that some 50,000 such persons had been permitted to return. The Commissioner General commented that UNRWA's records showed that only 7,420 displaced persons had been permitted to return since 1967. Concerning Israeli activities in the Gaza Strip, the Israeli note verbale and the Commissioner General's comments differed both on the extent of resettlement of refugees whose shelters had been demolished by the Israeli authorities, and on the purposes for which some of the demolition had been carried out.

The reports were the subject of a resolution introduced by Pakistan on November 13 and eventually sponsored by 15 states. This resolution combined and closely followed the two resolutions of the 27th General Assembly on these issues. In a preambular paragraph it continued the assertions made in the earlier resolutions that certain Israeli actions in the occupied territories violated the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and in its operative paragraphs it reaffirmed the rights of the displaced persons to return to their homes and camps, called on Israel immediately to facilitate this return, and requested the Secretary General to report to the 29th Assembly on Israel's compliance.

The United States abstained because of the resolution's preambular paragraph alleging violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention without calling on the parties concerned to apply the provisions of that Convention for an impartial determination of the truth of the allegations.

*"Palestinian Rights" Resolution.*—On November 13 Pakistan introduced a resolution on self-determination for the Palestinians, which was eventually sponsored by 12 Afro-Asian states and Yugoslavia. Recalling previous resolutions on the subject, which it closely paralleled, the draft resolution in its operative section (1) reaffirmed that the people of Palestine were entitled to equal rights and self-determination, in accordance with the UN Charter; (2) expressed once more the Assembly's grave concern that the people of Palestine had not been permitted to enjoy their inalienable rights and to exercise their right to self-determination; and (3) declared that full respect for and realization of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine were indis-

pensable for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The resolution differed from its predecessors by expressly stating that the enjoyment of "the right to return" was indispensable for the achievement of a just settlement of the problem of the refugees and for the exercise of their right to self-determination. The Committee approved the resolution on November 16 by a recorded vote of 78 to 6 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 7 by a vote of 87 to 6 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions.

The United States voted against the resolution as it had earlier ones on the same subject because it appeared to infringe on the sovereignty of states in the area in contravention of the UN Charter; it said nothing about UNRWA, which was the subject under consideration; and it tended to prejudice the efforts of those trying to promote peaceful settlement in the Middle East based on the principles of Security Council resolutions 242 and 338.

*UNRWA Finances.*—The Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA<sup>3</sup> was established by the 25th General Assembly in 1970 and continued by the 26th and 27th Assemblies.

In an October 19 report the Working Group concluded that UNRWA was likely to have a deficit of \$3.3 million in 1973 and that the estimated deficit for 1974 was \$10.4 million. It endorsed the Commissioner General's view that unless these deficits, as well as the reductions in working capital made to cover past deficits, could be restored in the course of 1974, serious cuts in UNRWA's services to the refugees would have to be made. UNRWA's education program, which utilized only cash, not commodities, would suffer particularly. The Working Group called on governments, particularly those that had not contributed in the past or had contributed inadequately, to give generously to UNRWA.

On November 16 India introduced a draft resolution, also sponsored by Afghanistan, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Iran, Jamaica, Sweden, and Yugoslavia. After expressing concern at UNRWA's financial situation, it noted the consequent continuing need for the Working Group's efforts, and requested that body to continue its work for another year. The resolution was approved in the Special Political Committee on November 20 by a vote of 115 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions, and adopted by the General Assembly on December 7, by a vote of 125 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions.

*Pledging Conference.*—The annual pledging conference for UNRWA was held on November 30. Some 47 governments attended and most, including the United States, announced contributions which totaled approximately \$50.6 million in cash, goods, and services in support of UNRWA's 1974 program.

Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., announced a U.S. pledge of \$23.2 million in cash and commodities for 1974. He noted as well that an additional contribution of \$2 million for UNRWA's educational program was currently being considered by the U.S. Congress.<sup>4</sup> He praised the dedicated work of the UNRWA Commissioner General and his staff and stressed the acute financial problem faced by

<sup>3</sup> France, Ghana, Japan, Lebanon, Norway, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

<sup>4</sup> This was subsequently approved by the Congress.

UNRWA. "The United States continues to support the search for peace," he said "and we firmly believe that this peace must include a just settlement of the refugee problem. Our pledge to UNRWA testifies to our interest and concern for this terribly difficult question." The U.S. pledge was subject to two conditions: (1) that UNRWA comply with the conditions imposed by Section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act, which states it should "take all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving military training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army or any other guerrilla-type organization or who has engaged in any act of terrorism"; and (2) that the U.S. contribution not exceed 70% of all contributions from governments.

*UN Conciliation Commission for Palestine.*—In 1972 the General Assembly had asked the PCC<sup>5</sup> to report to the 28th Assembly on the implementation of paragraph 11 (on repatriation or compensation of the refugees) of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). On September 29 the Secretary General circulated the PCC's report, prepared before the October war and covering the period September 30, 1972, to September 29, 1973. The PCC recalled its conclusion in earlier reports that any prospect of achieving progress toward the implementation of paragraph 11 presupposed substantial changes in the situation. The events of 1967 had further complicated an already very complex problem which had since remained essentially unchanged in regard to any possibilities for furthering the Commission's work. The PCC regretted its inability to carry forward its work, but remained determined to do so as soon as possible.

The U.S.-sponsored resolution (see p. 12) requested the PCC to present a further report on its work to the 29th Assembly.

#### *Human Rights in the Occupied Territories*

Between November 19 and November 26 the Special Political Committee devoted seven meetings to consideration of the agenda item on "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories." Representatives of about 40 states as well as the "Palestine Arab delegation" participated in the discussion.

The 23d General Assembly, in a resolution adopted on December 19, 1968, had established the three-member Special Committee, which was not constituted until September 1969 when the Secretary General announced that Sri Lanka, Somalia, and Yugoslavia would be the members. However, the Special Committee has never been permitted to visit either Israel or the occupied territories because Israel considers it and its mandate biased. In 1972 the 27th General Assembly called upon Israel to implement the recommendations of the Special Committee, increased the number of issues that the Committee was to investigate, and decided to inscribe the Committee's report on the agenda of the 28th Assembly.

*Special Committee's Report.*—Since it was still unable to enter the occupied territories, the Special Committee reported that it had "continued to follow developments in the occupied territories through the Israeli press and other sections of the foreign press, as well as

<sup>5</sup> General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of December 16, 1948, established the PCC. Its members are France, Turkey, and the United States.

through press reports of statements by members of the Government of Israel and other Israeli leaders." The report drew heavily on these sources as well as on interviews of individuals by the Committee and on Committee meetings in New York in February and March 1973.

After an analysis of the international law applicable to the disposal of real and personal property and the treatment of cultural property in occupied territories, the report focussed on allegations of an Israeli policy of annexation of, and settlement in, the occupied territories; Israeli ill-treatment of detainees; exploitation of the natural resources of the territories; and interference with freedom of worship, family rights, and local customs. In essence, the report declared that all of these allegations were borne out by the evidence available to the Committee, which found that Israel's actions in all of these questions were in substantial violation of international law.

The Committee reaffirmed its recommendation from earlier reports that there should be machinery, perhaps similar to the Protecting Power formula envisaged under the Geneva Conventions, providing for investigation of allegations of violations of the international law protecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. The Committee also called on the General Assembly to take special measures to prevent Israel from consolidating its annexation of the occupied territories.

*General Assembly Action.*—On November 22 the Special Political Committee received two draft resolutions sponsored by Afghanistan and Mauritania. The first resolution eventually had 10 additional sponsors, 6 of whom also sponsored the second resolution.

The first resolution affirmed that the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War applied to the occupied territories, and called on Israel to respect the Convention. The resolution was approved by the Committee on November 26 by a vote of 109 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly on December 7 by a recorded vote of 120 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions.

In its final form, the second resolution *inter alia* expressed grave concern at nine specified ways that Israel was violating international law in the occupied territories, asked the Special Committee to continue its work, and placed the item on the agenda of the 29th General Assembly. This resolution was approved in the Committee on November 26 by a vote of 82 to 7 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly on December 7 by a vote of 90 to 7 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions.

Ambassador Schaufele explained in the Special Political Committee that the United States had voted in favor of the first resolution because it considered that the Fourth Geneva Convention applied to the occupied territories. However, the United States was unable to support the second resolution just as it had been unable to support the earlier resolution establishing the Special Committee because the resolution had prejudged the conclusions of the inquiry. The present resolution did not help to establish the conditions under which a just and durable peace could be established in the Middle East.

## CYPRUS

The UN peacekeeping force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) remained in operation during 1973. The intercommunal talks between the representatives of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities continued with constitutional experts from Greece and Turkey and the Secretary General's Special Representative, B.F. Osorio-Tafall, present.

*Intercommunal Talks*

In his May 31 report the Secretary General reiterated his belief, and that of his predecessor, that the intercommunal talks were the best way to achieve a lasting and agreed solution based on the concept of "an independent, sovereign and unitary state with the adequate participation of the two communities."

The talks centered on the structure, functions, and financing of local government bodies. Although the Secretary General expressed the hope that agreement on questions of principle could be reached, this failed to materialize during 1973. The outstanding differences concerned not the general principle of local autonomy, which had been agreed upon, but the scope of that autonomy as well as the degree of supervision to be exercised by the state agencies over the activities of local governments.

In both his May 31 and his December 1 reports to the Council the Secretary General noted that certain reservations had been voiced by the Turkish Cypriot side concerning the use of the term "unitary," on the grounds that the parties attached different interpretations to it and that it could therefore lend itself to misunderstanding and even prejudice the nature of an ultimate agreed settlement. These reservations were reemphasized by the Turkish Cypriot representatives and by the Government of Turkey. The Greek Cypriot side has continued to regard the previously agreed concept of a "unitary" state of Cyprus as essential for the success of the intercommunal talks and "strongly opposes a virtually total autonomy for the Turkish Cypriot community."

*Arms Control and Deconfrontation*

Despite the continuing tensions on Cyprus, there were very few violent incidents of an intercommunal nature, most of the violence resulting from anti-government activities by illegal Greek Cypriot groups. These activities nevertheless aroused concern in the Turkish Cypriot community, and UNFICYP maintained close contact with the Cyprus Government and the Turkish leadership with a view to preventing adverse intercommunal consequences.

During the first half of 1973 an agreement was reached with the Turkish Cypriot authorities providing for UNFICYP surveillance over the rocket launchers and anti-tank launchers the Turkish Cypriots had imported in 1972. These weapons are kept under a double lock and key system and are subject to unrestricted inspection by UNFICYP, as are the weapons imported by the Cyprus Government in 1966 and 1972.

UNFICYP also presented to the Cyprus Government and the Turkish Cypriot leadership concrete proposals for military deconfrontation involving, first, the appearance of military personnel without weapons, and second, their replacement by unarmed police. These proposals were accepted by the Government but not by the Turkish Cypriot leadership.



*Security Council Meetings*

The Security Council met on June 15 and again on December 14 to consider the Secretary General's reports on Cyprus. The Council each time adopted without objection a resolution similar to those adopted in previous years extending the UNFICYP mandate for another 6 months and urging the parties to act with the utmost restraint and to continue and accelerate cooperative efforts toward achieving a peaceful solution. Both resolutions were adopted by a vote of 14 to 0, with the P.R.C. abstaining.

Addressing the Council on June 15, Ambassador Scali found grounds for encouragement in the Secretary General's report and said:

"We are gratified that the intercommunal meetings between Turkish and Greek Cypriot leaders have continued in a relatively restrained and constructive atmosphere. We strongly urge all sides to take fullest advantage of this promising atmosphere, of the opportunity now at hand. We persist in our hope that in the end all elements of the Cypriot nation will reside peacefully with one another in a sovereign, independent, and united Cyprus."

He emphasized the continuing financial deficit in the operation of UNFICYP, and appealed to UN members to cooperate in efforts to put UNFICYP on a sound and current financial basis. Noting that the situation on Cyprus had progressed to a point where it was possible seriously to consider reducing UNFICYP's manpower and streamlining and reorganizing its operations, he strongly supported the intention of the Secretary General to study ways to reduce the UN commitment in terms of finances and manpower.

In his December report the Secretary General noted that the first phase of reduction in UNFICYP strength had taken place in the latter half of 1973, and that a second phase was envisaged for the first half of 1974. UNFICYP's total strength would then be reduced from about 3,100 to about 2,300 military personnel and civilian police.

The U.S. Representative at the December meeting, Ambassador Schauffele, noted the "excellent beginning" made by the Secretary General in implementing the planned reductions. He supported the Secretary General's plan to reconstruct the Force on the premise that its "primary function in Cyprus is preventive action" rather than interposition of military force and noted that in practice UNFICYP had been playing this role for some years. He added that the United States did not believe that explicit assurances by the parties were necessary since conditions were conducive to substantial reduction and restructuring of the Force, and he strongly urged the Secretary General to examine closely all reasonable opportunities for additional phased reductions in 1974. With respect to the situation within Cyprus, he said that the United States was "moderately encouraged" about the future.

". . . Although the intercommunal talks have not resulted in breakthroughs on basic questions, the negotiations continue. Likewise, the military situation remains calm. We encourage all sides to take advantage of the opportunities that now exist for substantive progress."

Finally, he again called attention to the continuing deficit in financing the operations of UNFICYP, and expressed the U.S. belief that "every effort should be made to reduce, if possible to eliminate, and certainly not to increase this deficit."

*UNFICYP*

The Secretary General reported that as of November 30 UNFICYP was composed of 2,730 men from Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. The Force comprised both military personnel and civilian police.

UNFICYP, as in the past, continued to be financed from voluntary contributions. The United States pledged \$4.8 million toward the 1973 expenses of UNFICYP, bringing the total U.S. cash pledge to UNFICYP since its inception in March 1964 to \$66.5 million, in addition to air transport services in 1964-1965 valued at \$1.3 million. The Secretary General noted in his December report that the UNFICYP operational deficit had increased to \$23.1 million. He also pointed out that with the full implementation of the contemplated force reductions, the costs would be \$6.0 million per 6-month period, a reduction of \$1.52 million from earlier expenditure levels.

## SECURITY COUNCIL MEETINGS IN PANAMA

Referring to the precedent of the meetings at Addis Ababa in 1972, the Panamanian Foreign Minister, in a January 9, 1973, letter to the President of the Security Council, invited the Council to meet at Panama City from March 15 to 21, 1973. The invitation was supported by the other Latin American members of the United Nations.

The Security Council met January 16 and by consensus accepted the invitation. Most members of the Council spoke in support of the invitation. The U.K. Representative expressed reservations in view of the lack of an active Latin American item on the Security Council agenda and thought that the holding of a Council meeting in a problem area would not lessen tension. The U.S. Representative, Ambassador George Bush, expressed similar concerns and in addition raised practical questions concerning the availability of communications and the financing for such meetings. Ambassador Bush noted, however, that the United States valued deeply its close relations with Panama and stated that the considerations he had raised were not directed toward that government.

On January 26 the Council adopted, on the recommendation of its Committee on Council Meetings Away from Headquarters (a committee of the whole), a single, broad agenda item entitled "Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter."

At 10 meetings in Panama, the Council heard statements by some 40 representatives including a majority of the independent nations of Latin America. Most of these supported the Panamanian position that the 1903 U.S.-Panama Isthmian Canal Convention should be abrogated and Panama should be given effective sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

Two draft resolutions were voted on at the end of the meetings on March 21. The first, cosponsored by Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, and Yugoslavia, dealt with the Canal. It (1) took note of the Joint Declaration by the United States and Panama in 1964; (2) took note of the willingness of the United States and Panama to abrogate the 1903 Convention and its amendments and to conclude

a "new, just and fair treaty" fulfilling Panama's legitimate aspirations and guaranteeing respect for its "effective sovereignty over all of its territory"; and (3) urged both states to continue negotiations and to conclude without delay a new treaty aimed at eliminating the causes of conflict. The proposal was defeated by a vote of 13 to 1 (U.S.), with 1 abstention (U.K.). The U.S. negative vote constituted a veto.

Ambassador John Scali explained that in view of the continuing negotiations between the United States and Panama on the Canal issue, this was not an appropriate subject for a substantive resolution in the Security Council. Moreover, the draft was unbalanced and incomplete because although it addressed the points of interest to Panama, it ignored legitimate interests important to the United States.

Guinea, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, and Yugoslavia cosponsored a second draft resolution that dealt with sovereignty over natural resources. This draft was adopted by a vote of 12 to 0, with 3 abstentions (France, U.K., U.S.). In its operative paragraphs the resolution (1) urged states to adopt appropriate measures to impede the activities of those enterprises which deliberately attempt to coerce Latin American countries; and (2) requested states, with a view to maintaining and strengthening peace and security in Latin America, to refrain from using or encouraging the use of any type of coercive measure against states of the region.

In explaining the U.S. abstention, Ambassador Scali pointed out that sovereignty over natural resources was not an appropriate subject for Security Council action but should more properly have been discussed in other UN organs such as ECOSOC, the General Assembly, or the Seabed Committee. He also declared that the United States did not accept the premise in the draft that coercive measures endangering peace and security were being used in Latin America, and he noted that the resolution did not adequately take into account provisions for legitimate collective measures by international organizations.

Several other draft resolutions—on colonialism, nonintervention in the affairs of other states, and the Latin American Nuclear Free Zone—were circulated in the course of the meetings but not brought to a vote.

#### CUBAN COMPLAINT AGAINST CHILE

On September 11 the Chilean military forces overthrew the leftist government of President Salvador Allende. On September 12 the Cuban UN Mission transmitted to the President of the Security Council a note from the Cuban Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating that on September 11 shots had been fired by the armed forces of Chile against the Cuban Embassy in Santiago and that a Cuban merchant vessel, the *Playa Larga*, had been the target of attacks by the Chilean Air Force and Navy. On September 13 Cuba requested that the Security Council meet as a matter of urgency to consider these "serious acts" which it said created a situation constituting a "serious threat to international peace and security." In a letter of September 15 the Chilean UN Mission rejected the Cuban charges, saying that "apart from being false [they] did not and do not constitute a situation capable of threatening international peace and security."

During subsequent consultations the United States interposed no objection to holding a meeting but expressed some doubts about the propriety of convening the Council in this case. The actions referred to in the complaint were a part of a violent internal upheaval within a member state, and redress would be more appropriately sought through bilateral channels.

The Council met twice, on September 17 and 18, to consider the Cuban complaint. Seventeen states in addition to the two parties spoke.

In opening the debate the Cuban Representative repeated the charges with respect to the Cuban Embassy and the *Playa Larga*, attacked the new Chilean regime as a "fascist military group," declared it to be the duty of the international community "to condemn the fascist regime which is temporarily established in Chile." and formally accused the U.S. Government "as an accomplice and as mainly responsible for the crime committed against the Chilean people."

The Chilean Representative rejected the Cuban charges. Declaring that the merchant ship had left Valparaiso without necessary clearance and with a cargo of sugar already paid for by Chileans, he said his country had exercised the internationally recognized right of "hot pursuit" in attempting to stop it. He said, further, that Cuban Embassy personnel had fired first on the Chilean soldiers sent to protect them, and he charged the Cuban Embassy with intervening in Chilean internal affairs using *agents provocateurs*, and with importing large quantities of weapons. He noted that all the Cuban Embassy staff had already left the country, by agreement with the Chilean Government and in good order, before the Council was requested to meet. He concluded that the Cuban complaint to the Security Council was in any case out of order since the alleged acts, exaggerated out of all proportion, did not constitute a threat to peace and security.

Ambassador Scali vigorously denounced the Cuban charges that the United States had been involved in the overthrow of the Allende regime. He said that the United States deplored the loss of life in Chile and the death of President Allende. He went on to note that the situation seemed to have calmed. He affirmed that the United States regretted all departures from constitutional processes, including the breakdown of these processes in Chile in recent months which culminated in the tragic events of September 11, and was "uncompromisingly opposed" to violent action against diplomatic establishments and merchant shipping in international waters. However, he questioned whether the Cuban assertions were founded on fact. Finally, he stressed again that it would have been more appropriate for Cuba to seek redress through bilateral negotiations, noting that "if the United States and other member states were to seek to convoke the Security Council on every occasion when injuries were inflicted on our diplomats and damage to our overseas missions the Council would be in almost continuous session."

No member put forward any specific proposals for a resolution or consensus statement, and no further meeting was held.

#### KOREA

On June 23, 1973, Republic of Korea President Park Chung Hee announced a foreign policy initiative designed to further prospects

for peace on the Korean peninsula. *Inter alia* he stated that the Republic of Korea would not object to: (1) North Korean participation in international organizations; (2) North Korean participation with the South in the UN General Assembly debate on Korea; and (3) concurrent admission of South and North Korea to UN membership provided this would not hinder national unification. In a subsequent press conference the same day, Prime Minister Kim Chong Pil stated that South Korea would accept disbandment of the UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea,<sup>6</sup> if the UN resolved to disband it, but would oppose withdrawal of UN forces until the threat of aggression on the Korean peninsula had been eliminated.

The United States welcomed and supported the initiative as a constructive contribution to the process of détente in Korea that began with Red Cross talks between South and North in 1971 and led, at Republic of Korea initiative, to broader discussions culminating in the July 4, 1972, joint communique calling for peaceful reunification of Korea. The communique also announced establishment of machinery for further contacts between the two parties, including a South-North Coordinating Committee.

Speaking later on June 23, North Korean Premier Kim Il Sung rejected President Park's suggestion of UN membership for both Koreas. Kim instead proposed a confederation of South and North, to be named the Koryo Confederated Republic, and said UN admission of the Koreas should be only as a single state.

In their annual report to the Secretary General on August 30, 1973, the members of UNCURK recommended that the Commission be dissolved. The report's concluding observations stated in part:

"The importance of the Korean problem demands that all appropriate and acceptable means of promoting the peaceful unification of Korea should be made use of, and UNCURK believes that the United Nations in particular should not cease to assess with imagination and flexibility what its own role should be.

"Giving due weight to these considerations and to developments during the past year, the members of UNCURK express their considered judgment that the presence in Korea of UNCURK is no longer required and they accordingly recommend that UNCURK should be dissolved.

"The members of UNCURK make this recommendation without prejudice to the accepted authority and competence of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take whatever action it may deem necessary, in the interest of preserving peace and security, to maintain political oversight of the situation in the Korean peninsula."

The United States supported the recommendation made by the members of UNCURK.

The General Committee of the 28th General Assembly met on September 20 to consider the provisional agenda, which included two items relating to Korea that had been deferred by the 27th General Assembly. These were:

<sup>6</sup> UNCURK was established by a General Assembly resolution on Oct. 7, 1950, to represent the United Nations in bringing about a unified, independent, and democratic Korea. Its members in 1973 were Australia, Netherlands, Philippines, Thailand, and Turkey. Chile, an original member of the Commission, withdrew on Nov. 14, 1970; Pakistan, another original member, withdrew on Nov. 21, 1972.

1. "Question of Korea: Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" proposed on August 23, 1971, by the Secretary General. (Item 40)

2. "Creation of Favorable Conditions to Accelerate the Independent and Peaceful Reunification of Korea," proposed on September 15, 1972, by Algeria and 28 other members. (Item 41)

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly plenary that the two items be merged and inscribed as a single item, "Question of Korea," and allocated to the First Committee for consideration. The plenary approved this recommendation on September 21.

On September 21 two draft resolutions, provisionally submitted to the UN Secretariat on September 10, were circulated as First Committee documents. One, ultimately cosponsored by 27 states (including the United States), in its operative paragraphs: (1) welcomed the South-North dialogue; (2) approved UNCURK's recommendation that it be dissolved; (3) expressed the hope that, in the spirit of universality, South and North Korea would consider membership in the United Nations; (4) expressed the hope that the Security Council, "bearing in mind the need to ensure continued adherence to the Armistice Agreement and the full maintenance of peace and security in the area," would in due course give consideration, in consultation with the parties directly concerned, to those aspects of the Korean question which fall within its responsibility.

The other draft resolution, cosponsored by Algeria and 34 other states, called for: (1) dissolution of UNCURK; (2) annulment of "the right to use the UN flag by the foreign troops stationed in South Korea" and dissolution of the UN Command;<sup>7</sup> and (3) withdrawal of "all foreign troops stationed in South Korea."

After having reached agreement by consensus on October 1 to invite representatives of South and North Korea to participate in its deliberations on Korea, the First Committee debated this question at 10 meetings between November 14 and 21. Statements were made by 61 countries. The People's Republic of China and the U.S.S.R. were among the delegations speaking in favor of the Algerian draft resolution, of which they were cosponsors. A number of states strongly supported the draft resolution offered by the United States and other members.

In a lengthy and polemical speech on November 14, the North Korean Representative called for dissolution of UNCURK, which he termed "a tool of the outside forces for interference," termination of the UN Command, and withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea. He stated that the draft resolution submitted by Algeria and others embodied "this demand of the times," while the draft resolution proposed by the United States and others "openly stresses the necessity of maintaining an unstable armistice instead of a lasting peace in Korea, seeks the continued presence of foreign troops in South Korea under that pretext, and calls for keeping Korea divided into North and South instead of for its reunification."

<sup>7</sup> The UN Command was established by a Security Council resolution on July 1, 1950, which requested UN members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to earlier Security Council resolutions to make such forces available to "a unified command under the United States," requested the United States to designate the commander of such forces, and authorized the use of the UN flag.

On November 15 the South Korean Representative stated that the draft resolution submitted by the United States and others was "an approach based on the realities in Korea which is conducive to encouraging developments and national reconciliation by ensuring peace and security." The draft resolution proposed by Algeria and others, he said, "does not reflect the Korean situation but articulates only the uncompromising North Korean argument." The South Korean Representative stated that the UN Command "has effectively prevented the recurrence of war and has maintained peace and security" in Korea. He added that it would be a realistic approach for the Security Council, which established the UN Command, "to take up the matter with the parties concerned at an appropriate time when the tension is eased and when the danger of a military clash is diminished."

Speaking on November 15, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Scali, stated:

"... This resolution represents a sincere effort on the part of all its sponsors to frame a consensus acceptable to the broad mass of the United Nations membership. Both this resolution's tone and its content are reasonable. In putting this draft forward, its sponsors are genuinely seeking to encourage movement on the Korean issue in a direction acceptable to all parties concerned. I am confident that the great majority of us here favor conciliation rather than confrontation. It is this positive spirit of conciliation which has inspired [the] draft resolution. . . ."

As debate progressed, the view grew among some delegations that a compromise between the positions outlined in the two draft resolutions was both desirable and possible. With this aim resolutions were introduced on November 20 by Tunisia and five other states, and on November 21 by Saudi Arabia. In the meantime the Netherlands Representative and the Algerian Representative, in consultation with the respective parties, conducted negotiations to reach a mutually acceptable compromise solution. These negotiations produced an agreed statement, which was then endorsed by the groups of states cosponsoring the two original draft resolutions. On November 21 the statement was read to the First Committee by its Chairman, who proposed that it become the consensus of the Committee. The statement: (1) announced that neither of the two original draft resolutions would be put to a vote; (2) noted with satisfaction the 1972 joint communique issued by South and North Korea and urged continuation of the dialogue between the two states; and (3) decided to dissolve UNCURK immediately.

After being informed by the Chairman that the draft resolutions submitted by Tunisia and others, and by Saudi Arabia, would not be pressed to a vote by their sponsors, the First Committee on November 21 adopted without objection the consensus statement read by the Chairman. The General Assembly in plenary session adopted the First Committee report and consensus statement without objection on November 28.

#### SOUTHERN AFRICA

##### *Portuguese Guinea*

On September 24, 1973, the African Party for the Liberation of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC), which has been en-

gaged in insurgency against the Portuguese administration of Portuguese Guinea since 1963, issued a "Proclamation of the State of Guinea-Bissau." About 68 nations, including the U.S.S.R., the P.R.C., India, a number of other eastern European and Asian states, and nearly all the African countries, subsequently announced recognition of the "sovereign state of Guinea-Bissau."

In a letter to the President of the General Assembly on October 12, 56 delegations requested the inclusion on the Assembly's agenda of an item entitled, "Illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and acts of aggression committed by them against the people of the Republic." The letter declared it imperative that the General Assembly consider the "explosive situation prevailing in the region with a view to securing immediate cessation of the war of repression being waged by the Government of Portugal against the people of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and to restore the territorial integrity of that state."

The General Committee on October 19 decided by a vote of 17 to 1 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions, to recommend that the item on "Guinea-Bissau" be included on the agenda and that it be considered in plenary meetings. In an explanation of the U.S. negative vote, Ambassador Schaufele stated that the title of the proposed agenda item prejudged the issue, and that the committee's decision set a potentially dangerous precedent which could be used by nonrepresentative groups in many parts of the world as a pretext for interjecting national problems into the UN forum. On October 22 the General Assembly by a rollcall vote of 88 to 7 (Bolivia, Brazil, Greece, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, U.S.), with 20 abstentions, decided to inscribe the item.

The General Assembly began its debate on "Guinea-Bissau" on October 26. By a rollcall vote of 93 to 7 (U.S.), with 30 abstentions, the Assembly on November 2 adopted a resolution which welcomed "the recent accession to independence of the people of Guinea-Bissau," condemned Portugal's "illegal occupation" of "Guinea-Bissau" and its "acts of aggression" against the territory's people, and demanded that Portugal withdraw from the territory. In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Evans, reaffirmed the U.S. support for self-determination, but stated that it was the U.S. observation that Portugal continued to control the population centers, most rural areas, and the administration of Portuguese Guinea. He went on to say that these circumstances, under generally accepted precepts of international law, dictated that Portugal continue to be recognized as sovereign in Portuguese Guinea. Implicit in his statement was the view that the charges of "aggression" and "illegal occupation" evaporated in the absence of an independent "Guinea-Bissau."

### *Apartheid*

As in previous sessions, the 28th session of the General Assembly devoted considerable time to the consideration of apartheid in South Africa. The question arose not only under the agenda item on this subject, as usual referred to the Special Political Committee for discussion, but also in the credentials context and as the result of a request that South African liberation movements be invited to participate in the Committee's discussion. Over 85 states took part in the Special Political Committee's consideration of apartheid at 18 meetings be-



tween October 9 and November 15. The Committee approved eight substantive resolutions, all of which were adopted in plenary by recorded votes. The United States voted for two of the resolutions, against one, and abstained on the others.

*South African Credentials Challenged.*—Early in the session, just before South African Foreign Minister Hilgard Muller was scheduled to speak in the general debate on October 4, representatives of Mauritius, Senegal, and Tanzania requested that the meeting be suspended until the Credentials Committee could meet to determine whether the South African credentials were valid. By a recorded vote of 80 to 26 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions, the General Assembly decided to comply with the request. The United States opposed the motion because in its opinion the Credentials Committee was empowered only to verify the authenticity of the signatures of the credentials.

The Credentials Committee met the same day and voted to accept the South African credentials as being in accordance with rule 27 of the rules of procedure. However, by a recorded vote of 72 to 37 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions, the General Assembly on October 5 adopted a Syrian amendment to the Credentials Committee's report calling for rejection of the credentials of the South African delegation. The President of the Assembly then ruled that since the Assembly's action did not hold that the credentials were not in accordance with the rules of procedure, the vote was tantamount to a condemnation of and warning to South Africa, but did not affect the rights and privileges of the South African delegation in the General Assembly. Foreign Minister Muller then addressed the Assembly. An overwhelming number of delegations, however, left the chamber in protest.

*Participation of Liberation Movements.*—In a letter of September 19 to the Chairman of the Special Political Committee, the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid<sup>8</sup> requested that South African liberation movements be invited to participate in the Special Political Committee's discussion of apartheid. On October 9 the Committee agreed without objection to the Apartheid Committee's request. In a subsequent statement the U.S. Representative, Mr. Evans, doubted the wisdom of the Committee's hearing liberation movement members as representatives of political organizations rather than as individual witnesses. He observed that the Committee's action gave the appearance of according nongovernmental entities a status that could be regarded as constituting intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states. He further pointed out that granting special status to liberation movement representatives was unnecessary as they could receive full hearings through normal committee procedures.

*Resolutions on Apartheid.*—On October 11, Sweden introduced a draft resolution on "Political Prisoners in South Africa," ultimately sponsored by Australia, New Zealand, and nine Western European states. The resolution condemned South Africa's failure to comply with previous General Assembly and Security Council requests to release persons imprisoned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid and again called on it to release such persons. The Committee approved the resolution by acclamation on October 12 and the General Assembly adopted it October 26 by a vote of 112 (U.S.) to 1 (South Africa), with 2 abstentions.

<sup>8</sup> Members of the Apartheid Committee in 1973 were Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukrainian S.S.R.

On October 29, Nigeria introduced a draft resolution on "Trade Union Action Against Apartheid" that was ultimately sponsored by 48 African, Asian, Latin American, and Eastern European states. The Committee approved the draft on October 31 by a vote of 97 to 0, with 9 abstentions (U.S.), and the Assembly adopted it on December 14 by a vote of 107 to 1 (South Africa), with 12 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained, *inter alia*, because the resolution commended a resolution of the International Conference of Trade Unions Against Apartheid<sup>9</sup> which made a number of recommendations unacceptable to this country, including a call for the severing of all economic and other relations with South Africa.

On October 29, Jamaica introduced a draft resolution on the "Program of Work of the Special Committee on Apartheid" that was eventually sponsored by 36 states from all regions. The resolution requested the Apartheid Committee to intensify its efforts and authorized it to hold a special session in Europe, send missions to consult with member states, send representatives to consult with the OAU, participate in conferences on apartheid, and consult with experts, liberation movements, and other organizations concerned with the campaign against apartheid. The Committee approved the draft by a vote of 107 to 1 (Portugal), with 4 abstentions (France, Malawi, U.K., U.S.), on October 31, and the Assembly adopted it by a vote of 119 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with 4 abstentions (France, Malawi, U.K., U.S.), on December 14. The United States abstained because it believed that Apartheid Committee's proposed program placed unnecessary and inappropriate demands on the UN budget.

On October 30 Denmark introduced a draft resolution on "Dissemination of Information on Apartheid." Eventually sponsored by 19 states, the resolution, *inter alia*, requested the Unit on Apartheid and the Office of Public Information in the UN Secretariat to intensify the information program on apartheid and requested the Secretary General to establish an information center in an independent country in southern Africa. The Committee approved the draft on November 15 by a rollcall vote of 107 to 0, with 3 abstentions (Portugal, U.K., U.S.), and the Assembly adopted it on December 14 by a vote of 123 to 1 (South Africa), with 3 abstentions (Portugal, U.K., U.S.). The United States abstained because it believed that the proposed information center would not only be expensive to maintain, but also probably ineffective.

On November 14 Sierra Leone introduced a draft resolution on "Intensification and Coordination of UN Action Against Apartheid" which was eventually sponsored by 43 states. The Committee approved the resolution by a rollcall vote of 105 to 1 (Portugal), with 5 abstentions (France, Israel, Malawi, U.K., U.S.), on November 15, and the Assembly adopted it by a vote of 121 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with 5 abstentions (France, Israel, Malawi, U.K., U.S.), on December 14. The United States abstained principally because the resolution requested the Apartheid Committee to submit a report to the General Assembly on "assistance provided by foreign economic interests to the South African regime in resisting international action against apartheid." The United States rejects the premise that the presence of for-

<sup>9</sup> The conference was held in Geneva, June 15-16, under the sponsorship of the Workers' Group of the ILO.

eign economic interests in southern Africa is contrary to the interests of the non-white peoples. It believes, rather, that cutbacks in investment and employment would adversely affect the nonwhite population more severely than the white.

On November 14 Egypt introduced a resolution on "Action by Intergovernmental and Nongovernmental Organizations" that was eventually sponsored by 44 states. The resolution, *inter alia*, called on governments to initiate action in UN specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations to intensify efforts against apartheid and to formulate programs of action against apartheid in light of the recommendations of the Apartheid Committee. The Committee approved the draft resolution by a vote of 99 to 0, with 11 abstentions (U.S.), on November 15, and the Assembly adopted it by a vote of 117 to 1 (South Africa), with 10 abstentions (U.S.), on December 14. The United States abstained because of the resolution's call on member states to follow the Apartheid Committee's recommendations, which included the expulsion of South Africa from the specialized agencies. The United States believes that the specialized agencies should not be made battlegrounds in the fight against apartheid. The agencies have specific technical tasks which they can perform adequately only in the absence of political obstruction, and, further some of them could not function properly without near universal participation.

On November 14 Finland introduced a draft resolution on the "UN Fund for South Africa," eventually sponsored by 26 states from all geographic regions. The resolution appealed to all states, organizations, and individuals for contributions to the Trust Fund. The Committee approved the draft resolution by a vote of 108 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention (Portugal), on November 15, and the Assembly adopted it by a vote of 125 (U.S.) to 1 (South Africa), with 1 abstention (Portugal), on December 14. In an explanation of vote, Ambassador Schaufele stated that the U.S. affirmative vote did not constitute a commitment to contribute, as all U.S. contributions are subject to Congressional approval.

Finally, on November 15 Algeria introduced a comprehensive resolution on the "Situation in South Africa Resulting from the Policies of Apartheid" that was ultimately sponsored by 50 states. The Committee approved the resolution on the same day by a vote of 84 to 3 (Portugal, U.K., U.S.), with 23 abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 14 by a vote of 88 to 7 (Bolivia, Israel, Nicaragua, Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S.), with 28 abstentions.

In a statement before the Special Political Committee on November 15, Ambassador Schaufele explained the U.S. position on the resolutions on apartheid. He emphasized that the United States abhors apartheid but believes the resolutions' proposals are impractical and counterproductive. With specific reference to the comprehensive resolution, he said that the United States voted against it because it proposed mandatory sanctions against South Africa and because it condemned states having economic relations with South Africa. The United States does not believe that sanctions are a realistic or effective way of inducing South Africa to change its internal policy and rejects the contention that economic relations with South Africa are inimical to the interests of the country's non-white population. The United States also dis-

agreed with the resolution's provisions calling on states to terminate tariff preferences and trade credits for South Africa. Further, the United States opposed the declaration that the present South African Government has no right to represent the South African people and the request that the specialized agencies deny membership to the South African Government and allow South African liberation movements to participate in its place.

(See section on "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms," p. 140, for consideration of draft convention on apartheid.)

## DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL

### CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

The U.S. and U.S.S.R. Representatives serve as cochairmen of the 26-member CCD,<sup>10</sup> which held two sessions in 1973—February 20 to April 26 and June 12 to August 30. The American delegation was led by Ambassador Joseph Martin, Jr.

The questions of limitations on chemical weapons and a comprehensive nuclear test ban were the major issues considered by the CCD.

#### *Chemical Weapons*

At the opening meeting the U.S. Representative declared that the United States was fully committed to the goal of achieving effective controls on chemical weapons. Other CCD members also endorsed this goal, but many difficult problems, especially that of verification, remained to be resolved.

Much of the discussion revolved around three proposals: (1) a draft convention proposed by the U.S.S.R. and its allies in 1972; (2) a proposal by Japan for a gradual approach to a comprehensive ban; and (3) a working paper by 10 nonaligned states.

*Soviet Draft Convention.*—The communist countries' draft convention of 1972, modeled on the Biological Weapons Convention<sup>11</sup> that had been approved by the General Assembly in 1971, called for a comprehensive ban on the production, stockpiling, and development of all chemical weapons. It proposed verification by national means, consultation and cooperation, and a complaints procedure involving appeal to the Security Council.

Amplifying their views in a working paper of June 28, 1973, the U.S.S.R. and its allies proposed that each party establish a national control committee to supervise compliance with the convention within its own territory and suggested that there could also be voluntary exchanges of information among states. As additional measures for control, they proposed analyzing economic data contained in open publications and prohibiting patents on "chemical substances, weapons, equipment and means of delivery" banned by the convention. The U.S.S.R. rejected mandatory inspections, however, which it said could be used as a pretext for violation of the sovereignty of states.

<sup>10</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia. France has never participated.

<sup>11</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, opened for signature at Washington, London, and Moscow on April 10, 1972. The Convention is not yet in force.

The United States considered the Soviet draft inadequate in its verification provisions. Dr. Fred Iklé, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, pointed out on July 31 that verification was a substitute for full trust. He therefore saw no sense in proposing verification schemes that presupposed full trust among states that were to be party to a treaty. So-called "national means" of verification, therefore, must not only be capable of producing the requisite observations or data, but also must be entrusted to the parties that wished reassurance, not to those about whom reassurance was being sought. It was necessary to be clear on who was verifying whose adherence to a treaty. He believed that all had confidence in the capability of governments to assure adherence to international agreements within their own territories if they wished to do so.

Ambassador Martin later noted that the Soviet-proposed system was essentially self-inspection. In the absence of adequate international verification measures, it was unrealistic to expect other states to rely on national groups that monitored their own governments.

*Japanese Working Paper.*—Japan said that in the absence of acceptance by all countries concerned of "an adequate form of on-site inspection in the verification procedure," it would be virtually impossible to have a comprehensive ban in one step. It proposed a gradual approach and suggested that controls should be applied first to production of supertoxic agents. On August 21 Japan submitted a working paper outlining the main points of such an agreement which would prescribe a comprehensive ban while temporarily excluding from the prohibitions production of the nonsupertoxic agents and destruction of stockpiles. Parties would agree to continue negotiations on matters temporarily excluded in order to develop measures for the eventual comprehensive ban. Stockpiles would be destroyed when the verification system had been found to be effective.

Japan proposed a combination of national and international systems of verification, which would include "inspection by cooperation." International verification would be carried out by an international organization whose responsibilities would include "constant and objective surveillance and inquiry as deemed necessary." Either the international verification organization or any party to the treaty could request an explanation of a suspected treaty violation. The suspected state might then invite an on-site inspection or the organization—either on its own initiative or at the request of a party—could notify the suspected state of a planned inspection. Any state so notified, if it did not accept the inspection, "would have to give strong reasons for not complying."

The United States welcomed the Japanese initiative which it regarded as an example of the type of serious and constructive effort which has so often characterized the work of the CCD. Ambassador Martin noted in particular that it was based on a gradual approach in which the scope of activities to be prohibited was directly related to possibilities of verification. It was thus a more practical and realistic approach than the abolition of existing chemical capabilities and options without adequate verification.

*Nonaligned Working Paper.*—On April 26, 10 nonaligned members—Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Egypt, Ethiopia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Sweden, and Yugoslavia—submitted a working paper asserting there was basic agreement in the CCD that the objective should be

a comprehensive ban covering all chemical weapons. These states believed that the degree of danger from chemical weapons depended not only on the toxicity of agents but also on the available protection against them. Since most of the world lacked adequate protection, even less toxic agents could "create as great a danger as highly toxic ones and therefore should be prohibited." It was essential to couple prohibitions with adequate verification. The solution to these two problems of scope and verification should not be discriminatory, but should be based on "an acceptable balance of obligations and responsibilities for all states." In their view, an agreement banning only development and production would be particularly discriminatory, especially against states that had no chemical weapons.

The 10 states affirmed that verification should "give every party a reasonable assurance of compliance" through a combination of measures that included the basic elements of self-control, national means of verification, and international measures of verification. Self-control measures might include declarations, at the time the prohibition entered into force, regarding national activities; legal measures to implement the prohibition; and organization of a national control body authorized to cooperate with the international control organ. States could use their own means of verification and might undertake to consult and cooperate with one another in solving problems. International verification would be carried out by a "qualified and independent international control organ" whose activities might comprise collection, analysis, and circulation of data and assistance to parties in developing national means. Results of international verification would be made available to all parties on an automatic and fact-finding basis. There might also be, "as a nonrecurrent measure," international inspection to verify the destruction of stockpiles. Finally, they proposed that as a last resort complaints concerning alleged breaches of the treaty could be lodged with the Security Council.

The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Martin, expressed agreement with many of the positions taken by the 10 states in their paper, but noted a number of ambiguities and unsolved problems as well.

He considered it premature to conclude that a production ban would be "discriminatory." Many countries might find a net advantage in preserving stability and obtaining treaty assurance that the situation would not change for the worse. There was no evidence that many countries possessed stockpiles and a production ban might therefore leave some continents or regions without any. Since chemical weapons, unlike strategic nuclear weapons, cannot effectively be projected across continents, a production ban could strengthen security in such regions by preventing any chemical arms race from beginning. Nor would a comprehensive ban necessarily put all countries on the same level, since those with highly developed chemical industries could readily transfer stocks of dual-purpose agents from peaceful to military uses.

While agreeing that the purpose of verification was to provide "reasonable assurance of compliance," he said the United States would not wish to renounce the possibility of maintaining a deterrent in kind unless assured that the system of verification provided a very high degree of confidence and protection. With regard to a "nonrecurrent" inspection of stockpile destruction, he noted that subsequent inspection might be appropriate if evidence appeared that all stockpiles had not been destroyed.

The United States considered that the general principle of verification through a combination of national and international measures was acceptable. With respect to self-control measures, the U.S. Representative noted that declarations could have considerable value, particularly if they were supplemented from time to time. Besides declarations regarding production facilities and stockpiles, he suggested it would also be helpful to have periodic reaffirmations of compliance and statements on national production of substances limited by the agreement.

Although he noted that some agency would be needed in each country to collect information, he said that the reliability of any national control body would depend on the extent to which other parties could rely on its independence from the government it monitored and the degree to which it would have "unimpeded access to all relevant facilities within its country, military and civilian." He urged caution in assessing the reliability of national means and recalled that a previous U.S. study had concluded that off-site observation could not identify chemical munitions storage.

In conclusion, the U.S. Representative reaffirmed that the 10-power paper was a concrete contribution to the CCD's work and that further exploration of some of its elements could enhance its contribution.

#### *Comprehensive Test Ban*

The U.S. Representative reaffirmed American support for an adequately verified comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons testing, but maintained the position that in spite of seismological progress national means of verification should still be supplemented by some on-site inspections.

Most CCD members reaffirmed their support for a comprehensive test ban, and many questioned the need for on-site inspection on the grounds that present seismological methods were adequate to make the probability of detection high enough to provide an effective deterrent to clandestine testing.

Criticizing the United States for insisting on on-site inspections, the U.S.S.R. continued to maintain that an underground test ban could be verified by national means of control. It agreed that the international exchange of seismic data was important and said it was willing to participate in such exchange, within the framework of a comprehensive test ban agreement verified by national means. It warned, however, that although negotiations could continue in the CCD even without the participation of France and the P.R.C., an agreement on the cessation of tests "by everyone everywhere" could only be effective if all nuclear states became parties to it.

In a paper of July 5 the United States described various problems of identifying underground events by seismological means and outlined its program of research on these problems. In introducing the paper, the U.S. Representative observed that while it showed considerable progress there was obviously a great difference between knowing how to do something theoretically and having the capability to do it in practice. The paper suggested a number of ways of improving and extending a seismic detection system, including unmanned seismic observatories (USOs), and stated that the United States was planning to install an experimental USO in order to test

the technology. The paper found it unlikely that a seismic network could identify as earthquakes or explosions all the events it detected. Moreover, teleseismic means would be less effective if testing states employed various evasion techniques such as "decoupling" signals by conducting explosions in underground cavities or masking signals from explosions by the stronger signals of a large earthquake.

On Japanese initiative, the CCD held several informal meetings in July to discuss technical problems with experts from several countries, including the United States. Summing up the results of these meetings, the Japanese Representative said they had confirmed that seismological means were highly effective but that teleseismic observation had its limits. The ultimate detection threshold was said to be seismic magnitude 4.0, i.e., explosions of one or two kilotons in hard rock. If the evasion question were excluded, the identification threshold would approach the detection threshold as a result of recent research and development, but 100% certainty would not be possible for small events.

The U.S. Representative described the meetings as "exceptionally constructive," especially in helping clarify the capabilities and limitations of seismic verification methods. It appeared to be generally accepted, he observed, that some problems, "notably certain possibilities of evasion," were beyond the capabilities of seismic networks. He reiterated that the United States could consider a verification system adequate "if, and only if, it would reduce the risks of violation to an acceptable level." Although consultations between parties to help clarify ambiguous events would be useful, they could not replace the deterrence provided by on-site inspections. Since further testing could be militarily significant, an effectively verified comprehensive test ban would be "a significant constraint on the further development of nuclear weapons."

Canada renewed its proposals for the reduction of the size and number of tests and for an agreed moratorium on testing. Japan repeated its 1972 proposal for the cessation of tests above a certain "threshold," i.e., the seismic magnitude at which all underground events could be identified. The U.S.S.R. rejected these proposals.

### *Conventional Weapons*

Concerning the other topics on the CCD's agenda, the United States continued to consider control of conventional weapons an urgent matter because, as the U.S. Representative pointed out, although there has been no nuclear conflict since 1945 there have been many conflicts, often of great intensity, using conventional weapons. Although agreeing that priority attention should continue to be given to weapons of mass destruction, the United States declared that long-range arms control objectives could not be achieved without dealing with conventional weapons. A discussion of issues and objectives with regard to their control need not detract from efforts regarding weapons of mass destruction. The U.S. position was supported by some other states, including the United Kingdom which said that nuclear and conventional disarmament should proceed in parallel. Nevertheless, most of the CCD members apparently continued to believe that control of conventional weapons, which were, moreover, closely linked to the security of nonnuclear states, was much less urgent than control of weapons of mass destruction.



*Adoption of Report*

On August 30 the CCD adopted, for submission to the General Assembly, a progress report on its deliberations during 1973 on the questions before it, together with the pertinent documents and records. This report formed the basis for much of the 28th General Assembly's consideration of disarmament matters.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 28th General Assembly considered nine items related to disarmament and arms control, eight of which had been placed on the agenda by the 27th Assembly and were allocated to the First Committee. They dealt with (1) economic and social consequences of the armaments race, (2) world disarmament conference, (3) general and complete disarmament, (4) napalm and other incendiary weapons, (5) chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, (6) urgent need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, (7) implementation of the General Assembly resolution concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, and (8) declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. The First Committee held a combined general debate on these topics from October 23 to November 8. It subsequently approved 11 resolutions, all of which were adopted by the General Assembly.

The ninth item, entitled "Reduction of the military budgets of states permanent members of the Security Council by 10% and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries," was proposed by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko during his statement to the General Assembly on September 25. The General Assembly considered the item directly in plenary and adopted two resolutions.

*U.S. Statement*

The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Martin, addressed the First Committee on October 23 and gave a comprehensive statement of U.S. views on all arms control issues.

He noted that many factors on the world scene gave rise to apprehension and discouragement over the prospects for arms control, but there were equally strong reasons to take encouragement. Ten years ago, arms control and disarmament seemed enmeshed in the cold war. But in the fall of 1973, besides agreements already concluded, promising negotiations were under way or about to begin on strategic arms limitations (SALT), on mutual and balanced force reductions (MBFR) in Central Europe, and on European security and cooperation. The CCD continued its important work on a comprehensive test ban and chemical weapons limitations. He then asserted that at the United Nations.

" . . . It is up to us to build on the base of agreements already achieved in order to take those further steps which may not be feasible."

Taking up specific areas of arms control negotiations, Ambassador Martin observed that nuclear disarmament understandably enjoyed priority attention. He cited in particular the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Agree-

ment of June 21, 1973, in which the two sides stated their intention, building on the 1972 SALT accords, to reach permanent agreement on more complete measures for the limitation and subsequent reduction of strategic arms. SALT, he added, represented a fundamental change in international relationships, in that each side had set a goal of breaking the momentum and moderating the process of strategic arms competition.

Turning to the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), Ambassador Martin noted that more than 100 countries had signed the treaty. The goals of the NPT were greater stability for a world living under a nuclear threat, reduction of the chances of a nuclear war whether initiated by design or by accident, and easing the burden of armaments on the world. Strengthening the NPT, he said, was one of the General Assembly's heaviest responsibilities. Noting that Article VIII of the NPT called for a review conference 5 years after entry into force, he said the United States looked forward to the conference and intended to cooperate fully with other treaty parties in ensuring its careful organization. Consultations to that end were under way.

Ambassador Martin noted that a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing remained an important objective in nuclear arms control. A substantial contribution had been made by the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963<sup>12</sup> as an initial breakthrough after years of stalled negotiations which helped to make possible the later arms control agreements. The United States, however, regarded this treaty for all its value as just a step toward the ultimate objective of an adequately verified comprehensive test ban. Emphasizing the high priority the United States was giving to the verification problem, he reported on progress in understanding seismic detection and identification capabilities and cooperation with other countries on seismic research.

Reviewing the CCD's work on chemical weapons, Ambassador Martin affirmed that the United States agreed with the point in the non-aligned working paper that prohibition of chemical weapons must be coupled with adequate verification, and that verification in turn has both technical and political aspects which interact with the question of the scope of prohibitions. The United States also considered that the possibility of a gradual approach to the prohibition of chemical weapons should be held open. Ambassador Martin reaffirmed:

"The United States remains committed to seeking effective limitations on chemical weapons. We will continue our search for workable means of restricting these weapons during the coming year, while exercising restraint in our own program."

The U.S. Representative then turned to the question of disarmament forums. The United States considered that the CCD, with its limited size, close working relations, and detailed understanding of technical issues, remained a valuable forum for achieving truly constructive results. The United Nations "should continue to provide full support to this Committee, which has been responsible for so much of the progress that we have made in arms control." Some countries, he noted, had called for the convening of a world disarmament con-

<sup>12</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water, signed at Moscow, Aug. 5, 1963; entered into force for the United States Oct. 10, 1963.

ference. The United States continued to believe that although such a conference could serve a useful function at a later stage in the disarmament process, it would not at this time produce useful results and could well impede further progress. Consequently, the United States was opposed to the early convening of a world disarmament conference or to setting a date or starting preparations for one at this time. A third possible forum, to which some speakers had alluded, was a reconvened UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC), which had last met in 1965. The United States doubted seriously that such a large conference (composed of all UN members) could tackle the working out of concrete treaty agreements, and if it served only as a forum for exchanging views, it was difficult to see how it could add to the debate of the First Committee.

The U.S. Representative concluded by declaring that the process of compromise, overcoming long-standing political differences, and subordinating ideological differences would be needed for more rapid progress in all sectors of arms control and disarmament. At the same time he noted the encouraging worldwide growth of an idea which is the cardinal principle of all disarmament work: "that limitations can assure security and stability better than even the highest levels of armaments."

#### *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race*

The agenda item entitled "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security" was first introduced by Romania at the 25th General Assembly in 1970. Resolutions on the subject were adopted in 1970 and 1971; the first called for a study of the subject by a group of experts, and the second requested the Secretary General to publicize the experts' report and decided to consider the question again at the 28th Assembly.

On November 13 Romania introduced a new resolution, ultimately sponsored by 13 states, reflecting a conviction that "persistent action is necessary in order to halt and reduce the arms race, especially in the nuclear field, including continuous efforts toward reducing military budgets, starting with the strongly armed countries." The resolution, *inter alia*, (1) considered that constant awareness and continuing review of the effects of the arms race could facilitate future disarmament negotiations; (2) called upon all states to make renewed efforts to end the arms race, including the reduction of military budgets; (3) requested bodies concerned with disarmament to give high priority to the identification of appropriate ways and means to approach matters regarding the reduction of military budgets; (4) requested the Secretary General to pursue the study of the consequences of the arms race so that he could, upon request of the General Assembly, give an up-to-date report; and (5) reiterated the decision to keep the subject under constant review.

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 15 without objection, and the General Assembly adopted it without objection on December 6.

#### *World Disarmament Conference*

In 1972, the 27th General Assembly had approved a resolution establishing a 35-member special committee to examine governments' views and suggestions "on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems." The United States had abstained

on the grounds that views on this matter were already well known, and that it did not intend to participate in the special committee. After its formation many states felt that the special committee's membership had been determined improperly, and this and other problems prevented it from even issuing a final report of its findings.

On December 13, 1973, Mexico introduced a draft resolution, sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, India, Mexico, and Yugoslavia, providing for the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Committee "to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems, including conditions for the realization of such a conference, and to submit, on the basis of consensus, a report to the General Assembly at its 29th session." The draft resolution stipulated the Committee's membership should be 40 non-nuclear-weapon states and invited the nuclear powers to "cooperate or maintain contact with" the Committee, "it being understood that they will enjoy the same rights as the designated members." The resolution, which had been the subject of extensive consultations before its introduction, was unanimously approved by the Committee on December 13, and unanimously adopted by the General Assembly on December 18.

The United States supported the resolution because it was acceptable to all nuclear-weapon states, and because it made clear that there had been no decision to convene or to begin preparations for a world disarmament conference, which, as Ambassador Martin had explained in the general debate, the United States continued to oppose. The United States understood that the provision for a consensus report by the Committee meant, as the representative of Mexico had indicated, that the views of all the nuclear-weapon states would be reflected.

#### *General and Complete Disarmament*

The General Assembly adopted three resolutions under the heading "General and complete disarmament." The first dealt with SALT; the second, which the United States cosponsored, concerned preparations for the NPT review conference; the third dealt with the overall topic. The United States abstained on the first and third.

Mexico introduced the resolution on SALT on November 22. At the time of voting the resolution had 13 sponsors. The preambular paragraphs, *inter alia*, reaffirmed the Assembly's 1972 SALT resolution appealing to the United States and the Soviet Union to expedite the conclusion of further agreements "including important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions of offensive and defensive strategic nuclear-weapon systems" and to keep the General Assembly informed of the results of the negotiations. After noting with satisfaction the U.S.-U.S.S.R. agreement on basic principles, signed in June, the resolution appealed to the two governments "to bear constantly in mind in the current phase of the negotiations . . . the necessity and urgency of reaching agreement on important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions of their strategic nuclear-weapon systems as a positive step toward nuclear disarmament." It again invited the governments to keep the General Assembly informed.

The resolution was approved by the Committee at the same meeting by a vote of 79 to 1, with 18 abstentions (U.S.), and adopted by the Assembly on December 18 by a recorded vote of 94 to 1 (Albania)

with 19 abstentions (France, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.); the P.R.C. did not participate in the vote. The United States abstained for substantially the same reasons as the year before: while welcoming the interest shown by the world community in SALT, it reaffirmed its belief that the negotiations should proceed along lines set down by the parties themselves.

The second resolution was introduced by Sweden and ultimately sponsored by 26 states including the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. The resolution's preamble cited the provision in the NPT calling for a conference 5 years after the treaty became effective to review its operation, and noted that the fifth anniversary of the treaty's entry into force would be March 5, 1975. The operative paragraphs noted that a preparatory committee, composed of NPT parties who were members of the IAEA's Board of Governors or of the CCD, had been formed and requested the Secretary General to provide the services required for the conference and its preparation.

The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 23 by a vote of 66 (U.S.) to 2, with 10 abstentions, and adopted by the General Assembly on December 18 by a recorded vote of 100 (U.S.) to 2 (Albania, P.R.C.), with 11 abstentions.

The third resolution, introduced on November 22 by Yugoslavia and eventually sponsored by 14 states, (1) reaffirmed the responsibility of the United Nations in all aspects of disarmament, "in particular the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control"; (2) invited participants in disarmament negotiations to "ensure that the disarmament measures adopted in one region should not result in increasing armaments in other regions, thus upsetting their stability"; (3) invited all governments to "keep the General Assembly suitably informed of their disarmament negotiations"; and (4) requested the Secretary General to bring the resolution to the attention of all member states and other governments.

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 23 by a vote of 66 to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.), and the Assembly adopted it on December 18 by a recorded vote of 93 to 0, with 20 abstentions (U.S.). In explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Martin stated that while the United States believed the General Assembly should be kept suitably informed of the *results* of disarmament negotiations, the third operative paragraph of the resolution implied a practice that would run counter to the accepted principles of the confidentiality of negotiations in progress.

#### *Napalm and Other Incendiary Weapons*

Following up its previous initiative, Sweden on October 30 introduced a draft resolution on this subject cosponsored by six other countries. The preambular section *inter alia* cited the Secretary General's 1972 report on napalm and other incendiaries and an expert's study under Red Cross auspices on weapons that may cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects, and advocated prohibition or restrictions against the use of such weapons including incendiaries. An operative paragraph invited the conference on humanitarian law in armed conflicts, to be convened early in 1974, to consider the question of the use of such weapons and to "adopt rules" prohibiting or restricting their use.

The draft resolution underwent two revisions and acquired 14 more cosponsors. In the version voted on in the First Committee the main operative paragraph was modified to invite the humanitarian law conference to "seek agreement" on rules prohibiting or restricting use of the weapons in question. A new preambular paragraph took note of an invitation by the XXII International Conference of the Red Cross to the International Committee of the Red Cross to convene a conference of government experts in 1974 to "study in depth" the question of such prohibitions or restrictions.

The First Committee adopted the revised draft resolution November 22 by a vote of 89 to 0, with 18 abstentions (U.S.). Ambassador Martin declared that the United States particularly regretted that it could not vote for the resolution, since there had been hope that extensive negotiations would result in a very broadly acceptable text. However, the version before the Committee was ambiguous with respect to what was expected of the humanitarian law conference, and there was a risk that the draft might create unrealizable expectations of possible agreement on rules. In the U.S. view, before any basis for such agreement could be expected, many difficult and complex questions in the sensitive area of possible prohibition or limitation of the use of specific conventional weapons would have to be studied in depth. The appropriate approach was the Red Cross experts' study, in which the United States expected to participate. But until such a study had been accomplished, the United States did not consider that these questions could usefully be made the subject of actual negotiations.

On December 6, by a vote of 103 to 0, with 18 abstentions (U.S.), the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution recommended by the First Committee.

### *Chemical and Biological Weapons*

The CCD's report was before the First Committee when it took up the agenda item entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons." On November 9 Yugoslavia introduced a draft resolution eventually sponsored by 29 nonaligned states. In the resolution's original form, its main operative paragraphs (1) reaffirmed the objective of effective prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their elimination; (2) urged governments to work toward the complete realization of this objective; (3) requested the CCD to continue its negotiations "with a view to reaching an early agreement for the prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their elimination"; (4) reaffirmed the hope for the widest possible adherence to the Biological Weapons Convention; and (5) invited states that had not yet done so to accede to the Geneva Protocol.<sup>13</sup>

The United States and several other delegations sought a number of changes in the draft resolution. The major obstacle to U.S. support was the failure of the draft resolution to conform to prior agreed guidelines for future negotiations on chemical weapons as set forth in Article IX of the Biological Weapons Convention,<sup>14</sup> which had been

<sup>13</sup> Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous, or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on June 17, 1925.

<sup>14</sup> Article IX says: "Each State Party to this Convention affirms the recognized objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons and, to this end, undertakes to continue negotiations in good faith with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of their development, production and stockpiling and for their destruction, and on appropriate measures concerning equipment and means of delivery specifically designed for the production or use of chemical agents for weapons purposes."

endorsed overwhelmingly by the 26th General Assembly. After extensive negotiations the draft resolution was revised to meet these concerns, the most significant change being the alteration of the third operative paragraph to request the CCD to continue its negotiations "with a view to reaching early agreement *on effective measures* for the prohibition" of chemical weapons (added words in italics). This and other revisions were announced orally at the Committee's meeting on November 26; the voting followed shortly. The revised resolution was adopted by a vote of 98 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention (France); the P.R.C. did not participate in the vote. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 6 by a recorded vote of 118 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions; France and the P.R.C. did not participate.

#### *Suspension of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Tests*

The First Committee considered and approved two resolutions concerning the "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests."

The first resolution, introduced by Mexico on November 9, was sponsored by seven states. Its three operative paragraphs (1) condemned "once again with the utmost vigor all nuclear weapon tests"; (2) repeated the conviction that "whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban"; and (3) again urged nuclear states to end without delay all nuclear tests either through a permanent agreement or through unilateral or agreed moratoria.

The Committee voted on the resolution on November 15. Operative paragraph 1 was approved in a separate vote, taken at the request of Pakistan, of 83 to 4, with 41 abstentions (U.S.). The resolution as a whole was then approved by a rollcall vote of 92 to 5 (Albania, P.R.C., France, Gabon, Portugal), with 27 abstentions (U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.). The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 6 by a recorded vote of 89 to 5, with 33 abstentions (U.S.).

The United States abstained on the resolution because the second operative paragraph was incompatible with its position that the question of verification was central to and inseparable from consideration of the test ban issue.

The other resolution before the Committee was introduced on November 9 by Canada. It was subsequently revised and eventually sponsored by 21 states.

The resolution noted in its preambular paragraphs the recent 10th anniversary of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, and regretted that some states had not adhered to the Treaty. According to the preamble, the Assembly was "gravely disturbed" over the continuation of nuclear testing and "deeply concerned" over tests in the atmosphere. The operative paragraphs (1) emphasized the deep concern over the continuance of testing; (2) called anew upon nuclear-weapon states "to seek, as a matter of urgency, the end of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments"; (3) insisted that atmospheric testing be halted "forthwith"; (4) urged states to adhere to the Limited Test Ban Treaty without further delay; (5) vigorously urged members of the CCD immediately to start negotiations on a treaty for a comprehensive test ban; (6) requested the CCD to continue, "as a matter of highest priority," its deliberations on this treaty and to submit a special report on the re-

sults of its work to the 29th session of the General Assembly; and (7) changed the title of the agenda item to the "Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and the conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban."

The Committee voted on the resolution on November 15. At the request of Sri Lanka, a separate vote was held on operative paragraph 3, calling for an immediate end to atmospheric tests, which several delegations considered discriminatory. The paragraph was approved by a vote of 58 to 6, with 55 abstentions (U.S.). The resolution as a whole was then approved by a vote of 67 to 7 (P.R.C., France), with 50 abstentions (U.S., U.K., U.S.S.R.). The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 6 by a recorded vote of 65 to 7, with 57 abstentions (U.S.)

Ambassador Martin explained the U.S. abstention in the First Committee. He noted that operative paragraph 5 seemed to imply "that negotiations on a comprehensive test ban should take place regardless of whether a proper foundation for agreement exists. We believe that such pressures to start elaborating a treaty while deadlock remains over the complex verification issue could only lead to an empty diplomatic exercise without advancing the cause of a comprehensive test ban."

#### *Latin American Nuclear-Free Zone*

The Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>15</sup> established a zone free of nuclear weapons in Latin America. Under Additional Protocol II of the Treaty, nuclear-weapon states agree to respect the zone and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the Latin American parties. The General Assembly has adopted a series of resolutions since 1968 urging the nuclear powers to adhere to the Protocol. Until 1973 only the United Kingdom and the United States had done so. However, in June 1973 France signed the Protocol; the P.R.C. followed a month later, leaving only the Soviet Union as a non-signatory.

On November 8 the Mexican Representative introduced a draft resolution, sponsored by 19 Latin American countries, that noted with satisfaction the signing of the Protocol by France and the P.R.C., invited them to ratify it as soon as possible, deplored the fact that "one of the five nuclear-weapon states" had not heeded the urgent appeals of previous resolutions, and urged it once again to sign and ratify the Protocol "without further delay." On November 13, following statements by France and the P.R.C. of their intention to take the steps necessary for ratification, Mexico introduced, on behalf of the same sponsors, a revised version that noted the statement with satisfaction and deleted the provision deploring Soviet inaction while still urging it to sign and ratify the Protocol.

The revised resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 104 (U.S.) to 0, with 14 abstentions, and adopted by the General Assembly on December 6 by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 0, with 12 abstentions.

#### *Indian Ocean Peace Zone*

In 1971 the 26th General Assembly, acting upon the initiative of Sri Lanka, adopted a resolution declaring the Indian Ocean to be

<sup>15</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, done at Tlatelolco (Mexico City), Feb. 14, 1967, entered into force Apr. 22, 1968.



a "zone of peace." The 27th General Assembly established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean to study the implications of the declaration and the practical steps that could be taken to further its objectives. The 15-member<sup>16</sup> committee, which met 11 times between February 27 and October 4, 1973, submitted a report to the 28th General Assembly summarizing the views of its members on such questions as the aims of the declaration, the role of the Indian Ocean littoral and hinterland states, and the disarmament and law of the sea aspects of the declaration.

On November 12 Sri Lanka introduced a draft resolution ultimately sponsored by 18 states. Noting the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the resolution *inter alia* (1) urged all states to accept the principles and objectives of the Indian Ocean peace zone resolution; (2) requested the *Ad Hoc* Committee to continue its work; (3) urged all states, especially the major powers, to cooperate with the Committee; (4) requested the Secretary General to prepare a "factual statement of the great powers' military presence in all its aspects, in the Indian Ocean, with special reference to their naval deployments, conceived in the context of great power rivalry"; (5) recommended that the statement be based on available material and prepared with the help of qualified experts and outside bodies selected by the Secretary General; and (6) requested that the statement be transmitted to the *Ad Hoc* Committee by March 31, 1974.

The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 23 by a vote of 77 to 0, with 29 abstentions (U.S.), and adopted by the General Assembly on December 6 by a recorded vote of 95 to 0, with 35 abstentions (France, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.).

The U.S. abstention on this resolution, as on the two previous ones concerning the Indian Ocean peace zone, was based on the consideration that the imposition of a special regime on any part of the high seas would have serious and prejudicial implications for the important negotiations underway concerning the law of the sea, as well as for disarmament and arms control negotiations.

#### *Reduction of Military Budgets*

The Assembly considered the item at eight meetings between October 15 and December 7. On October 15 the U.S.S.R. introduced a draft resolution whose operative paragraphs (1) recommended that the five permanent members of the Security Council reduce their military budgets by 10 percent from the 1973 level during the next financial year; (2) appealed to the same states to devote 10 percent of the funds thus released to economic assistance to developing countries; (3) expressed the desire that other states, "particularly those with a major economic and military potential" also take steps to reduce military budgets and use some of the funds saved for economic assistance; (4) established a special committee to distribute the funds on an equitable basis, "having regard to the most urgent needs and requirements" of the recipients and without discrimination, and to determine the amount of the funds to be allotted and the schedule of their provisions; (5) requested the Secretary General to provide all possible assistance; and (6) suggested that the special committee submit a report to the 29th session of the General Assembly.

<sup>16</sup> Australia, P.R.C., India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Malagasy Republic, Malaysia, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

A revised version of the draft, introduced on November 26, specified the membership of the special committee as comprising the five permanent members of the Security Council, three countries each from the African, Asian, and Latin American regional groups, and two each from the Eastern European and Western European and Other groups. It referred to the distribution of funds under the resolution as being in addition to economic assistance already being provided through existing channels.

On December 7 Mexico introduced a separate resolution whose preambular paragraphs stated that the General Assembly was (1) convinced of the "urgent necessity" that the Security Council's permanent members reduce their military budgets and of the "desirability" that states with a major economic and military potential do so, (2) convinced further that part of the funds saved should be used for assistance to developing countries, and (3) conscious that the United Nations had not been able to study the question with the required depth and care. The resolution therefore (1) requested the Secretary General to prepare, with the assistance of qualified experts, a report on the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and of other states with a major economic and military potential and on the use of part of the funds thus saved for economic assistance; (2) called upon all governments to cooperate with the Secretary General on the study; and (3) invited the Secretary General to submit the report in time for consideration by the 29th session of the General Assembly.

The Assembly took recorded votes on both resolutions on December 7. The Soviet resolution was adopted by a vote of 83 (U.S.S.R.) to 2 (Albania, P.R.C.), with 38 abstentions (France, U.K., U.S.). The Mexican resolution was then adopted by a vote of 93 (U.S.S.R.) to 2 (Albania, P.R.C.), with 26 abstentions (France, U.K., U.S.).

The U.S. position on the Soviet resolution was based on a number of considerations. First, the United States believed the proposal was not practical, since there was no common standard for measuring or defining military budgets of the states concerned. Second, there was no assurance that the states concerned would submit their budgets to the close international scrutiny that would be necessary. Third, there was no suggestion of a system to verify budget cuts. Fourth, beyond the question of practicality, the United States did not feel it was useful to try to link military budget levels to the duty to provide economic assistance. There is no direct relationship between the size of a country's defense budget and the funds it may make available for development purposes abroad.

In the U.S. view, the Mexican resolution's preamble used exaggerated language in describing the reduction of budgets by the Security Council's permanent members as an "urgent necessity" and in addition made an unjustifiable distinction between the permanent members and other states with major economic and military potentials. Again, the implied linkage between reduction of military budgets and provision of economic assistance was objectionable. The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Schaefe, noted, however, that the experts' study called for in the Mexican resolution could be useful if it addressed, *inter alia*, such questions as defining military budgets, devising standard accounting procedures, and methods for taking account of inflation and different

price structures. On the understanding that these matters would be taken up, he indicated, the United States would welcome the opportunity to cooperate with the study and to nominate a U.S. expert to participate.

## OUTER SPACE

During 1973 the United States continued to participate actively in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the Committee's four subsidiary bodies,<sup>17</sup> and the General Assembly's consideration of its agenda items on outer space.

### WORKING GROUP ON REMOTE SENSING

The Working Group on Remote Sensing of the Earth by Satellites,<sup>18</sup> established in 1971 as the result of a U.S. initiative, held its second session January 29–February 10 in New York, and considered (1) the potential of satellite remote sensing for solving specific environmental and resources problems; (2) views of member states and UN bodies on their interest in the use of this technology; (3) systems which might be of special value in meeting international, regional, and global requirements for remote sensing data; and (4) the technology's economic, social, and legal implications for the international community.

The Working Group was to base a considerable portion of its deliberations on the results to date of the U.S. experimental satellite ERTS-1, launched successfully in July 1972, and early in the session the United States presented a technical briefing that included a review of those results. In the briefing it was noted that while some applications (such as mapping and geology) required only one picture others (such as changes in vegetation, fluctuation in snow and ice cover, and sedimentation flow in water courses) called for repetitive coverage, in some cases over several years. It was therefore emphasized that it would be premature to draw broad conclusions about the potential utility and cost effectiveness of the technology or of any particular application. This U.S. appraisal was reflected in the Working Group's report.

The Working Group noted the need for comprehensive information on alternative ways to make remote sensing data available internationally, including possible international distribution centers. It suggested that such information should include possible sources of data; data processing, management, and distribution; administrative and personnel considerations; and user needs and cost considerations.

<sup>17</sup> During the period covered by this report the 28 members of the Outer Space Committee were Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Hungary, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States. As noted below, the 28th General Assembly decided to enlarge the Committee by not more than nine. The four subsidiary bodies, each of which has the same membership as the Committee, are the Legal Subcommittee, Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites, and Working Group on Remote Sensing of the Earth by Satellites, the last being a subgroup of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee.

<sup>18</sup> The following definition was agreed upon by the Working Group for the purposes of its report: "Remote sensing of the earth from space is a methodology to assist in characterizing the nature and condition of the natural resources, natural features, and phenomena, and the environment of the earth by means of observations and measurements from space platforms. Specifically, at present, such methods depend upon the emission and reflection of electromagnetic radiation."

In this connection the U.S. Representative, Leonard Jaffe, announced that the U.S. Government was willing to work out an agreement with the United Nations to provide master copies of all data from the U.S. experimental remote sensing program if an international distribution center or centers should be established. Taking the U.S. offer into account, the Working Group recommended setting up a task force "to identify and report on the alternatives for the dissemination and optimum utilization of environmental and resource data, keeping in mind the data requirements of the developing countries. . . . in the interest of promoting the optimum utilization of this space application for the benefit of states and the international community."

In contrast to the agreement achieved on an approach to the study of organizational problems, significant differences arose within the Working Group over the question of legal implications of remote sensing from space. The U.S.S.R. circulated a "preliminary draft" of legal principles that would be applicable to surveys of earth resources, but did not press for their discussion by the Working Group. Some delegations proposed "broad and systematic examination" of legal implications while others, the United States among them, maintained that this would be premature and should await the results of the projected examination of possible alternative modes of international data dissemination.

With regard to economic and social implications of remote sensing, the Working Group reached a consensus that for an adequate assessment more detailed information was needed on operating costs and cost effectiveness.

#### LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE

The Legal Subcommittee held its 12th session in New York, March 26–April 20. In accordance with a resolution of the General Assembly in 1972, the Subcommittee took up as matters of priority the unfinished treaties on the exploration and use of the moon and on the registration of objects launched into outer space. Some delegations expressed views on other items on the agenda—definition of outer space, implications of space communications (in particular direct broadcast satellites), and remote sensing of the earth's resources by satellites—but as in 1972 work on the two treaties precluded more intensive consideration of the other subjects.

#### *Registration of Space Objects*

Although final agreement eluded the Subcommittee, it nevertheless made major progress toward a mutually acceptable treaty on registration of objects launched into outer space. The United States contributed significantly to that progress, tabling its own draft treaty which became one of the bases for further negotiation along with a Franco-Canadian text somewhat modified from the version reported out of the Subcommittee the previous year. This U.S. action was taken in response to the evident widespread desire of others for a mandatory registration scheme; the United States continued to regard the existing system of voluntary submissions to the UN Secretary General as satisfactory, but in an effort to accommodate the views of others suggested the codification of a variation of that voluntary system in a treaty.

The working group on the registration treaty reached agreement on many issues, including the information to be furnished with respect

to each object launched into earth orbit or beyond, and the obligation of states—especially those with space monitoring and tracking facilities—to respond to the greatest extent feasible to requests for assistance in identifying space objects causing damage. The U.S. Representative, Herbert Reis, noted that the United States, which would incur a major share of such an obligation, strongly supported this article.

The questions of providing for a review conference after the treaty had been in force for a certain period, and of requiring launching states to mark space objects remained unresolved. Some delegations regarded marking as “an essential element of registration”; others thought that a voluntary marking provision could be included; while still others, including the United States, rejected either compulsory or voluntary markings as serving no constructive purpose. Recalling a determination by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in 1970 that marking was impracticable on both technical and economic grounds, the United States maintained in addition that no intervening developments in space technology had altered that finding.

In view of the progress achieved the Subcommittee recommended that the Outer Space Committee seek to complete the registration treaty with a view to submitting an agreed text to the 28th General Assembly for adoption.

#### *Exploration and Use of the Moon*

Less progress was made on the treaty on exploration and use of the moon. The working group set up for negotiations on this treaty, although agreeing on some useful minor changes and additions, could not resolve differences on three major issues, all arising from U.S. proposals of the previous year: (1) expansion of the treaty's scope to include other celestial bodies besides the moon; (2) timing of international notification of missions to the celestial bodies covered by the treaty; and (3) creation of an international regime governing possible exploitation of natural resources of those bodies.

The issue of resources was taken up first. Several developing countries, apparently concerned over the possible implications for resource exploitation in other areas beyond national jurisdiction, such as the deep seabed, demanded a moratorium on such exploitation with respect to celestial bodies pending establishment of an international regime. Although the United States had initiated the proposal for such a regime when commercial exploitation might become practical, it nevertheless insisted on an explicit anti-moratorium provision to apply in the interim. The disagreement was unreconciled, and other major issues, whose final negotiation was understood to depend on settlement of the resources question, thus also remained unresolved. However, there was tacit movement toward agreement on a limited expansion of the treaty's scope to cover the other bodies of the solar system, an approach advocated by Sweden and supported by the United States, particularly in light of the increasing scale of exploratory missions to the planets.

Despite uncertain prospects for early accord on the outstanding issues, the Subcommittee asked the Outer Space Committee to try to complete the moon treaty at its 1973 session in the hope that an agreed text could be submitted to the General Assembly in the fall.

## SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee held its 10th session in New York, May 7-18, and considered *inter alia* status of the UN program for the promotion of space applications, reports of the specialized agencies and international organizations, and scientific and technical aspects of international space cooperation.

In considering space applications, the Subcommittee concentrated on the report of the Working Group on Remote Sensing. Besides endorsing the Working Group's proposal for a task force on international data distribution (see above, p. 46), it recommended that the Secretary General carry out a new survey of potential users of space remote sensing, annexing *inter alia* the most recent results of the ERTS-1 satellite as reported to the Subcommittee by the U.S. Representative, Arnold Frutkin, and continue to seek from the specialized agencies and other international organizations information on their activities related to remote sensing. The Subcommittee further recommended that the UN Expert on Space Applications organize regional workshops to train interpreters of remote sensing data in developing countries, and it approved a 1974 program for the Expert that included regional panel meetings and training workshops on satellite broadcasting systems for education, satellite meteorology, and remote sensing applications in cartography and land use.

In considering reports presented by the specialized agencies the Subcommittee took special note of the growing practical use of satellites by organizations such as IBRD, ITU, UNESCO, FAO, WMO, and IMCO in carrying out their programs in education, agricultural development, meteorology, and pollution control. The Subcommittee also recommended that the Secretary General prepare a comprehensive report on assistance by the UN system to developing countries in the field of space applications.

The Subcommittee expressed its satisfaction at the use of sounding rocket facilities at the Thumba Equatorial Rocket Launching Station in India and the CELPA Mar del Plata Station in Argentina and recommended continuing UN sponsorship of both ranges.

## WORKING GROUP ON DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITES

In accordance with a 1972 recommendation of the Outer Space Committee, endorsed by the 27th General Assembly, the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites<sup>19</sup> held its fourth session, and first since 1970, in New York, June 11-22. It met to study substantive material that had become available in the satellite broadcasting field since its previous session and to set out possibilities for further action by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The new material included (1) frequency allocation and operating regulations adopted at the ITU's 1971 World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications; (2) the 1972 UNESCO Declaration of Guiding Principles on the Use of Satellite Broadcasting; (3) studies by UNESCO and the World Intellectual Property Organization on pro-

<sup>19</sup> There is no internationally agreed definition of a "direct broadcast satellite." In the strict sense it is one capable of transmitting a broadcast signal to an unmodified individual receiving set. However, in international consideration of space communications technology the term is usually employed more loosely, applying also to transmissions to community or augmented individual receivers.

tection against unauthorized use of television signals transmitted by satellites; and (4) the draft convention on international direct television broadcasting by satellites introduced by the U.S.S.R. at the 1972 General Assembly.

Shortly before the session convened Canada and Sweden jointly presented a working paper containing a set of 10 draft principles on direct television broadcasting by satellite. The paper noted that a resolution of the 27th General Assembly had stated the necessity to elaborate principles governing such broadcasting "with a view to concluding an international agreement or agreements" and suggested that the draft principles formulated by the two states could provide a basis for action in compliance with the resolution. The U.S.S.R., however, maintained that binding treaty rules rather than a declaration of principles were needed.

The United States put forward its position in a June 15 statement by the U.S. Representative, Stuart H. McIntyre. The United States opposed any effort by the Working Group to elaborate principles in any form on the pragmatic ground that too little was known about the technology and how it might eventually develop to justify seeking at the present time to establish principles governing its use. Nevertheless, the United States was keenly interested in discussing the concerns of others in connection with satellite direct broadcasting, while asking that U.S. concerns also be taken into account. Foremost among the latter was the commitment to freedom of speech and information. The U.S. Representative asked that all Working Group members "weigh most carefully the possible consequences to this basic human right, as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in considering possible constraints on the use of satellite broadcasting." In the same connection, the United States saw in the blanket requirement for prior consent by a receiving state to international direct broadcasting—included in both the Swedish-Canadian draft principles and the Soviet draft convention—"an inherent danger of sanctioning not only total censorship but such arbitrary and diverse application of the principle as to nullify the basic human right to exchange ideas and information."

A second major U.S. concern, shared by some other Working Group members, was that the growth of a potentially beneficial space application should not be stunted by an unduly restrictive abstract approach to its use. In this connection the U.S. Representative referred to satellite broadcasting experiments involving community receivers that the United States was planning in cooperation with Canada and India and invited the participation of experts from other nations in experimental educational television projects within the United States in the Rocky and Appalachian Mountain areas and Alaska.

Addressing the concern expressed by a number of countries that the free flow of information and ideas via broadcast satellites might become a one-way flow controlled by the few states technically capable of launching and financially able to operate such a satellite service, the U.S. Representative declared that this country was prepared to study possible arrangements for sharing broadcast time and channels on any future system among countries within a given region. In general, the United States believed that regional approaches, whether among governments or among broadcasting agencies or broadcasters' unions, might well offer the most promising means to facilitate the future use of direct broadcast satellites.

Relatively few members of the Working Group appeared to share the U.S. view that potential benefits rather than possible problems should be stressed in the group's consideration of satellite direct broadcasting. A majority clearly favored some form of regulation of the international use of the technology. However, views varied as to the degree of restrictiveness and the urgency of instituting such regulation. The United States continued to believe that it would be premature to elaborate and adopt globally applicable principles, stressing that regional approaches should be explored further.

Differences also emerged regarding the substantive content of possible future norms, especially as they might involve the relationship between states' sovereign rights and freedom of information. In addition, besides the disagreement regarding prior consent, there were sharply contrasting views on program content control, whether there should be an attempt to define "illegal" broadcasts (as was done in the Soviet draft convention), what means might be authorized to counteract such broadcasts (the Soviet text indicated any means at a state's disposal), and dispute settlement generally.

Views also diverged on the effect of the 1971 ITU space telecommunications conference, some delegations asserting that acceptance of the procedures and frequency allocations agreed at that conference signified agreement with an overall "prior consent" principle. The United States vigorously denied this thesis, regarding the ITU regulations as dealing with technical and administrative matters only.

Finally there were differences over the significance of the distinction between broadcasting to community and to individual home receivers. Notwithstanding the obviously greater capability of governments to control the former, and the different time frame for development of the two modes (community broadcasting is already possible), some delegations alleged that the distinction was immaterial with respect to possible legal norms or principles. The United States and some other delegations disagreed.

The Working Group ended its session inconclusively but recommended that it reconvene in 1974, before the Legal Subcommittee's session, "to consider and discuss principles" on satellite direct broadcasting "with a view to making specific recommendations for the work of the Legal Subcommittee in this field." The Group would "take into account basic legal and operational assumptions," thus permitting consideration of other than legal factors, and "also study ways to enhance international cooperation with the aim of deriving maximum benefit from broadcast satellite technology."

The Outer Space Committee subsequently endorsed the Working Group's recommendations for its future work.

#### OUTER SPACE COMMITTEE

The Outer Space Committee met in New York, June 25–July 6, to review the work of its subsidiary bodies and prepare its report to the General Assembly. Also, pursuant to the recommendation of its Legal Subcommittee, it sought to resolve remaining differences over the draft treaties on the moon and on registration of space objects. An informal working group formed for this purpose made some progress, but differences still persisted on important issues.



With respect to the moon treaty, the working group addressed only one article, concerning natural resources, and disagreement persisted on the question of possible future resource exploitation prior to the establishment of an appropriate international regime. Neither the developing countries advocating a moratorium on such exploitation nor the United States changed their positions.

In contrast, the Committee brought the registration treaty a step nearer completion with agreement on an article providing the conditions for a review conference. However, the issue of requiring launching states to mark spacecraft remained unsettled with positions unchanged from those taken in the Legal Subcommittee.

The Outer Space Committee requested the Legal Subcommittee to make its best efforts to complete both treaties in 1974 "as a matter of highest priority." It also asked the Subcommittee to consider the question of elaborating principles governing direct television broadcasting by satellites, taking account of the recent work of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites, and to devote part of the 1974 session to responding to a request from the Working Group on Remote Sensing for the Subcommittee's views on legal implications of remote sensing by satellites.

In reviewing the report of its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee the Committee gave special attention to remote sensing. It approved both the Remote Sensing Working Group's recommendation that a task force be established on data dissemination and utilization and the Subcommittee's request that the Secretary General prepare a second survey of potential users of remote sensing from space. The Committee also agreed that the Subcommittee should consider at its next session as a "priority item" remote sensing of the earth by satellites "in all its aspects."

Also as a part of its review of the Subcommittee's report, the Committee took note of various examples of international cooperation in space programs, including the offers by numerous countries, including the United States, of education and training. It welcomed in particular the October 1972 announcement by the U.S. Government that it would provide launch assistance to other countries for any satellite project consistent with existing international arrangements.

In connection with international space cooperation the U.S. Representative, Herbert Reis, stressed that such cooperation "has become so integral a part of the U.S. space program that in 1972 each and every NASA launching had a distinct international aspect." This included the last two Apollo missions and especially the Earth Resources Technology Satellite ERTS-1. Further, joint space projects with a number of countries were projected for the near future, including a U.S.-U.S.S.R. experimental manned flight in 1975 to test compatible rendezvous and docking procedures.

Finally, at the instance of several members the Committee discussed the question of its enlargement, but without reaching any conclusions. There was general awareness that in light of the Committee's operation on the basis of consensus any expansion of membership should be modest.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The First Committee considered its agenda items on outer space matters at seven meetings from December 4 to 10. Both items, "Inter-

national cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space" and "Preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by states of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting," were comprehended in a lengthy omnibus resolution that the United States cosponsored.

In contrast to the proceedings at the 27th Assembly in 1972, when the question of a convention on direct satellite broadcasting led to sharp controversy, the outer space debate in 1973 was comparatively bland although differing viewpoints were maintained by their respective proponents.

The Committee closed its debate on December 7 with a lengthy statement by the U.S. Representative, Mr. Evans. He noted the expanding peaceful activity in space which was not only increasing man's knowledge of the universe but also helping improve the quality of life on earth. He cited as examples instrumented probes such as Pioneer 10 which had just transmitted data as it flew past the planet Jupiter; astronomical observations by the astronauts on the U.S. manned orbiting laboratory, Skylab; the U.S. weather satellites that were providing data for over 70 countries; communications satellites such as Intelsat; and earth resources technology satellites that had, *inter alia*, discovered subsurface water near usable soils in the drought-stricken Sahelian region in Africa.

Emphasizing the international aspects of the U.S. space program and expressing U.S. gratification that during 1973 the scope and depth of cooperation in space research had been significantly extended Mr. Evans called particular attention to a recently concluded agreement between NASA and the European Space Research Organization under which the latter would develop a manned orbital laboratory for use with the U.S. Space Shuttle.

Turning to UN work in outer space matters, the U.S. Representative reviewed the year in the Outer Space Committee and its subsidiaries and commended the 15-power draft outer space resolution which, he said, "sets out the work program for the Outer Space Committee and its subsidiary organs for 1974 and appropriate guidelines for the relationship between the Committee and other UN bodies in a fair, balanced, and comprehensive way."

Insofar as it related to these topics, the draft in fact did not occasion many difficulties. The potentially contentious issue of direct broadcast satellites was dealt with by a recommendation that the Legal Subcommittee consider at its 1974 session "as a matter of high priority, the question of elaborating principles governing . . . direct television broadcasting [by satellites] with a view to concluding an international agreement or agreements . . . taking due account of the interdisciplinary character of the subject and of the work of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites." The United States believed that this formulation adequately accommodated its reserved position on the question.

The only part of the draft that produced controversy was an operative paragraph enlarging the Outer Space Committee. As originally introduced by Austria on December 5 the draft resolution asked the Outer Space Committee to study and formulate proposals on enlargement and report to the General Assembly in 1974, but a number of countries sought changes to bring about quicker action.

After negotiations, the cosponsors agreed on a new preambular paragraph citing the considerable increase in UN membership since the Committee's establishment in 1961 and concluding that a corresponding enlargement of the Committee was desirable, and on a modified operative paragraph on enlargement. Under this paragraph as amended the Assembly decided to enlarge the Committee by not more than nine new members to be designated by the Assembly. President no later than May 15, 1974, "taking into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution."

The U.S.S.R. opposed the enlargement action as premature and inadequately considered, and because there had been no consensus within the Outer Space Committee itself on the question of expanding its membership. The United States, although generally reserved about the desirability of enlarging the Committee, continued to cosponsor the amended resolution because the relatively modest expansion called for did in fact correspond to the increase in UN membership since 1961 and was small enough to permit the Committee to continue to operate viably on the basis of consensus.

The revised text, with 23 cosponsors, was introduced on December 10 and voted on by the Committee the same day. A separate vote was taken on the operative paragraph on enlargement which was adopted by a vote of 77 (U.S.) to 9 (U.S.S.R.), with 2 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted by a vote of 83 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions (U.S.S.R.).

The General Assembly in plenary session adopted the resolution on December 18 by a vote of 77 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions.

#### LAW OF THE SEA

The third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea convened in a 2-week organizational session December 3 to 15, 1973, in New York. The opening session of the Conference, which marked the transition from preparatory meetings to formal negotiations, capped a year of intense international activity on the law of the sea—activity in which the United States was deeply involved.

Final dates for both the organizational session and the 1974 substantive session of the Conference were agreed upon by the 28th UN General Assembly. Prior to the General Assembly, the 91-member UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (Seabed Committee) held its final two sessions to prepare for the Conference.

#### SEABED COMMITTEE

The Seabed Committee, chaired by Ambassador H. S. Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka, met in New York, March 5-April 6 and in Geneva, July 2-August 24. Although the Committee made uneven progress in preparation of draft treaty articles, it received proposals representing the major points of view on the basic issues and by the end of the summer session the majority of Committee members felt that the time had arrived to shift to actual Conference work. The work of the Seabed Committee in 1973, as in previous years, took place primarily in its three Subcommittees.

Subcommittee I, chaired by Paul Engo of Cameroon, completed preparation of articles dealing with the principles and regime of an international authority for the deep seabed. The Subcommittee's progress was due in large part to the efforts of its 33-member working group. The working group, chaired by Christopher Pinto of Sri Lanka, developed alternative texts incorporating the broad range of views within the Seabed Committee. During 1973, new proposals within the Subcommittee's mandate were submitted by the U.S.S.R., Italy, and Turkey. The United States participated actively and ensured that the provisions of the 1970 U.S. draft Convention on the International Seabed Area were fully reflected in the texts elaborated by the working group.

Subcommittee II, chaired by Reynaldo Galindo Pohl of El Salvador, encountered serious difficulties—both procedural and substantive—in preparing draft articles on the varied and complex issues within its mandate. This mandate included the territorial sea; the contiguous zone; straits; the continental shelf; the nature and extent of coastal state jurisdiction over non-seabed resources beyond the territorial sea (fisheries); the high seas; the rights of land-locked, shelf-locked, and broad-shelf states; archipelagos; and islands (natural and artificial).

In an effort to organize its work, Subcommittee II, at its spring meeting, established a working group of the whole, chaired by Moncef Kedadi of Tunisia, to consider draft articles on the territorial sea, straits, archipelagos, continental shelf resources, fisheries, and related subjects. The working group, plagued by controversy over methodology, made only limited progress in these areas, though delegations submitted proposed texts on most of the subjects and issues involved. During 1973, Subcommittee II received 48 submissions—working papers, draft articles, and amendments—including a working paper on the management of anadromous and migratory fish and draft articles on the coastal seabed economic area tabled by the United States.

Subcommittee III, chaired by Alfred van der Essen of Belgium, moved forward in addressing the subject of marine pollution, while making only slight progress on marine scientific research. Subcommittee III's working group on marine pollution, under José Valarta of Mexico, drafted a number of treaty articles on protection of the marine environment, though it fell short of completing a comprehensive set of texts. A working group on marine scientific research, chaired by Andrzej Olszowka of Poland, was established at the end of the spring session but did not draft any significant agreed articles. Twenty-three new proposals were placed before Subcommittee III during 1973. The United States submitted a working paper and draft articles on marine pollution and draft articles on marine scientific research.

#### *U.S. proposals*

The major U.S. initiative at the spring meeting was a proposal for the provisional entry into force of the international regime and machinery for the deep seabed. The proposal was designed to facilitate seabed mineral development by permitting those provisions of an eventual convention dealing with such activities to enter into force immediately after signature without waiting for completion of the

formal ratification process which could take years. A related U.S. idea that the UN Secretariat prepare a study of precedents for provisional entry into force received the Seabed Committee's endorsement and such a study was circulated at the summer session. At the summer session, the United States also supported provisional application of the portions of the treaty dealing with fisheries and indicated its willingness to consider provisional application of other aspects as well.

At the summer session, the United States tabled four sets of draft treaty articles. The first, on the coastal seabed economic area, would accord to coastal states the exclusive right to explore and exploit seabed resources in a coastal seabed economic area whose limits are to be defined. Such coastal state jurisdiction would be tempered by incorporation of certain international elements: some form of revenue sharing from mineral exploitation; minimum international standards for protection of the marine environment from pollution by seabed exploration and exploitation; protection of investment; non-interference with other legitimate uses of the ocean; and compulsory dispute settlement. The U.S. articles did not specify limits for this coastal seabed economic area, but the U.S. Representative, Ambassador John R. Stevenson, suggested that the area should be seaward of the territorial sea (12 miles) and the 200 meter depth. He noted that there seemed to be a preponderant view in favor of 200 miles as an outer limit, but that a sizeable number of delegations preferred, in addition to this mileage limit, an alternative seaward limit which would embrace the full continental margin where it extended beyond 200 miles.

The U.S. texts on protection of the marine environment and prevention of marine pollution were designed to provide satisfactory arrangements for environmental protection and accommodation of coastal state concerns without undue prejudice to navigational rights. In an address before Subcommittee III, the Deputy U.S. Representative, John Norton Moore, also argued against the establishment of pollution control zones. Creation of such zones, he stated, would have the unexpected and unintended consequence of cutting off a majority of coastal states from direct access to the high seas without passing through another state's zone of jurisdiction, thus making them "zone-locked."

On scientific research, the U.S. articles called for cooperation in facilitating research in the territorial sea and, in lieu of a requirement of consent from coastal states, a set of obligations upon the researcher for the conduct of research in areas beyond the territorial sea where the coastal state exercised jurisdiction over seabed resources and coastal fisheries.

Finally, the United States introduced general articles providing for a system of peaceful and compulsory settlement of disputes. These articles called for agreement among the parties to a dispute upon a means of settlement, with resort to a Law of the Sea Tribunal to resolve the issues if the parties could not agree on any other method. Ambassador Stevenson described such a system as an essential aspect of any comprehensive law of the sea convention and noted that other U.S. draft articles contained cross references to a separate section of the treaty on dispute settlement.

*Trend of the Debate*

Debate on the deep seabed at the preparatory sessions included such issues as who may exploit deep seabed mineral resources—the international authority? private companies? states? a combination of these?; whether there should be production controls; and what should be the powers and composition of an international seabed resource authority;

There continued to be broad, though not universal, support for a 12-mile territorial sea. However, a number of participants conditioned their acceptance of this limit upon resolution of other issues in a manner satisfactory to them. Major maritime states, such as the United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and France, maintained the link between a 12-mile territorial sea and a guaranteed right of passage through and over international straits. Certain developing countries tied acceptance of such a limit to Conference endorsement of a 200-mile exclusive economic zone.

The supporters of the archipelago concept, led by Indonesia and the Philippines, vigorously advocated the concept that states consisting of islands can claim sovereignty over all waters enclosed by baselines connecting the outermost points of its islands. The complex issue of the treatment of islands became an important topic in the discussions for the first time in 1973 and generated sharp division of opinion.

Consideration of the extent of coastal state jurisdiction over the seabed areas adjacent to their coasts revealed a difference among coastal states, some advocating a 200-mile limit and others with broad continental shelves claiming “acquired rights” beyond 200 miles. Some land locked and shelf-locked states argued for narrower seabed limits.

On the subject of fisheries, the United States continued to seek support for its approach in which jurisdiction is based upon the different characteristics of different species. Emphasis was placed upon conservation, maximum utilization, and special treatment for anadromous and highly migratory stocks (i.e., host state management and preferential rights to anadromous stocks and international management of highly migratory stocks) and compulsory dispute settlement. At the summer session, Canada chaired two informal meetings which produced a useful exchange of views on fisheries.

Discussion of marine pollution centered on a debate as to whether there should be broad coastal state pollution jurisdiction—in zones of up to 200 miles—or exclusively international standards to combat vessel-source pollution, with the United States strongly supporting the latter. In addition, some developing countries argued for flexible marine pollution standards that would take economic development factors into account.

With respect to scientific research, although the United States and several others argued in favor of maximum freedom for such research, there was widespread support for a consent requirement beyond the territorial sea in areas where coastal states may have jurisdiction over coastal seabeds or fisheries.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 28th General Assembly reviewed and completed the arrangements for convening the organizational and substantive sessions of the Law of the Sea Conference. The Assembly's First Committee consid-

ered the seabed item at 15 meetings between October 15 and November 6, approving a draft Conference resolution which also decided to dissolve the Seabed Committee as from the inauguration of the conference.

The draft resolution fixed the dates of the organizational session as December 3-14, 1973, in New York. It changed the venue of the substantive session scheduled for 1974 from Santiago, Chile to Caracas, Venezuela and expanded the session to 10 weeks from June 20 to August 29, with the possibility left open for additional sessions not later than 1975.

The Committee agreed that states members of the UN or members of the specialized agencies or the IAEA and states parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, plus North Vietnam and Guinea-Bissau (Portuguese Guinea) be invited to participate in the Conference. The latter two entities were added by separate votes in the Committee. North Vietnam was included by acclamation, while the Committee decided to invite "Guinea-Bissau" by a rollcall vote of 79 to 7 (U.S.), with 30 abstentions. The United States opposed the latter's participation in the Conference on the grounds that it did not meet objective criteria for recognition of states. In explaining his vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Stevenson, reaffirmed U.S. support for the self-determination of states in Africa and elsewhere, but said that the United States was compelled to vote against inviting "Guinea-Bissau" as a consequence of U.S. policy on the recognition of states. The UN Council for Namibia was also invited to attend the Conference as an observer.

Following the decision on invitations, the First Committee approved the draft resolution by a vote of 106 (U.S.) to 0, with 9 abstentions. It was adopted by the General Assembly in plenary session on November 16 by a vote of 117 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions. (The U.S.S.R. explained that it had abstained because it considered the preparations for the conference inadequate).

During the General Assembly's consideration of the seabed item, Seabed Committee Chairman Amerasinghe held extensive consultations on the organizational and procedural matters to be addressed by the first session of the Conference. These consultations resulted in consensus on a "gentleman's agreement" adopted by the Assembly, without objection, concurrently with the resolution.

The gentleman's agreement recognized the desirability of concluding a convention that could secure the widest possible acceptance. It called for the Conference to "make every effort to reach agreement on substantive matters by way of consensus" and not to proceed to the vote on such matters "until all efforts at consensus have been exhausted." The agreement further directed the Conference at its first session to devise appropriate means to these ends. The United States strongly supported the concept of the gentleman's agreement. Ambassador Stevenson described it as auguring well for the Conference and expressed appreciation for the spirit of understanding shown by parties with different points of view in negotiating the agreement.

#### THIRD UN LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE: FIRST SESSION

The first session of the Law of the Sea Conference met in New York from December 3 to 15, 1973. The session adopted the conference

agenda, established its committee structure, and elected officers, but was unable within the limited time available to reach agreement on conference rules of procedure.

### *Officers and Committees*

H. S. Amerasinghe was elected Conference President by acclamation. The Conference established three main committees, chaired respectively by Paul Engo of Cameroon, Andres Aguilar of Venezuela, and Alexander Yankov of Bulgaria, which will have mandates corresponding to the three Subcommittees of the UN Seabed Committee; a 48-member General Committee, chaired by the Conference President; a 23-member Drafting Committee, chaired by Alan Beesley of Canada; and a 9-member Credentials Committee, chaired by Austria.

The election of officers and establishment of committees, however, required resolution of sharp disagreement over the allocation among regional groups of seats on the General and Drafting Committees. In particular there was controversy over accommodating the U.S. objective of securing seats on both these Committees. There were divergent views on whether the United States should be counted for this purpose within the quota assigned to "the Western European and Other" (WEO) group and significant opposition to any participant having seats on both bodies. After protracted consultations, however, President Amerasinghe, building upon a Canadian proposal, worked out a compromise that allowed the United States (along with the U.S.S.R.) to obtain seats on both the Drafting and the General Committees. When voting took place on the "WEO plus U.S." candidacies for the General Committee, the United States was elected by an overwhelming majority. All other votes on Committee composition (with the exception of the chairmanship of the Drafting Committee) were by acclamation.

### *Rules of Procedure*

Resolution of the difficult Committee allocation issue left only two days of scheduled Conference time for consideration of the rules of procedure. Though the session was extended for an extra day, insufficient time remained to complete consideration of the rules.

Draft rules of procedure prepared by the UN Secretariat formed the basis of consideration. They generally reflected past practice at international conferences—decisions by simple majority vote in committee and by two-thirds majority in plenary—but incorporated several innovations designed to prevent abuse of power by the majority, including provisions to prevent premature voting. The gentleman's agreement was appended to the Secretariat's draft rules.

Some developing countries considered these voting arrangements too restrictive of the rights of the majority. The U.S.S.R., France, and others, however, felt that Conference decisions should only be taken by even greater majorities than those specified in the draft rules. There was also controversy over the relationship of the gentleman's agreement to the rules of procedure. Some participants contended that adoption of the rules would terminate the existence of the gentleman's agreement, while the United States, among others, asserted that the agreement was clearly intended to be applicable throughout the Conference and sought its readoption through a Conference resolution.

Intensive negotiations, pursued up to the last minute, narrowed differences on these issues, but failed to achieve a consensus within the limited time remaining in the session. In closing the session the Con-



ference President announced that we would conduct informal consultations with sponsors of amendments to the rules, and other interested representatives between February 25 and March 1, 1974, with the possibility of additional consultations, if necessary. He proposed a final deadline of June 27, 1974, for adoption of the rules (at the end of the first week of the next Conference session), hopefully by consensus, but by voting if consultations failed to produce agreement.

The Conference approved the President's suggestion, along with an Argentine proposal that if voting became necessary, UN General Assembly Rules of Procedure should apply provisionally. These would provide for adoption of the rules by a simple majority, unless the Conference—also by a simple majority—decided to designate the matter an important question requiring a two-thirds majority.

Though all or part of its first week may be devoted to the Rules of Procedure, the next session of the Law of the Sea Conference in Caracas will turn to law of the sea substantive questions, whose resolution has been the subject of extensive preparation over the past 4 years.

## GENERAL POLITICAL PROBLEMS

### MEMBERSHIP

Three new members—the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, and The Commonwealth of The Bahamas—were admitted to the United Nations in 1973, bringing the total membership to 135. The admission of the two German states, 28 years after the end of World War II, made the United Nations a more realistic reflection of today's world, thereby strengthening the organization's potential.

#### *Federal Republic of Germany and German Democratic Republic*

On December 21, 1972, the Federal Republic of Germany (F.R.G.) and the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.) signed a basic treaty, which provided for a normalization of their bilateral relations. In a separate exchange of letters, the F.R.G. and G.D.R. agreed that each government would seek membership in the United Nations.

On November 9, 1972, the day after the negotiations for the treaty were completed, France, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. issued a Quadripartite Declaration stating that they would support applications for UN membership when submitted by the F.R.G. and G.D.R. and affirming, in this connection, that such membership "shall in no way affect the rights and responsibilities of the four Powers and the corresponding related quadripartite agreements, decisions, and practices."

The G.D.R. applied for admission to the United Nations on June 12, 1973, and the F.R.G. submitted its application for membership shortly thereafter. On June 18, the Quadripartite Declaration was circulated as an official document of the Security Council at the request of the Representatives of the four powers. On June 21, the Council met to consider the F.R.G. and G.D.R. applications. The Council President for June, the Soviet Representative, proposed that the applications be referred to the Council's Committee on the Admission of New Members pursuant to its provisional rules of procedure. The Committee met the same day and unanimously decided to recommend to the Council that the F.R.G. and G.D.R. be admitted to membership. On June 22, the

Council adopted by consensus a single resolution recommending favorable action by the General Assembly on the two applications.

On September 18, the General Assembly approved by acclamation a draft resolution sponsored by 75 states (including the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the U.S.S.R.) admitting the F.R.G. and the G.D.R. to membership. In welcoming the admission of the two German states to the United Nations, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Scali, stated:

"The Federal Republic of Germany is no stranger to the United Nations. It has played a substantial, indeed, often leading, role in the specialized agencies of this body. Its contributions have already brought great benefit to mankind. Now with its full participation, the entire world community stands to benefit.

"We have also noted with appreciation the declaration of the German Democratic Republic of its intention to abide by the principles of the United Nations Charter and to make its full contribution toward alleviating the world's economic, social and humanitarian ills.

\* \* \* \* \*

"The economic, technical, scientific, cultural, and spiritual contributions of the German people have justly attracted wide admiration and greatly enriched the world. Today, we look forward to their full and effective participation in the immense international economic and social tasks facing the United Nations. . . . With the help of the two German states, this world body will be better able to meet mankind's pressing problems."

### *The Bahamas*

The Commonwealth of The Bahamas, a former British dependency, in agreement with the United Kingdom attained independence on July 10, 1973, and that same day applied for admission to the United Nations. A week later, on July 17, the Security Council met to consider Bahamas' application. The Council President for that month, the acting U.K. Representative, immediately proposed that the application be referred, pursuant to the Council's provisional rules of procedure, to its Committee on the Admission of New Members for study. This committee met later the same day and unanimously decided to recommend to the Security Council Bahamas' admission. The following day the Council considered the Committee's report and adopted unanimously a resolution recommended by the Committee under which the Council would recommend to the General Assembly the admission of Bahamas.

Following the vote, Security Council members spoke to welcome the Council's decision. Ambassador Bennett referred first to the United States long history of "warm and cordial relations with its closest overseas neighbor, The Bahamas" and "our common heritage of concern for human dignity and self-determination." The United States, he said, "welcomed the decision of the United Kingdom, in response to the request of the Government of The Bahamas, to grant complete independence to The Bahamas" and was "pleased to support" Bahamas' application for UN membership. In conclusion, the U.S. Representative expressed confidence that Bahamas would play a "valuable and constructive role" as a UN member.

The General Assembly, on September 18, the opening day of its 28th session, adopted unanimously without vote a resolution cosponsored

by the United Kingdom and 26 other Commonwealth members admitting Bahamas to membership.

#### KHMER REPRESENTATION

Shortly prior to the opening of the 28th General Assembly, Prince Norodom Sihanouk cabled the Secretary General requesting him to include on the Assembly's agenda the question of the restoration of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia (GRUNK) to its "rightful place" in the United Nations and its related agencies. Sihanouk predicated his request on the decision of the Fourth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held September 5-9 at Algiers which, *inter alia*, requested countries to accord formal recognition to GRUNK and reaffirmed support for GRUNK within the United Nations and other international organizations. In his reply, the Secretary General asserted that he and his predecessors had all scrupulously avoided intervention in questions relating to the representation of member states and that the question raised by Prince Sihanouk could be brought before the General Assembly only by one or more states members.

On October 8, 31 states (Albania, Algeria, Burundi, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Iraq, Libya, Malagasy Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Upper Volta, Yemen (Aden), Yemen (San'a), Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia—later joined by Egypt) submitted a request for the inclusion on the agenda of a new item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations." The same group, plus Afghanistan, submitted a draft resolution which would restore the "lawful rights" of GRUNK in the United Nations, recognize its representatives as the sole lawful representatives of Cambodia, and "expel the representatives of the Lon Nol group from the seat they illegally occupy in the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it."

The General Committee considered the proposal for an addition to the agenda on October 15-16 and decided by 11 votes to 2 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions, that the new item should be included in the agenda and considered in plenary. On October 17, the General Assembly accepted the recommendations of the General Committee by a recorded vote 68 to 24 (U.S.), with 29 abstentions. Debate on the item began December 4.

#### *U.S. position*

On December 5, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Bennett, set forth the firm opposition of the United States to the draft resolution. He cited the resolution as an example of the growing tendency of some UN members to propose simplistic and one-sided resolutions on the most complex and difficult of issues, thereby weakening the Assembly's ability to have impact on the world's real problems. Moreover, he called attention to the joint views of seven Asian and Pacific states (Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand) circulated in a document of October 24, 1973. These states had asked that the Khmer people themselves be allowed to solve their own problems peacefully and free from outside interference in whatever form, that the political settlement be reached by the indigenous parties concerned, and that the United Nations not take

any action which might prejudice the decision of the Khmer people and prolong their tragic suffering.

Ambassador Bennett commented:

"... I believe that all of us have an obligation to examine these views carefully. Many members here have, in other circumstances, insisted on the importance of giving primacy to states of a region or their regional grouping in seeking solutions to problems of their respective area. In this case, it seems to me, we are fortunate to have a regional consensus before us, and we should certainly give it the greatest weight in our considerations."

Ambassador Bennett questioned whether the cosponsors of the draft resolution fully considered its basic conflict with the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. He asserted:

"It is hard to conceive of a more gross or more blatant interference in the internal affairs of a member state. If this were to become a precedent, who is to say what member state in this Assembly might not be the next victim of such a procedure?"

### *Assembly Action*

The Algerian Representative introduced the 33-power draft resolution on December 4. During the course of the debate in plenary on December 4 and 5, 27 members presented statements. With 17 members still inscribed to speak, the Representative of Liberia, on a point of order, moved to adjourn the debate and defer further discussion to the 29th General Assembly. In a rollcall vote, the motion to adjourn carried by a vote of 53 to 50, with 21 abstentions.

Those in favor were:

Austria	Japan
Bahamas	Khmer Republic
Barbados	Laos
Belgium	Lesotho
Bhutan	Liberia
Bolivia	Luxembourg
Brazil	Malawi
Canada	Malaysia
Chile	Mexico
Colombia	Netherlands
Costa Rica	New Zealand
Denmark	Nicaragua
Dominican Republic	Norway <sup>20</sup>
Ecuador	Panama
El Salvador	Paraguay
Fiji	Philippines
Federal Republic of Germany	Portugal
Ghana	Singapore
Greece	South Africa
Guatemala	Spain
Haiti	Thailand
Honduras	Turkey
Indonesia	United Kingdom
Ireland	United States
Israel	Uruguay
Italy	Venezuela
Ivory Coast	

<sup>20</sup> Norway abstained during the rollcall, but inadvertently was recorded electronically as having voted in favor.

Those opposed were :

Afghanistan	Mali
Albania	Malta
Algeria	Mauritania
Bahrain	Mongolia
Bulgaria	Nepal
Burundi	Niger
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Pakistan
Cameroon	Poland
Central African Republic	Romania
Chad	Senegal
China	Somalia
Congo	Sri Lanka
Cuba	Sudan
Czechoslovakia	Syria
Dahomey	Tanzania
Egypt	Uganda
Equatorial Guinea	Ukrainian S.S.R.
Gabon	U.S.S.R.
German Democratic Republic	United Arab Emirates
Guinea	Upper Volta
Guyana	Yemen (Aden)
Hungary	Yemen (San'a)
Iraq	Yugoslavia
Libya	Zaire
Malagasy Republic	Zambia

Those abstaining were :

Argentina	Kuwait
Australia	Lebanon
Burma	Morocco
Cyprus	Nigeria
Ethiopia	Qatar
Finland	Saudi Arabia
France	Sierra Leone
Iceland	Swaziland
India	Sweden
Iran	Trinidad and Tobago
Kenya	

Those absent were :

Botswana	Oman
Gambia	Peru
Jamaica	Rwanda
Jordan	Togo
Maldives	Tunisia
Mauritius	

#### *Credentials Committee Report*

Supporters of Prince Sihanouk pursued their attack on the Khmer Republic when the Credentials Committee met on December 11. Under rule 28 of the General Assembly's Rules of Procedure the Credentials Committee has the limited and precise role of examining the credentials of representatives which, under rule 27, shall be issued either by the Head of the State or Government or by the Minister of Foreign

Affairs. The Senegalese Representative proposed, however, that the Credentials Committee refuse to accept the credentials of the delegation of the Khmer Republic on the ground that GRUNK was the real representative of the Cambodian people. The U.S. Representative noted that the credentials submitted for the representatives of the Khmer Republic met the requirements of rule 27 and, further, that the Credentials Committee was not intended to debate politically-laden questions of representation. The Credentials Committee then rejected the proposal of Senegal by a vote of 3 in favor (China, Senegal, Tanzania) to 5 against (Greece, Japan, Nicaragua, U.S., Uruguay), with the U.S.S.R. absent.

The General Assembly, in plenary session, considered the report of the Credentials Committee on December 13 and 17. Supporters of Prince Sihanouk seized the occasion to mount still another attack when the Senegalese Representative introduced on behalf of 33 sponsors an amendment to the Credentials Committee report to reject the credentials of the Khmer Republic's delegation. The General Assembly defeated the proposed amendment by a recorded vote of 50 in favor to 55 opposed (U.S.), with 17 abstentions.

#### PEACEKEEPING

The 27th General Assembly in 1972 adopted a resolution urging the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations<sup>21</sup> (Committee of 33) to "accelerate and intensify its work" and recommending that the Special Committee's Working Group<sup>22</sup> submit reports that would "facilitate discussion and agreement on questions of substance." Although meetings of the full Committee and the Working Group remained inconclusive, several developments pointed to new movement on this question. In his address to the 28th General Assembly in September 1973, Secretary Kissinger signaled the possibility of changes in the U.S. approach to peacekeeping. Earlier the United Kingdom had submitted a working paper containing some useful new ideas. In October, the creation of another peacekeeping force in the Middle East provided additional experience and impetus for eventual agreement on general guidelines.

#### *Working Group*

The main work of the Committee during 1973 took place in its Working Group, first established in 1968 and enlarged in 1972. The Working Group met 13 times between March 7 and November 13; the Committee as a whole met four times (February 16, March 23, May 9, and November 19).

The Working Group at the beginning of the year decided to base its discussions on a working document prepared by the Committee's Rapporteur which summarized under specific headings all concrete proposals submitted to the Committee and described progress to date. Most of its meetings were then taken up in an effort to compile a list of those matters for which responsibility would be exercised directly

<sup>21</sup> Members are Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

<sup>22</sup> Members are the officers of the Committee (Chairman—Nigeria; Vice Chairmen—Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Japan; Rapporteur—Egypt), Argentina, France, India, Pakistan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

by the Security Council in the prompt establishment, direction, and control of peacekeeping operations.

The major new proposal submitted during 1973 in connection with the deliberations of the Working Group came from the United Kingdom, which formally submitted a letter to the Secretary General on September 6 seeking "to indicate possible solutions to the main problems of decision-taking in terms of Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter" (i.e. of the veto). The U.K. proposal listed certain decisions (e.g. authorization, duration, financial arrangements) to be taken directly by the Security Council under Article 27 (3). It called for a second category of decisions (e.g. size or force and appointment of a commander) to be taken by the Secretary General and to go into effect automatically unless a challenge by a Security Council member were upheld by the Council within a short period. In a third category of decisions, the initiative would lie with the Secretary General. The U.K. proposal would permit any Security Council member during the course of an operation to challenge "any operational initiative" which would then have to stop unless authorized by a substantive vote of the Council.

The Working Group on November 13 adopted a report which agreed in principle on a list of 12 items to be included as Security Council responsibilities in the prompt establishment, direction, and control of peacekeeping operations: (1) authorization; (2) definition of purpose and mandate; (3) kind of advice and assistance required by the Council; (4) duration and related questions; (5) financial arrangements; (6) size (magnitude); (7) agreements with contributing countries (model agreement and changes thereto); (8) agreements with host country (including model status of forces agreement and changes thereto); (9) approval of roster of potential commanders; (10) authorization for appointment of deputy commanders; (11) ultimate direction and control during the operation; and (12) subsequent alterations. Four items on which no agreement was reached were included as "items upon which discussion will be resumed." These were: (1) manner of termination; (2) composition; (3) support facilities; and (4) appointment of commander.

It was understood that all these topics still had to be discussed in substance after the Working Group had concluded its consideration of the Rapporteur's working document and its elaboration of the respective responsibilities of other appropriate UN organs with respect to peacekeeping operations. The Working Group recommended that when it resumed its deliberations, it take up the responsibilities of these other UN organs "beginning with a subsidiary organ of the Security Council to be established under Article 29 of the Charter."<sup>23</sup>

The Special Committee took note of the Working Group's report and on November 19 adopted its own report to the General Assembly. This report noted that "progress has been made" by the Committee and concluded that peacekeeping operations in the Middle East "are providing practical examples and constitute an experience which may assist the Special Committee and its Working Group in making further progress."

<sup>23</sup> Article 29 provides that "The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions."

*General Assembly*

Even before the Middle East war gave new urgency to the problem, the United States had sought to make the General Assembly the starting point for renewed UN activity on peacekeeping guidelines. Secretary Kissinger in his speech to the General Assembly on September 24 declared:

“We should delay no longer. The time has come to agree on peacekeeping guidelines so that this organization can act swiftly, confidently, and effectively in future crises. To break the deadlock, the United States is prepared to consider how the Security Council can play a more central role in the conduct of peacekeeping operations.”

In a press conference in New York two days later, the Secretary explained further:

“We are prepared now to take into account the view of those who want the Security Council to take a more active role, although we cannot go all the way with them into the detailed day-to-day supervision. . . . We are prepared to give the Security Council a greater role, but not such a role that it can hamstring day-to-day operations.”

Before further consideration could be given to general guidelines, the United Nations had the immediate problem of forming a force in the Middle East. (see p. 7.)

Speaking before the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly on November 28 Ambassador Schauffele set forth U.S. views on those aspects of the UN Emergency Force that might be usefully kept in mind in the development of guidelines. He said:

“. . . we are encouraged by the fact that in the case of the new UNEF there was no argument at all about the primacy of the Security Council in such operations. . . . The Secretary General proposed the terms of reference for the operation, and the Council approved them. The Security Council wisely enlisted the full cooperation of the parties concerned, since this is a ‘consent’ operation, not an enforcement action. The Council defined the mandate; it set the size of the force; it provided for equitable financing of the operation and it gave its consent to other decisions before the operation could be launched.”

Generalizing further, Ambassador Schauffele declared:

“The United States believes that possibilities now exist for reconciling differences which have hitherto held up agreement on peacekeeping guidelines. We see a possibility of agreement on the basis of these principles. The first we have already stated—that excessively detailed guidelines may be self-defeating and may deprive members of the Security Council of the desirable and necessary flexibility called for by particular circumstances. Second, we believe we can find ways whereby, on the one hand, not every detail needs to be submitted to the Security Council before a peacekeeping operation can be launched, but on the other hand the right of the Council to consider such features could nevertheless be protected. Third, we believe that there are ways and means to reassure all the members of the Security Council that specific operations will not transcend the bounds of the original mandate. My delegation has noted with great care the pro-



posals that have been made by other members of the Committee of 33 and will be prepared for further discussions on this subject in that forum."

The Special Political Committee considered the question of peace-keeping at five meetings between November 26 and 29. It unanimously approved a resolution cosponsored by Byelorussian S.S.R., Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia. The resolution requested both the Special Committee and its Working Group to intensify their efforts to complete their task by the 29th General Assembly in 1974. The resolution was adopted unanimously by the Assembly in plenary on December 7.

#### STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" was considered by the 28th General Assembly pursuant to a resolution adopted at the 27th session which requested the Secretary General to report on the implementation of the Declaration. This item has been considered annually since the Soviet Union first proposed its inscription in 1969; the Declaration itself was adopted in 1970.

The Assembly's First Committee considered the item at nine meetings between November 28 and December 10. The Committee had before it the Secretary General's November 1 report containing replies from 30 member states in response to his request for relevant information and suggestions concerning implementation of the Declaration. The United States did not reply.

On December 5, Algeria introduced a draft resolution ultimately sponsored by 29 African, Asian, Latin American, and Eastern European states. The Committee approved the draft on December 10 by a vote of 69 to 2, with 17 abstentions (U.S.), and it was adopted by the Assembly on December 18 by a vote of 97 to 2, with 18 abstentions (U.S.).

The resolution, *inter alia*, (1) reaffirmed the Declaration and appealed to all states to adhere to its provisions and to broaden détente; (2) expressed the hope that current favorable trends, including the establishment of zones of peace and cooperation, will be maintained and intensified; (3) recommended that states make efforts to establish a system of universal collective security without military alliance; (4) reaffirmed the right of all states to participate on a basis of equality in the settlement of major international problems; (5) reaffirmed the sovereign right of any state to dispose freely of its natural resources; (6) appealed to militarily significant states to extend political détente to military détente; (7) reaffirmed the legitimacy of struggles for self-determination and independence; and (8) requested the Secretary General to report to the 29th General Assembly.

The United States did not participate in the debate. The U.S. position remained as in 1972 when it explained its view that the United Nations needs to move away from declarations and resolutions that restate the purposes and principles of the Charter and to take more effective action on the many concrete items on its agenda.

Also on December 10, Cyprus, Kenya, and Malta submitted a draft resolution which would have (1) affirmed that international security includes security from dangers threatening the physical environment, and (2) requested the Secretary General, with the cooperation of the Executive Director of UNEP, to prepare a study on the subject. The First Committee decided to postpone consideration of this draft resolution until the next session of the General Assembly.

#### STRENGTHENING ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

As the result of a Romanian initiative at the 27th General Assembly, the 28th session had on its agenda an item "Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of cooperation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations among states." The 27th session had invited member states to communicate to the Secretary General their views and suggestions on ways and means to strengthen the UN role and had asked the Secretary General to report to the 28th General Assembly on the basis of these views and suggestions. Eighteen members, including the United States, responded to this invitation.

The United States, in its response of August 7, made no new proposals but stressed suggestions previously made; for example, more frequent recourse by the Security Council to fact-finding missions, good offices, mediation, conciliation, and preventive diplomacy; the development of more reliable and systematic methods of establishing and maintaining peacekeeping forces; the adoption of procedural reforms to improve the working of General Assembly sessions; better organization and coordination in the economic and social fields; and strengthening of the International Court of Justice. The United States also urged that the United Nations move away from "lengthy, sweeping, and polemical" declarations toward concise and dispassionate statements "designed to make a concrete contribution to the solution of the many problems" confronting the organization and that its resolutions reflect "full consultation, facilitative compromise, and realistic calls to action." The United States reasserted its firm conviction that the best way to strengthen the United Nations is for the organization "to act effectively on the specific issues before it."

This topic was again referred for consideration directly to plenary, which took up the item on November 27. The following day a draft resolution was circulated cosponsored by Romania and 16 African, 6 Asian, 7 Latin American, 3 West European, and 1 East European states. They were subsequently joined by six more cosponsors from Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

In its operative paragraphs this draft, *inter alia*, reaffirmed that it was imperative that the United Nations "become a more effective instrument in safeguarding and strengthening the independence and sovereign equality of all states, as well as the inalienable right of every people to decide its own fate without any outside interference, and that it should take firm action, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to oppose foreign domination and to prevent and suppress acts of aggression or any other acts which, in violating the Charter, may jeopardize international peace and security." The resolution expressed the belief that the United Nations could make a greater con-

tribution to the maintenance of international peace and security by "using more actively the machinery and possibilities provided by the Charter with a view to preventing conflicts and encouraging the peaceful settlement of disputes between states." It also stressed the need for "continuous improvement of the functioning and effectiveness" of the principal UN organs in the exercise of their Charter responsibilities and the need for enhancing the effectiveness of General Assembly and other resolutions by promoting "consultation among all member states interested in their elaboration and adoption, and by evaluating, as appropriate, their practical effects." It urged all member states to fulfill their obligations under the Charter and, in accordance with its provisions, to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The draft resolution again invited member states to make known and further elaborate on their views and suggestions on strengthening the role of the United Nations and requested the Secretary General to report "in a systemized manner" on all the views, suggestions, and proposals made, beginning with the 27th General Assembly, for consideration by the Assembly at its 29th session.

The United States was one of 21 states that spoke on the item. The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Bennett, on November 29 expressed his Government's "full agreement" with those who had noted that the UN success "depends primarily on the political will of its members to apply the principles laid out in the Charter." He took the occasion of the Assembly's consideration of ways to strengthen the United Nations to call to its attention a trend that was having "just the reverse effect," specifically the "growing tendency on the part of this organization to adopt unenforceable or impractical resolutions and to reject constructive if limited action in an effort to attain unrealistic 'total' solutions." While recognizing that international cooperation must be based on "the perception of mutual interest among like-minded states" and that an Assembly as large as the present one "can only function on the basis of such groupings," the U.S. Representative expressed concern that bloc voting in the United Nations was "now too often being used in a manner which raises serious questions" for the organization's future. Pointing out that each nation remains responsible for its own votes in the United Nations, he observed that too often representatives privately admit that their delegation "was voting against its own preferences and convictions on a given issue in the interests of one or another form of 'solidarity,'" and declared, "Sovereign states cannot so easily abdicate responsibility." At the same time, he saw in the UN response to the October hostilities in the Middle East a "cause for optimism about this organization's ability to function effectively even in the most difficult situations." He noted that all groups in the United Nations had played a part in proposing and supporting constructive UN action. He concluded by expressing the appreciation of this Government for the Romanian effort "to focus attention on the central problem before us all—how to make the United Nations more effective in the real world, how to move it from rhetoric to relevancy."

The draft resolution was adopted without objection on November 3.



---

---

PART II. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND HUMAN  
RIGHTS AFFAIRS

---

---



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Responsibility for international economic and social cooperation is vested in the General Assembly and under its authority in ECOSOC. In addition to being authorized by the UN Charter to coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies and certain other bodies of the UN system, ECOSOC does much preparatory work for the General Assembly, debating issues and considering reports in the economic and social fields that are forwarded to the Assembly for further consideration, generally in the Second Committee (Economic and Financial) or the Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural).

ECOSOC holds two major sessions each year—a spring session in New York and a summer session in Geneva—with brief organizational and resumed sessions as required. It has established five regional commissions and six functional commissions as well as other subsidiary bodies. Over 90% of the resources of the UN system are devoted to economic and social activities, and ECOSOC is the intergovernmental body responsible for coordinating them. Most of the bodies dealing with economic, social, scientific, and human rights affairs that are described in Part II report to ECOSOC.

At its 1971 summer session, ECOSOC approved a package of reforms advocated by the United States that established a standing Committee on Review and Appraisal of the Second UN Development Decade and a standing Committee on Science and Technology for Development. The package also included the enlargement of ECOSOC from 27 to 54 members, a change that required an amendment of the UN Charter. The purpose was to reinvigorate the Council and to gain added support for its work from the developing countries, some of whom had to wait 15 years or longer for an opportunity to serve on the 27-member Council. The General Assembly had approved the necessary Charter amendment in 1971. As one of his first official acts as Secretary of State, Secretary Kissinger on September 24 deposited the U.S. ratification with Secretary General Waldheim, and the amendment entered into force the same day. On October 12 the General Assembly decided that for the remainder of 1973 the 27 states already serving as members of ECOSOC's three sessional committees (Economic, Social, and Coordination) should also serve on the Council itself. In October the newly enlarged ECOSOC approved unanimously a U.S. proposal for a World Food Conference.

The new Review and Appraisal Committee as well as ECOSOC itself devoted a great deal of attention in 1973 to considering the progress of the developing world in achieving the ambitious goals set for the Second Development Decade. This consideration helped to focus the attention of the UN system on the problems of development and the ways in which the UN organizations could provide assistance. At the same time it brought about agreement and consensus among the UN member governments on most of the substantive issues. Statements

of interpretation or reservation by the United States and others during the final detailed review in December by the General Assembly's Second Committee were not extensive.

An important addition to the UN system in 1973, initiated at ECOSOC, was the establishment of an Economic Commission for Western Asia. Debated for over a decade, it was approved during the 1973 summer session. The United States voted against the resolution because its provisions excluded Israel, a UN member from that geographic region.

#### INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION

As the focal point for coordinating the economic and social activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, ECOSOC's Coordination Committee continued in 1973 its schedule of in-depth review of a limited number of specialized agencies and more general review of the activities of the other agencies. However, as the reviews unfolded, it became apparent that many of the members of the Coordination Committee did not believe that examining agency activities one by one contributed much to overall coordination. A key problem was the inability of most members to synthesize and digest the masses of information provided by the agencies since the information was for the most part not presented in compatible or comparable styles. There was also a general feeling that the Coordination Committee should turn its efforts toward reviewing multidisciplinary or major program areas of the UN system which cut across agency boundaries rather than looking at the fragmentary portions carried out by individual organizations.

As a result of the Committee's consideration, the Council decided that while the current cycle of in-depth review by agency should be completed, another method would have to be developed to provide a better cross-organizational review of the UN system's activities. As a step toward achieving this objective, the United States and others put forward a proposal, approved without vote by both the Committee and ECOSOC, calling upon the Administrative Committee on Coordination<sup>1</sup> to prepare a plan for the development and implementation of compatible information systems by the various bodies in the UN system both to assist with the internal management of the organizations and to provide a better information base for coordinated governmental policy and decision-making processes.

The 1973 discussion in ECOSOC's Coordination Committee underscored for the United States the need to develop an external evaluation mechanism to assist the member governments in assessing the effectiveness and cohesiveness of the UN system's policies and program implementation in economic and social fields. This view was also reflected in U.S. legislation passed in late 1973 (Public Law 93-189, amending the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) which, *inter alia*, called upon the President, acting through the U.S. representative to the United Nations and its affiliated organizations to "propose and actively seek the establishment" of "a single professionally qualified group" to provide "an independent and continuous program of selective examination, review, and evaluation of the programs and activities of such organizations."

<sup>1</sup> The Administrative Committee on Coordination is composed of the UN Secretary General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies and the IAEA. The heads of other UN organs are invited to participate as appropriate.



## WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE

During 1973, the question of world food supplies again emerged as a priority concern. The United States has for many years been deeply involved in policies and programs designed to relieve worldwide hunger and malnutrition and to respond to specific cases of disaster relief. The UN system has been intimately involved through the WFP, the FAO, and participation in various relief efforts. However, the issue became acute in 1973 principally because of the sudden decline in the reserves of food grains occasioned by crop failures in certain countries and large grain purchases by the U.S.S.R. which forced the world price of food grains upward. FAO Director General Addeke Boerma early in the year drew the world's attention to the precariousness of the situation.

Responding to this situation, Secretary Kissinger, in his address to the UN General Assembly on September 24, 1973, called for the holding of a World Food Conference in 1974 under UN auspices "to discuss ways to maintain adequate food supplies, and to harness the efforts of all nations to meet the hunger and malnutrition resulting from natural disasters."

This proposal immediately generated great interest among the world community and within the United Nations. Nonaligned countries seized on the proposal as a confirmation of the concerns they had expressed in a declaration at the Nonaligned Summit Conference in Algiers in September, which called for a world food conference under the auspices of FAO and UNCTAD. The U.S. proposal was subsequently inscribed for consideration on the agendas of the resumed 55th session of ECOSOC, the 28th General Assembly, and the FAO 17th Conference, which met in Rome in November. During the next 3 months, members of these organizations discussed various aspects of the proposed conference. Their conclusions were embodied in a resolution initiated by the United States and cosponsored in its final form by 33 other states. The resolution was adopted by ECOSOC on December 11 without a vote. It was subsequently approved by the General Assembly's Second Committee on December 12 and adopted by the General Assembly on December 17, also without a vote.

The resolution called for a World Food Conference at the ministerial level under UN auspices in Rome for 2 weeks in November 1974; requested the UN Secretary General, after consultation with FAO and UNCTAD, to appoint a secretary general and a secretariat for the conference; and entrusted ECOSOC with overall responsibility for the conference. ECOSOC established an intergovernmental preparatory committee, open to all UN members, to meet three times during 1974, in New York, Geneva, and Rome. FAO was expected to provide the major substantive support for secretariat operations. While the exact agenda of the Conference was to be determined by the preparatory committee, the General Assembly recognized in the preamble of the resolution that the principal task of the Conference consisted in "developing ways and means whereby the international community as a whole could take specific action to resolve the world food problem within the broader context of development and international economic cooperation." The Assembly further emphasized that the Conference should place emphasis on additional measures for increasing the food production, consumption, and trade of developing countries.

The United States hopes that the Conference will focus clearly on the determination of general principles for international measures to improve agricultural production in the developing countries, assist the development of national stockpile policies and programs, and improve food aid management. (See also p. 156.)

## PROGRESS ON THE SECOND DEVELOPMENT DECADE

### INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The comprehensive International Development Strategy for the more rapid development of the developing countries was adopted by the General Assembly on October 24, 1970, as a major feature of the 25th anniversary commemorative session. The Strategy provided quantitative goals, including an annual growth in GNP of 6% for the developing countries as a whole during the decade of the 1970's, and a set of policy measures in the economic, financial, social, scientific, and technological fields.

The Strategy also provided for carrying out biennial reviews and appraisals of the progress of the Decade. The review process was to identify both the shortfalls in achievement and the factors that accounted for them. All UN agencies were requested to review progress in their respective sectors and make appropriate submissions to ECOSOC which would make an overall appraisal for consideration by the General Assembly. The Committee for Development Planning<sup>2</sup> would assist in carrying out the exercise and the Secretary General would prepare appropriate documentation and reports.

### FIRST BIENNIAL REVIEW AND APPRAISAL

The first biennial review was conducted throughout 1973. Governments provided the UN Secretariat with documentation for 1971 and 1972 based upon their national reviews of economic and social progress. The Secretary General summarized and analyzed this material together with the preliminary work of the various UN regional commissions and specialized bodies. The Committee for Development Planning prepared a brief report, emphasizing social concerns which it believed should be of major importance to developing countries. The regional economic commissions, UNCTAD, and the specialized agencies also made separate reports.

All of these reports were made available to ECOSOC's Committee on Review and Appraisal for consideration and appropriate action. This committee met in New York from May 21 to June 8 and prepared a working paper which was further considered and revised by ECOSOC at its 55th session, in Geneva from July 4 to August 10. The revised working paper was forwarded to the 28th General Assembly for final action.

The General Assembly's Second Committee established a working party of the whole which met from October 23 to November 30 to consider the paper forwarded by ECOSOC along with other preliminary reviews and appraisals. The negotiations were intensive, leading at times to confrontation, particularly with respect to future actions to be taken in the trade and monetary fields. However, the working party

<sup>2</sup> An expert group of 24 members, serving in their individual capacities, appointed by ECOSOC for 3-year terms. John P. Lewis of the United States is a member.

succeeded in reaching agreement by consensus on an extensively revised draft which was adopted without a vote by the Committee on December 7 and by the General Assembly on December 17 as the "First Biennial Overall Review and Appraisal of Progress in the Implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade."

The review noted that the world economy had experienced a series of monetary crises that have had severe repercussions, especially on the developing countries. The international community had become more aware of the interdependence of its common problems, realizing that developing and developed countries shared a common interest in a rational functioning of the world economy. The review continued by noting the cause of development had lost momentum and there had been little progress toward the aid targets of the International Development Strategy. Even the modest beginning toward narrowing the gap in living standards between developed and developing countries was not yet in sight.

The annual average rate of growth in the first 2 years of the Second UN Development Decade was only 5.5% instead of the target of 6%. Per capita growth of gross domestic product was not much above 2.5%. Unfavorable weather had aggravated the situation, so that agricultural production suffered a serious setback in a large number of countries. Manufacturing output, however, approximated the target rate of an 8% annual increase.

The report generally praised the efforts of developing countries in improving their efficiency in the use of development resources, particularly in the fields of health, housing, and trade. The report stated, however, that only some developed countries had demonstrated a sense of commitment to the Strategy. It was particularly critical of the fact that their overall assistance did not meet the target of 1% of GNP and that the official development assistance component was only .33% of GNP compared to the Strategy's target of .70%.

The report called on developing countries to improve their national planning and to carry out economic and social reforms including intensifying agrarian reforms, promoting industrialization, and combating mass poverty and unemployment. Developed countries were asked, *inter alia*, to be receptive to international commodity agreements, to ensure that the multilateral trade negotiations ensure significant gains for exports of developing countries, to refinance past debts on equitable terms, and to make a satisfactory and early reform of the international monetary system.

#### REACTIONS TO THE REVIEW AND APPRAISAL

The report reflected a wide consensus, but over 30 states or groups of states made statements of explanation or reservation at the time the review was approved in the Second Committee.

The developing countries as a group felt strongly that progress in the first 2 years of the Decade had been inadequate and that the goals and objectives were not being achieved. They emphasized that the growth rate was under the 6% target and that the assistance target of 1% of GNP for the overall transfer of resources was not being achieved. They believed that their exports were not growing fast enough because the developed countries had not undertaken the policy

measures to provide access to their markets on a preferential basis. They sought greater assistance, but preferably in forms other than direct aid such as faster transfer of technology, a reformed monetary system with increased allotments of IMF "Special Drawing Rights" for developing countries, refinancing of previous debts, an expanded generalized system of preferences for developing countries, and commodity agreements with pricing policy consistent with increased earnings. They also believed that they had been inadequately compensated for their nonreplenishable basic commodities and emphasized their right to exercise sovereignty over their natural resources. They expected that this would lead to increased control over or elimination of foreign investment in their natural resources and to greater benefits to them.

The developed countries, in general, believed that the first 2 years of the Decade was too short a period to evaluate definitively progress under the Strategy since only preliminary data was available. Although it was widely acknowledged that primary responsibility for development rested with the governments of the countries concerned, many developed countries recognized that they would have to give special attention to the needs of poor countries if substantial progress was to be expected and the goals of the Decade attained. They were not, however, willing to commit themselves to undertaking all the specific measures recommended in the review when other international bodies were still in the process of studying and negotiating in such areas as monetary reform and trade negotiations.

The United States played an active role in the global reviews undertaken by UNCTAD, ECOSOC, and the General Assembly in order to develop an informative and balanced review and appraisal that could be agreed by consensus and could suggest ways and means to achieve the goals of the Strategy. The United States had a number of reservations to the final report as adopted, however. It believed that sovereignty over natural resources must be exercised in accordance with international law; that pricing policy for commodities should not be set unilaterally by exporting countries; and that international commodity agreements must be considered on a case-by-case basis. The United States did not view debt rescheduling as a principal means for avoiding debt crises. The United States regarded the IMF and its Committee on Reform of the International Monetary System and Related Issues (see p. 153) as the only proper forum for consideration of, or agreement on, matters relating to the substance of monetary reform and to other matters relating to the structure or operations of the IMF. Finally, the United States was not prepared to prejudge the multilateral trade negotiations expected to follow the Declaration of Tokyo (see p. 98).

#### MID-TERM REVIEW AND SPECIAL ASSEMBLY SESSION

The widespread interest of the majority of UN members in problems of development was reflected in the number of resolutions adopted by the 28th General Assembly under a variety of agenda items, on such questions as monetary reform, trade negotiations, permanent sovereignty over natural resources, special assistance to least-developed or landlocked countries, uses of science and technology, and possible new resources for development from reductions in defense budgets.

Most of these resolutions, discussed elsewhere in this report, were initiated and sponsored by the developing countries.

Two significant resolutions concerned future reviews of development to take place in 1975. The first was introduced in the Second Committee by the Netherlands and sponsored by 26 developed and developing states. It called for increased efforts by all concerned in preparing for the Mid-Term Review and Appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade and requested the Secretary General to prepare a report, including recommendations for improvement, on the machinery and procedures for the conduct of the sectoral, regional, and overall review and appraisal. The United States supported this resolution which was approved without a vote on December 10 and adopted by the General Assembly without a vote on December 17.

The second resolution, originally submitted on November 27 by 68 developing states, called for a special session of the General Assembly in the spring of 1975 to examine the world economic situation and to create a new system of international economic relations. This draft became the subject of intensive negotiations in which the United States played an active role. The United States wanted the resolution to reflect accurately the relationship between the General Assembly and other institutions concerned with international economic affairs, and it did not want a special session of the General Assembly to interfere with the complex and important Mid-Term Review and Appraisal. The negotiations were successful and led to the approval without a vote on December 5 of a revised draft resolution sponsored by 87 states including both developed and developing. Under the terms of the resolution as adopted, the special session will be held "just before" the 30th regular session begins in 1975 (that is, in September). It will examine the political and other implications of the state of world development and international economic cooperation. It will also, in the light of the implementation of the International Development Strategy, consider new concepts and options with a view to promoting effectively the solution of world economic problems and initiate structural changes in the UN system in order to make it "a more effective instrument of world economic cooperation and for the implementation of the International Development Strategy." The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 17 by a recorded vote of 123 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions.

## ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

ECE, with headquarters in Geneva, is composed of the 31 European members of the United Nations, the United States, Switzerland, and Canada. Canada, which has for years participated in many ECE activities in a consultative capacity, was admitted to full membership on August 9, 1973, by ECOSOC at its 55th session.

ECE was established in 1947 to assist with the reconstruction of the war-ravaged European economy. Its original concerns were with the basic sectors of the economy and the fundamental problems of production, distribution, and trade in Europe. Today, when almost all of its

members have highly industrialized economies, the ECE has become a forum where East and West discuss and act on common problems of trade, environment, and transportation; exchange technical information; draft technical conventions; and review economic developments in the region.

One of ECE's newer subsidiary bodies, the Senior Advisers on Environmental Problems, held its first meeting in April 1973. This body was created in 1971, but was unable to meet in 1971 or 1972 because of disagreement whether the German Democratic Republic, which was not a member of ECE, should participate. This problem disappeared with the admission of the German Democratic Republic to ECE membership in late 1972. The Senior Advisers adopted a short-term work program at the April session, and at a special *ad hoc* meeting in December reached agreement on terms of reference and a conceptual long-term work program, subject to approval at the next regular meeting. The United States, which was represented at both meetings by a member of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, pressed for a strong coordinating role for the Senior Advisers over all environment-related activities carried out by the ECE subsidiary bodies. During the year, ECE bodies held four environment-related seminars dealing with water pollution arising from agricultural activities; the role of transportation in urban planning, development, and environment; environmental statistics; and the chemical industry and the environment.

The United States continued its strong interest in the activities of ECE's Committee on Housing, Building and Planning. The U.S. delegation at the Committee's 1973 session was headed by the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) and included the president of the National Association of Home Builders. Both GSA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) were represented at the Fourth Seminar on the Building Industry, held at London in October, and a HUD official chaired the Seminar on the Financing of Housing, held at Geneva in August, in which several prominent U.S. experts participated. In addition, several high-level HUD officials conferred with the ECE Secretariat on housing matters during the year.

Among the more important activities of the Inland Transportation Committee in which the United States participated was a meeting in October of the Group of Experts on Customs Questions Affecting Transport. The United States was instrumental in focusing attention at this meeting on the smuggling of drugs in vehicles travelling internationally under the Customs Convention in International Transport of Goods under the cover of TIR Carnets. At the urging of the United States and others, the Group of Experts adopted for referral to the full Committee a resolution calling for measures to combat illegal drug trafficking under the TIR system. U.S. experts were also active throughout the year in ECE activity concerned with vehicle safety, container transport, transport of dangerous goods, and transport by ship-borne barge.

The United States continued to be a strong participant in ECE work on the improvement of international trade procedures. Several meetings were held of the Working Party on Facilities of International Trade Procedures and its subsidiary groups, the Group of Experts on Automatic Data Processing and Coding and the Group of Ex-

perts on Data Requirements and Documentation. The purpose of these groups is to reduce the heavy cost of paperwork in international trade.

In November at its 22d session, the ECE Committee on the Development of Trade decided to arrange a second informal meeting of East-West trade experts and tentatively adopted the theme, "New Developments in East-West Trade, Problems and Prospects." This meeting, which will probably be held in early 1975, is intended to allow trade experts to discuss East/West trade matters without necessarily reflecting their governments' official policies.

#### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

ECAFE's regional members are in the vast area from Iran far into the Pacific and from Mongolia southward through New Zealand. With the admission in 1973 of Bangladesh, the Commission's full membership reached 31, of which five are from outside of the region (France, Netherlands, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.) There are also eight associate members, two of which—Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Gilbert and Ellice Islands—were admitted during 1973.

ECAFE was established in 1947 to assist in the postwar reconstruction and economic development of Asia. Its headquarters are in Bangkok, although some related organizations and activities are in other Asian cities.

At ECAFE's 29th plenary session, held in Tokyo, April 11–23, the People's Republic of China participated for the first time. There were many statements of pride that ECAFE's membership, as a result of the changes at the Tokyo meeting, now includes almost the entire Asian population.

Much of the Tokyo plenary session was devoted to consideration of the region's economic situation and the mood was generally a pessimistic one. An unusual amount of time was given to agricultural problems and it was unanimously agreed that ECAFE should become more involved in agricultural matters.

There was also widespread support for a proposal originally made by the Philippines that ECAFE should reform its committee structure and related activities to improve its overall efficiency. This project became a major ECAFE activity during the second half of 1973. By the end of the year, agreement was nearly complete on a program to restructure the Commission's entire committee system, to initiate actions designed to make meetings briefer and more efficient, and to give more authority to a body composed of the permanent representatives to ECAFE stationed in Bangkok. The final proposals were to be submitted for approval at the 1974 plenary session.

ECAFE carries out its traditional activities largely through a busy schedule of committee and subcommittee meetings, seminars, and a training program in certain specialized areas. The United States in 1973 participated in sessions having to do with trade, industry, and natural resources; offshore prospecting; metals and engineering; transport and communication; tourism and the facilitation of international traffic; containerization; and statistics. In addition, there was an even larger number of meetings on purely regional or sub-regional matters in which the United States did not participate.

During 1973, approval was given and the first organizing steps taken in connection with three new bodies sponsored by ECAFE: an Asian Clearing Union, an Asian Reserve Bank, and an Asian Rice Trade Fund. The United States is not involved in any of these new organizations.

U Nyun (Burma), who had served ECAFE as its Executive Secretary for nearly 14 years, retired in July and was succeeded on August 1 by Ambassador J. B. P. Maramis, a career diplomat from Indonesia.

#### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

ECLA is composed of the 26 UN members in the Western Hemisphere plus three nonregional members (France, Netherlands, and United Kingdom). There are also two associate members, the West Indies Associated States and Belize (British Honduras).

ECLA was established in 1948 as a center for planning and programs related to the economic development of Latin America. On the occasion of its 25th anniversary in 1973, President Nixon sent a congratulatory message that was read by Ambassador Bernard Zagorin to ECLA's 15th plenary session, held in Quito, March 23-30.

In addition to its headquarters in Santiago, ECLA maintains small branch offices in Mexico City, Bogota, Port of Spain, Washington, Montevideo, and Rio de Janeiro. In December 1973 Argentina agreed to assist in opening another branch office in Buenos Aires.

The most important issue considered at ECLA's 15th plenary session was a review of Latin America's economic situation, especially as it related to other regions of the world. In connection with that agenda item, a summary report that has since been entitled "The Quito Appraisal," was prepared in advance by a Committee of High-Level Experts from the developing members of ECLA. This Committee was established at the 14th session of ECLA in 1971. The United States believed that the summary report, which was not substantially altered by the ECLA plenary session, should not stand by itself as the first regional appraisal, since both the basic ECLA secretariat study and the record of the debate made highly significant contributions to that appraisal, and since all ECLA members had not been involved in preparing the summary report. The United States also had serious problems with respect to a number of the specific points made in the "Quito Appraisal." Despite these objections, the document, including U.S. reservations, was approved by a large majority and later became an important element in the worldwide review and appraisal of the progress on the Second UN Development Decade.

Another development at the plenary session was the promise by the Executive Secretary, Enrique Iglesias, that he would reshape the secretariat's work program. In November, under the personal direction of the Executive Secretary, the ECLA secretariat issued a thorough revision of this program. The result was a significant reduction in total work projects and a sharper focus on subjects of special relevance to Latin America in the next few years.

During 1973, ECLA continued its regular activities related to the Latin American economies, although emphasizing more than usual the economic relations between the region and other parts of the world. Also during the year, the first formal steps were taken toward a closer



relationship between ECLA and the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES). On the basis of a plan prepared jointly by the leaders of ECLA and ILPES, a consolidation under which ILPES would maintain its own identity within the ECLA secretariat was approved in November by the ILPES Governing Council. The plan was to be considered by the ECLA Committee of the Whole in 1974.

#### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA

Full membership in ECA is limited to independent African countries. The United Kingdom, France, Spain, and the non-self-governing territories in Africa are associate members. The United States, while not a member, supports the Commission's activities by maintaining liaison with ECA headquarters in Addis Ababa, attending a number of its meetings as an observer, and providing technical and economic assistance.

ECA, which was established in 1958, is charged with promoting the economic and social development of Africa, strengthening economic relations among African countries and territories; undertaking studies of economic development; collecting, evaluating, and disseminating economic and technical information; and helping formulate policies to promote economic development. The Commission also provides advisory services to its members in various economic and social fields.

The United States sent observers to a number of ECA conferences and meetings during 1973. A five-man delegation headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State attended the 11th session of the Commission held at Accra, Ghana, February 19-23. The session, also known as the Second Conference of Ministers, drew ministerial representation from many countries and provided a high-level forum for discussion of Africa's most pressing economic problems. Several themes were stressed repeatedly in the discussions—a realization that African countries must rely upon themselves for their economic development; a call for intra-African cooperation in trade, transportation, communications, monetary matters, and other economic areas; a claim for a more active African role in international trade and monetary negotiations; and more favorable terms of trade with the developed world. The Commission adopted 15 resolutions, the most important of which concerned trade, development, and financial matters. One resolution drew attention to the drought disaster in the Sahelian zone and called for relief from appropriate organizations.

During the year, the ECA technical Committee of Experts met once and its Executive Committee met twice. These bodies supervise the activities of ECA between its biennial sessions. The Executive Committee adopted a number of resolutions, including one calling for strengthened cooperation between ECA and the OAU.

In other ECA meetings, two experts from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service presented seven papers at a bilingual training course in tax policy, legislation, and administration held at Addis Ababa in October. The Americans concentrated on that part of the course dealing with the administration of individual and corporate income taxes. U.S. experts also attended a meeting of non-UN organizations interested in population work in Africa, a meeting of the consultative group of the African Census Program, and a seminar on preparation of the 1973 World Program of Industrial Statistics.

The United States continued to provide assistance to the ECA in 1973 by financing internships of young African officials at ECA headquarters; providing U.S. experts to assist ECA in trade promotion, livestock development, and agricultural economics programs; financing the training of African officials in the United States; and financing an ECA meeting of voluntary agencies working in Africa. In addition, the United States provided financing for ECA activities promoting the creation of women's bureaus in African countries and for publication of an ECA newsletter on women's activities. During the year the United States also provided three census specialists on a non-reimbursable basis to the ECA-administered African Census Program which assists individual African countries with their census operations.

In addition to this continuing assistance, the United States agreed in November 1973 to finance two special multi-disciplinary UN Development Advisory Teams, initially for 2 years, which will service planning needs primarily of the relatively least developed of the developing countries of Africa. Under this program, the United States will pay for the services of up to 12 senior-level experts in agriculture, finance, and industrial development to work with ministries of ECA member governments.

#### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR WESTERN ASIA

Although ECWA was not scheduled to come officially into existence until January 1, 1974, preparations for its opening began in August after ECOSOC approved its establishment.

During ECOSOC's debate on the subject at its summer session, the United States objected to the Lebanese-initiated resolution proposing the creation of ECWA. It was the U.S. contention that the resolution was contrary to the terms of and practice under the UN Charter since its language excluded from membership in the new regional commission a UN member (Israel) of the region involved. The United States proposed that this legal issue be referred to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. The U.S. motion to that effect, however, was defeated in committee, which immediately thereafter approved the Lebanese draft. ECOSOC itself adopted the draft resolution on August 9 without a formal vote.

According to the resolution, ECWA will carry out duties in general like those of the other four regional economic commissions. Its prime responsibility is to "initiate and participate in measures for facilitating concerted action for the economic reconstruction and development of Western Asia." Toward this end, ECWA may carry out investigations and studies, collect and disseminate appropriate information, perform certain advisory services for the member countries, and assist ECOSOC in carrying out its duties within the region.

With respect to membership, the resolution states that "the Commission shall consist of the states members of the United Nations situated in Western Asia which at present call on the services of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut." The 12 countries covered by these criteria are Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Emirates, Yemen (Aden) and Yemen (San'a). ECOSOC is to decide on future membership applications on the basis of ECWA's recommendation.

ECWA's secretariat and initial operations will be based on the existing UN Economic and Social Office in Beirut, which will be consolidated into the new organization. The intention is to build on that base during 1974-77 until the secretariat and its operations reach an appropriate size for the region. For at least that initial phase, the secretariat's largest substantive divisions will be those for economic and social planning, social security and other social services, and international trade and development.

ECWA will hold its first plenary session in Beirut in 1974 and meet biennially thereafter.

In late December, the UN Secretary General announced the appointment of Mohamed Said al-Attar as ECWA's first Executive Secretary. Ambassador al-Attar was the Permanent UN Representative of Yemen (San'a). In addition to his diplomatic experience, he is trained as an economist and social scientist.

#### UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The UNDP is the world's largest program of grant technical assistance. Established in 1966 through merger of the UN Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, it is the hub for all technical assistance activities in the UN system and disburses over 70% of the technical assistance funds expended by the various international organizations involved in such activities. The UNDP responds to requests from developing countries for technical assistance and pre-investment studies designed to provide public infrastructure for modernization and the necessary basis for the development of sound capital projects which can then be financed by either public or private investment capital. All states that are members of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, or the IAEA are, in principle, eligible for assistance, and UNDP projects are underway in some 135 countries and territories.

Projects of from 2 to 5 years' duration in such fields as agriculture, industry, education, health, policy and planning, transportation, and natural resource exploration comprise the major part of the UNDP program. In addition, the UNDP undertakes smaller projects designed either to train nationals by means of fellowships or to provide countries with required expertise through the use of advisers. Both types of projects are ordinarily executed for the UNDP by the UN Secretariat or one of the other organizations of the UN system.

The UNDP has its headquarters in New York. Rudolph A. Peterson, former President of the Bank of America and Chairman of the President's Task Force on International Development in 1969-1970, is Administrator of the Program.

#### *Policy and Advisory Bodies*

The UNDP's policies are established and its programs and budget are approved by a Governing Council which meets twice each year, ordinarily at New York in January and at Geneva in June. As provided in various decisions of the UN General Assembly the Council also has become the governing body for the UN Fund for Population Activities, the UN Capital Development Fund, and the recently authorized UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, as

well as for the program of technical assistance financed from the regular UN budget. The Governing Council is composed of representatives from 48 states—21 developed and 27 developing. The United States has been a member of the Governing Council since the UNDP's establishment.

In addition, the UNDP receives advice from an Inter-Agency Consultative Board (IACB). The IACB, which provides other organizations of the UN system with consultative participation in the UNDP's decision-making and policy-making process, is composed of the UN Secretary General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies, IAEA, UNCTAD, and UNIDO. The IACB ordinarily meets twice each year to advise the Administrator on major issues pertaining to UNDP policy formulation and program direction and to assist in bringing about maximum coordination and integration of all UNDP-related activities of the UN system.

### *Field Organization*

At nearly 100 field offices in developing countries, UNDP resident representatives advise their host governments on development planning and UN assistance and coordinate the operation of UNDP-financed programs within their countries of assignment. Designated by the General Assembly in 1970 as overall leaders of the UN technical assistance teams in their respective countries, many of the resident representatives have on their staffs representatives of the FAO and UNIDO in the roles of senior agricultural and industrial advisers. During 1973, 15 resident representatives were U.S. citizens.

### *Financing*

The financial resources of the UNDP come principally from voluntary contributions pledged by governments. During 1973, 128 governments pledged \$306.3 million and the assisted governments were assessed an additional \$13.1 million for local costs over and above their counterpart contribution to each project. The United States, which has always been the highest contributor to the UNDP, pledged \$90 million in 1973, subject to the condition that its contribution should not exceed 40% of all governmental contributions. In fact, the U.S. contribution represented 28% of total contributions in 1973, down from 30% for the previous year. At the pledging conference for 1974, held on October 30, 1973, pledges and indicated pledges totalled \$363 million, an impressive 18% above the 1973 level. This included an assumed U.S. contribution of \$90 million—the same amount as in 1973 and representing 24.8% of the total.

### *Development Assistance*

During 1973, the UNDP had underway approximately 5,000 projects, of which over 800 were large-scale projects costing an average of more than \$2 million each. An additional 1,000 projects had been approved but were not yet operational. Cost of these projects to completion was estimated at \$3.6 billion, with the UNDP providing \$1.5 billion and the recipient governments \$2.1 billion in counterpart contributions. Actual program costs during 1973 totalled about \$269.3 million, while administrative and overhead costs totalled an additional \$71 million.

While the majority of UNDP projects relate to a single country, 498 of the 6,905 projects approved (and not yet completed) as of Decem-

ber 31, 1973, were regional, 147 were interregional, and 6 were research projects with global implications. Of the country and regional projects, 1,750 were in Africa; 1,704 in Asia and the Far East; 1,739 in Europe, the Mediterranean area, and the Middle East; and 1,559 in Latin America. Major sectors of concentration were agriculture, forestry, and fisheries (1,432 projects); industry (1,178); central economic and social policy and planning (913); transport and communications (705); education (547); science and technology (511); health (488); labor, management, and employment (320); social services (291); and natural resources (204).

### *New Program Directions*

During 1973, the UNDP continued implementation of reforms initiated in 1971 as a result of the comprehensive study of the UN development system undertaken by Sir Robert Jackson (Australia). The Governing Council approved 47 more country programs bringing to 82 the number of countries where this exercise has provided a framework for the establishment or reordering of priorities, elimination of marginal projects, and greater coordination of the efforts of the 14 UN agencies executing technical assistance projects funded by the UNDP.

In preparation for the second programming cycle (1977-1981), the Governing Council drew up new guidelines for the allocation of UNDP resources. These guidelines provide for a significant increase in resources for the lower income countries, particularly the least developed countries.<sup>3</sup> The relatively wealthy recipient countries, on the other hand, will receive no increase in the level of UNDP assistance and will endeavor to become net contributors to the Program as soon as possible.

To improve program performance, the UNDP Administrator undertook in 1973 a number of measures, such as introducing a new evaluation system and strengthening the career personnel system. He also strengthened the Program's leadership by appointing two new Deputy Administrators, Bert Lindstrom of Sweden and I. G. Patel of India. As a first step in an effort to improve working relationships with the various regional economic commissions, Bruce Stedman, an American serving as UNDP Regional Representative in Addis Ababa, was raised to the rank of Assistant Administrator with responsibility for liaison with ECA. Mr. Stedman's promotion was also designed to further UNDP efforts to give particular attention to the least developed countries, a majority of which are in Africa.

During 1973 the UNDP administration and Governing Council gave considerable attention to initiation of special measures for the least developed countries. In addition to innovative programs, additional funding of \$35 million for the period 1973-76 was approved by the Council. To further these efforts, seven developed countries made special pledges totaling \$8 million. In addition, \$5 million in special funding was also approved by the Governing Council for programs in the drought-stricken Sahelian Zone of Africa.

<sup>3</sup> The 25 least developed countries, as designated by the Committee for Development Planning and approved by the General Assembly in 1971, are Afghanistan, Bhutan, Botswana, Burundi, Chad, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Guinea, Haiti, Laos, Lesotho, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, Sikkim, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Upper Volta, Western Samoa, and Yemen (San'a).

### *UN Regular Program*

Provision is made annually in the UN regular (or assessed) budget for a small program of technical assistance. Known as the "Regular Program of Technical Assistance," its funding in 1973 amounted to \$8.7 million of which \$5.4 million was for projects in human rights, social development, public administration, development planning, public finance, natural resources, transportation, housing, statistics, and other fields; \$1.8 million was designated for a unified system of regional and subregional advisory services; and the remaining \$1.5 million was designated for industrial development projects which were reviewed and approved by the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO (see p. 90).

The UNDP Governing Council provides general policy guidance for the UN Regular Program. As a result of the Council's recommendations, the Regular Program has been concentrating those of its resources not specifically designated by the General Assembly on such areas as human rights and public administration where its distinct contribution could be more readily seen, and restricting its aid largely to a limited number of least developed countries.

Although sympathetic with the effort to use the Regular Program to provide additional assistance to the least developed countries, the United States has continued to advocate that all technical assistance development be eliminated from the UN assessed budget and funded through the UNDP. This would restrict the Regular Program to those few programs, such as human rights, for which there are not other sources of funds.

### *UN Volunteers*

The 25th General Assembly in 1970 established, as of January 1, 1971, a corps of UN Volunteers (UNV). In 1973 the UNDP Administrator, who also serves as Administrator of UNV, appointed John Gordon, head of the Canadian University Service Overseas, to be UNV Coordinator effective January 1, 1974. Mr. Gordon replaced Assad K. Sadry of Iran. UNV has its headquarters in Geneva.

UN Volunteers work on projects funded by the UNDP. These projects run the gamut of development activities, although they are primarily in the rural sector.

At the end of 1973, 168 UN Volunteers were stationed in 29 developing countries. The volunteers came from 32 countries, 14 of which were developing nations. There were 18 U.S. volunteers serving in 1973. Plans call for increasing the number of UN Volunteers to about 300 by the end of 1974 and to about 500 over the next 3 years.

In April 1973 the UNV sponsored discussions with the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service (ISVS), the Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS), and representatives of various UN specialized agencies on the future of the UNV program. As a result of these talks, it was decided to renew UNV's contract with the ISVS Clearinghouse through June 1974. This arrangement, whereby ISVS recruits, selects, and trains UN Volunteers, was started in May 1971 and has been responsible for 83% of the UN Volunteers recruited thus far.

While the living expenses of UN Volunteers in their country of assignment are ordinarily borne by the host government, external costs are, as a general rule, borne by the sponsoring organization or agency

in their home country. To provide for volunteers for whom no such sponsor funding is available, the General Assembly invited governments, nongovernmental organizations, and private individuals to contribute to a special voluntary fund. By the end of December 1973, total pledges to the UNV voluntary fund amounted to \$581,659, including two pledges by the United States totalling \$400,000.

On December 13 the General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution recommended by the Second Committee expressing its satisfaction with the progress of the program and its plans for future development.

### *Capital Development Fund*

The General Assembly established the UN Capital Development Fund in 1966 over the opposition of the United States and most other developed countries. The United States considered that what was required was not another institution to provide capital development financing at less than the market rates but greater use of existing institutions such as IDA and the regional development banks. The United States and some other developed countries also objected to the fact that the administrative expenses of the Fund were to be covered in the UN assessed budget.

In 1967 the General Assembly placed the Fund under the management of the Administrator and the Governing Council of the UNDP, because pledges to the Fund were not sufficient to make a separate administration economical. Pursuant to an UNCTAD resolution of May 19, 1972, calling for special measures for the least developed countries, the Administrator proposed to the Governing Council in June 1972 that the Capital Development Fund be utilized to provide small-scale plants for the least developed countries. This proposal was accepted by the Council, and, by the end of 1973, Fund commitments and identified potential commitments for projects in the least developed countries represented the equivalent of about \$3 million.

In a resolution adopted on December 13, the UN General Assembly welcomed the Fund's new orientation toward serving first and foremost the least developed countries and called upon member states to provide substantial voluntary contributions. The United States abstained on this resolution, which was approved by the Second Committee by a vote of 90 to 0, with 29 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 100 to 0, with 25 abstentions.

Only \$684,318 was pledged by 25 countries to the Capital Development Fund for 1973. As of the end of 1973, only the equivalent of approximately \$3.0 million had been paid in against cumulative pledges since 1966 of \$5.9 million—many of them in nonconvertible currencies. However, the financial prospects for the Fund improved considerably at the pledging conference for 1974 (held in November 1973) when 19 countries pledged \$5,418,177 for 1974. The primary cause for this large increase was a \$4.7 million pledge by the Netherlands, which became the first developed country to contribute to the Fund.

### UN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

UNIDO was established by the General Assembly in 1966 as an autonomous organization within the United Nations to promote and accelerate the industrialization of the developing countries. Member-

ship in UNIDO is open to all members of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the IAEA. The United States has been a member since the beginning.

UNIDO helps to promote industrial development chiefly by providing technical assistance, preinvestment studies, research, and publications. It does not provide capital assistance. A headquarters staff in Vienna collects and disseminates information on industry, organizes conferences and in-plant training, and stimulates contacts between businessmen and government officials in both developed and developing countries.

#### *Program Activities*

UNIDO carries out its program activities primarily as an implementing agency for industrial development projects funded by the UNDP, but it also receives operational funds from the UN Regular Program of Technical Assistance. Its Special Industrial Services program is financed by the program reserve fund of the UNDP. In addition, a number of countries make direct voluntary contributions to the UNIDO General Trust Fund or pay for specific projects that they sponsor jointly with UNIDO. As of December 31, 1973, there were 1,574 projects approved and underway at an estimated total value of \$71.6 million, of which the UNDP was providing \$57.6 million. These projects included providing expert advice, equipment, and training facilities in addition to scores of experts to advise in factories, training centers, research and development institutes, and government agencies concerned with industrialization.

A small Vienna-based joint UNIDO-IBRD office initiated a program of feasibility studies during the latter half of 1973 in preparation for a broad joint program to become operative on January 1, 1974.

UNIDO's administrative and research activities are funded out of the UN regular budget. In 1973 these cost \$12.6 million, with \$30,798,000 budgeted for the 1974-75 biennium.

The United States supported UNIDO financially through a voluntary contribution to the UNDP and through its assessed contribution to the UN regular budget. It did not make a direct voluntary contribution to the UNIDO General Trust Fund or have any funds-in-trust projects. However, AID collaborated with the University of North Carolina to offer a special training course on industrial environmental issues, in which 10 UNIDO-sponsored trainees participated. UNIDO has become increasingly interested in the environmental aspects of industrialization and during 1973 elaborated a joint program of activities with UNEP.

#### *Industrial Development Board*

The United States is a member of UNIDO's Industrial Development Board (IDB), the 45-state policy-formulating body which meets annually to review past activities and approve future programs and budgets. The IDB held its seventh session at UNIDO headquarters in Vienna May 7-15, 1973. The subsidiary organ of the IDB, the Permanent Committee, held its second session immediately preceding the IDB and its third session December 3-10. These sessions focussed on approval of the program and budget for 1974-75, a medium term plan for 1974-77, and preparations for the Second General Conference of



UNIDO in 1975. Taking an active part in all these sessions, the United States continued to stress the need for UNIDO to establish priorities and strengthen its analytical capabilities in order to enhance its program of operational activities.

The IDB adopted by consensus three resolutions in favor of exchanges of industrial formulas among the developing countries, a special program for the least developed countries, and carrying forward the work of the Group of High-Level Experts on a Long-Range Strategy (see below).

The IDB also adopted three "decisions." The first, adopted by a vote of 20 to 2 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions, recommended an increase from \$1.5 million to \$2 million in the UNIDO program of technical assistance financed from the assessed UN budget, with the additional resources to be used for special measures in favor of the least developed countries. The United States voted against this decision because it believed that technical assistance programs should be financed through voluntary contributions and not through assessed budgets.

The second decision, adopted by a vote of 27 to 11 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions, recommended that the General Assembly give increased administrative autonomy to UNIDO, including a separate budget, separate personnel system, and the establishment of a trust fund composed of all voluntary contributions to UNIDO other than those from the UNDP. The United States opposed this decision because it believed it to be inconsistent with the terms of the resolution which established UNIDO.

The third decision, adopted by a vote of 29 to 0, with 14 abstentions (U.S.), recommended increasing the number of industrial development field advisors from 30 to 60 by 1977. The United States abstained because it believed that increases in field personnel should not be made by set numbers but should be justified by need as reflected in the program.

On December 6 the 28th General Assembly, on the recommendation of its Second Committee and by a vote of 110 to 1, with 17 abstentions (U.S.), adopted a resolution that, *inter alia*, welcomed the first decision, endorsed the third, and requested the Secretary General to prepare, for submission to the 29th Assembly, a report on the question of the establishment of a UN industrial development fund. The Second Committee referred to the Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) portions of the IDB decision concerning increased autonomy for UNIDO. On December 5 the Fifth Committee decided without a vote to recommend that the General Assembly request the Secretary General to prepare a report for the 29th Assembly "on the question of the separate preparation and submission of the program and budget of UNIDO, and the question of administrative autonomy for UNIDO." The Assembly endorsed the recommendation on December 6, without a vote.

#### *Second General Conference of UNIDO*

The IDB approved the holding of UNIDO's Second General Conference at Lima, Peru, March 12-26, 1975. It also approved a wide-ranging provisional agenda which included consideration of such general themes as the basic issues of industrialization during the Second UN Development Decade, special measures for the least developed countries, policies and actions necessary to achieve the industrial

development goals of the Decade, and international cooperation for promotion of industrialization of the developing countries; and such specific issues as follow-up to the first General Conference (held in 1971), a long-range strategy for UNIDO, and institutional arrangements for UNIDO. The United States emphasized that the principal work of the Conference should relate to the mid-term review and appraisal of the international development strategy with respect to the industrial sector. The Permanent Committee at its third session established an 11-member subcommittee to carry forward preparations for the Conference between sessions of the IDB and the Permanent Committee.

On the recommendation of its Second Committee, the General Assembly on December 6 adopted without a vote a resolution approving the date and site for the Second General Conference, noting the recommendations of the IDB concerning the Conference, and recommending that the Conference should examine cooperation of the developed and developing countries with a view to "establishing the basic principles for an international declaration on industrial development and cooperation, and with the aim of defining a comprehensive plan of action for assisting the developing countries."

#### *Long-Range Strategy*

The 18-member Group of High-Level Experts on a Long-Range Strategy for UNIDO, appointed by the Secretary General at the request of the 26th Assembly in 1971, held its fourth and final meeting in Vienna in February 1973. The report of the Group, submitted to the IDB, made six recommendations covering the major functional areas of UNIDO as well as related financial and administrative matters. The United States took the position during the IDB's consideration of the report that the recommendations were too general in nature to be of practical value and that more work was necessary to elaborate a useful long-range strategy. It proposed creating intersessional machinery to refine and further develop the recommendations of the Group. The IDB accepted this proposal and established an *Ad Hoc* Committee of 27 which met in July and December. At the latter session the United States submitted a comprehensive discussion paper. Although the "provisional conclusions" were drafted, they required further consideration by the Committee before it could submit its report to the IDB in 1974.

#### UN CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

UNCTAD is an organ of the General Assembly concerned with the trade and related economic problems of the developing countries. Conference sessions convene every 4 years. The first, UNCTAD I, met in Geneva in 1964; UNCTAD II met in New Delhi in 1968; and UNCTAD III met in Santiago, Chile, in 1972. Membership is open to any country that is a member of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, or the IAEA. At the end of 1973 UNCTAD had 145 members, the 135 members of the United Nations plus 10 other states that were members of specialized agencies. The German Democratic Republic and North Korea joined UNCTAD in 1973.

UNCTAD has permanent machinery which functions between conference sessions. The senior body is the 68-member Trade and Develop-

ment Board (TDB) which met three times in 1973. The Board has five main committees—Commodities, Manufactures, Invisibles and Financing Related to Trade, Shipping, and Preferences—and a number of subsidiary bodies. TDB members are elected on the basis of a specified number of seats for each of four groups, defined along generally geographic lines. Membership on the main committees is open to all UNCTAD members. The United States is a member of the TDB, of the five main committees and, with a few exceptions, of the other subsidiary bodies.

### *Economic Rights and Duties of States*

Acting on a proposal of President Luis Echeverría of Mexico, UNCTAD III established a working group to draw up the text of a draft Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. This working group, of which the United States is a member, met twice during 1973, in February and again in July.

While there was general agreement on the structure and some of the substance of the proposed Charter, important differences remained among the many varying proposals for substantive provisions at the end of the working group's second session. In addition, the legal character of the eventual document—whether it would be legally binding or a statement of principles to which states would seek to conform—was still undetermined. Some progress had been made, however, and the TDB on September 8 unanimously recommended to the General Assembly that the working group meet twice again in 1974. The Assembly accepted this recommendation without objection on December 6.

The U.S. position on the proposed Charter was set forth by Secretary Kissinger in his September 24 address to the General Assembly:

“... Such a document will make a significant and historic contribution if it reflects the true aspirations of all nations; if it is turned into an indictment of one group of countries by another, it will accomplish nothing. To command general support—and to be implemented—the proposed rights and duties must be defined equitably and take into account the concerns of industrialized as well as of developing countries. The United States stands ready to define its responsibilities in a humane and cooperative spirit.”

### *Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences*<sup>4</sup>

The UN Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences was held in Geneva from November 12 to December 15, under the auspices of UNCTAD, after an intergovernmental preparatory committee charged with drawing up a draft code had held two sessions earlier in the year. The United States played a major role in the meetings of the preparatory committee and at the conference, in which 84 countries participated.

The United States sought to mediate between the mercantile nations of Western Europe on the one hand, which historically have exercised little governmental control over shipping, and the developing countries on the other, which view the code as an instrument for regulating all the activities of liner conferences.

<sup>4</sup>Liner conferences are two or more shipping lines grouped together to fix uniform freight rates and sometimes to concert their business activities in other ways. Most U.S. shipping lines are conference members.

At the end of the conference there were still disagreements over major elements of the draft code. The participants decided that the conference should resume at a second session in March 1974 when attention would focus especially on the issues of cargo-sharing, freight rate setting, and the method of settling disputes.

### *Containerization*

Acting on a recommendation of the 1972 UN/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic, the 54th ECOSOC during its organizational meetings in January 1973 called on UNCTAD to undertake the preparation of a preliminary draft convention on international intermodal transport. The convention would deal primarily, but not exclusively, with container transport. The ECOSOC resolution envisaged the holding of a plenipotentiary conference to consider such a convention in 1975. The TDB in September approved the convening of an intergovernmental preparatory group to prepare the draft convention.

The preparatory group held its first session in Geneva from October 29 to November 2. The purpose of the meeting was to provide guidance to the UNCTAD secretariat for the preparation of studies which the group would need at its future sessions. The United States joined with other developed countries at the meeting in suggesting that the secretariat focus on the problems of documentation and liability in intermodal transport. In addition, the U.S. delegation, along with the delegations of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, presented a set of concepts—not intended to represent fixed government positions—which could form the basis of a convention. The preparatory group agreed that these two suggestions would, along with others submitted at the meeting, provide the necessary guidance to the secretariat.

On May 4 the 54th ECOSOC also accepted a recommendation of the UN/IMCO Conference with regard to container standards and called for the convening of an *ad hoc* intergovernmental group at the end of 1975 to review work carried out in this field by the nongovernmental International Organization for Standardization. ECOSOC requested the UN Secretary General to submit a report to it in April 1974, suggesting the terms of reference of the *ad hoc* group.

### *Commodity Consultations*

As instructed by UNCTAD III, the Committee on Commodities met in special session in March 1973 to organize "intensive intergovernmental consultations on agreed commodities or groups of commodities . . . with the aim of reaching concrete and significant results on trade liberalization and pricing policy early in the 1970's." The Committee adopted a resolution setting the objectives and modalities for the consultations, and on this basis the UNCTAD Secretary General prepared a tentative schedule of consultations for consideration by the TDB.

Disagreement between African and Latin American delegations over the holding of such a consultation on coffee was the most difficult issue confronted by the TDB at its 13th session (August–September). The African countries insisted that no commodity consultations be held unless agreement were reached to hold a consultation on coffee. The Latin American countries argued that coffee should be excluded from the consultations because the negotiation of such a commodity

agreement was a current concern of the International Coffee Organization. They also noted that some Latin American governments directly interested in the coffee trade were opposed to consultation. The developed countries, including the United States, did not oppose coffee consultations in principle. They noted, however, that under the terms of the resolution adopted by the Committee on Commodities the holding of consultations on any particular commodity required the agreement of interested governments. They believed this procedure should be adhered to.

Toward the end of the TDB session, a group of Asian countries introduced a draft resolution requesting the UNCTAD Secretary General to make arrangements for consultations on coffee to take place between October 1973 and March 1974. After further discussion the resolution was adopted without a vote.

The first intergovernmental consultation (on tungsten) was held in October. A series of 13 other commodity consultations was scheduled for 1974.

#### *Multilateral Trade Negotiations*

UNCTAD III had urged that "problems in the monetary, trade, and finance spheres should be resolved in a coordinated manner, taking into account their interdependence." While voting for the resolution as a whole, the United States had joined with other developed countries in a statement to the effect that the resolution "should not be interpreted in any way which affects the independence of GATT or IMF, or implies the setting up of new intergovernmental machinery."

The TDB devoted most of its resumed 12th session in May 1973 to consideration of this topic. The Board resolved that it should keep under review the progress of the multilateral trade negotiations (carried out under GATT auspices) and the IMF discussions on monetary reform, and decided to hold a special session later in the year or in 1974 for that purpose. The TDB also requested the UNCTAD Secretary General to keep under review, and propose improvements on, the "existing arrangements for the solution of the interrelated problems of trade, development finance, and monetary issues in a coordinated manner." The United States disassociated itself from this resolution, primarily because the TDB action could be construed as aimed at an institutionalized UNCTAD role in coordinating the work of other organizations which had primary responsibility for trade negotiations and monetary reform. A spokesman for most of the other developed countries said that they interpreted the phrase "existing arrangements" to refer only to the on-going consultations between the executive heads of UNCTAD, GATT, and the IMF. A spokesman for the developing countries rejected this interpretation.

The TDB continued its discussion of the trade negotiations and monetary reform talks, and of the interrelationships between them and development finance, at its 13th session. At that time it requested the UNCTAD Secretary General to carry forward his consultations with the Director General of GATT concerning appropriate arrangements for the former "to be able to follow the developments in the multilateral trade negotiations in order to assist developing countries." The GATT Contracting Parties met shortly thereafter in Tokyo and

agreed that the Trade Negotiations Committee, which they had established to direct the multilateral trade negotiations, could decide to invite the UNCTAD Secretary General to attend its meetings as appropriate. (See also p. 98.)

In connection with its consideration of TDB activities, the 28th General Assembly on December 6 adopted without objection two resolutions dealing with the multilateral trade negotiations and international monetary reform which had been recommended by its Second Committee.

In the first, the Assembly noted with satisfaction the decision to open multilateral trade negotiations within the framework of GATT; reiterated the provisions of the Tokyo Declaration of the GATT Contracting Parties relating to the developing countries and the role of UNCTAD; and emphasized that the Tokyo Declaration, being expressed in broad terms, enabled governments in the course of the negotiations "to take due account of the concerns, perspectives and principles voiced at Tokyo by different delegations, particularly those of the developing countries."

Following the approval of the resolution in the Second Committee on November 30 without a vote, the U.S. Representative noted for the record the U.S. understanding that the purpose of the resolution was not to amend or to go beyond matters which were agreed to in the Tokyo Declaration.

In the resolution on the reform of the international monetary system, the Assembly called attention to those aspects of the monetary system which were of particular interest to developing countries and asked that these receive further examination, principally within the IMF. *Inter alia*, it asserted that it was fundamentally important to ensure that the reformed monetary system create conditions for and contain arrangements to "promote an increasing flow of real resources from the developed countries to the developing countries," and it recommended that the earliest possible decision be reached on the question of establishing a link between the IMF Special Drawing Rights and additional development finance.

Following the approval of this resolution in the Second Committee on November 30 without a vote, the U.S. Representative stated that the U.S. Government took the position that the IMF, including its Committee of 20, was the only proper forum for any agreement relating to the substance of monetary reform issues or to the structure or operations of the IMF. (See also p. 153.)

In July the UNDP approved a project, to be implemented by the UNCTAD secretariat, which will provide documentary and technical assistance to developing countries taking part in the trade negotiations. The scheme will cover, as necessary, statistical and technical data collection and processing, training of officials, advisory services, and other elements. This project supplements other activities of the UNCTAD secretariat in assisting the developing countries in the negotiations, including the on-going consultations between the UNCTAD Secretary General and the GATT Director General.

#### *Conduct of International Business*

*Transfer of Technology.*—The Intergovernmental Group on Transfer of Technology, established by UNCTAD in 1970, held its first substantive session in Geneva January 29–February 9, 1973. At the

TDB's 13th session, the developing countries urged that the intergovernmental group be transformed into a main committee of the TDB and that it begin the elaboration of an international code of conduct on the transfer of technology. The United States joined with other developed countries in arguing that the question of transforming the intergovernmental group into a permanent body should be deferred until 1974 after the group's second substantive meeting. The United States and many other developed countries also questioned whether the transfer of technology, given its private commercial character, was amenable to regulation by a code of conduct and believed that it was premature to begin work on such a code.

The TDB asked the intergovernmental group to study the possibility and feasibility of a code of conduct at its next session, as well as to discuss and suggest terms of reference for any eventual main committee on the transfer of technology.

*Restrictive Business Practices.*—At its sixth session, in Geneva in August, the UNCTAD Committee on Manufactures considered the report of an *ad hoc* group of experts on restrictive business practices which had been created by UNCTAD III. The developing countries proposed that most of the group's recommendations be adopted, but the reactions of developed countries to the report and its recommendations were mixed. The United States did not endorse the group's recommendations.

No agreement was possible on the substantive issues emerging from the report of the group of experts and the committee agreed unanimously to the convening of a second group of experts to carry on further the work in this field requested by UNCTAD III.

#### *Appointment of New Secretary General*

On December 6 the General Assembly, without vote, confirmed the appointment of Gamani Corea of Sri Lanka for a 3-year term as Secretary General of UNCTAD, beginning April 1, 1974. Mr. Corea succeeds Manuel Perez-Guerrero of Venezuela.

### GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

The accession of Singapore and Hungary in 1973 brought to 83 the number of nations now contracting parties to the GATT. In addition, the Philippines joined Tunisia in acceding provisionally and 14 other countries apply the General Agreement on a *de facto* basis. As a provisional agreement designed to spur the economic growth of its contracting parties by eliminating barriers to and establishing rules for world trade, the GATT continues to be the principal multilateral instrument involving U.S. economic interests in the field of international trade policy.

The GATT consists of (1) a set of general rules to promote the conduct of trade among the contracting parties on a fair and equitable basis, (2) procedures for application of these rules, and (3) concessions agreed upon in trade negotiations in the form of schedules of tariff rates extended by individual contracting parties to other contracting parties. The GATT contracting parties have established forums in which general and specific trade problems and disputes may be discussed.

While not formally a part of the UN system, the GATT Contracting Parties, functioning as an institutional entity, cooperate closely with UN organizations. For example, the GATT Contracting Parties and UNCTAD jointly operate an International Trade Center to assist developing countries in promoting their exports.

Since entering into force on January 1, 1948, the GATT has provided the framework for seven multilateral rounds of tariff negotiations. The sixth, the Kennedy Round, was completed June 30, 1967. The tariff reductions negotiated in the Kennedy Round were effected in five yearly stages, the last of which was implemented on January 1, 1972.

In 1973 the GATT was principally concerned with initiating its seventh round of multilateral trade negotiations, the most ambitious and far-reaching to date. Following a series of meetings of the special preparatory committee established late in 1972 to develop methods and procedures for the negotiations, ministerial representatives from 102 countries, including U.S. Secretary of the Treasury George P. Shultz, met in Tokyo September 12-14, 1973, and adopted unanimously the Tokyo Declaration officially launching the negotiations.

The Tokyo Declaration is a broad statement of aims and principles which provides the essential basis for conducting the negotiations. It specifies *inter alia* that the negotiations are to cover tariffs and non-tariff trade barriers as well as other measures which impede or distort international trade in both industrial and agricultural products, including tropical products and raw materials, whether in primary or processed form. The negotiations are to include all products, particularly those of export interest to developing countries, and consideration is to be given to improving the international trading system in light of progress in the negotiations. It was agreed that the negotiations would be considered as one undertaking, the various elements of which shall move forward together. The Declaration created a Trade Negotiations Committee which is responsible for planning and directing the negotiations. The first session of the Committee took place in October and was devoted to a discussion of procedural arrangements and technical work to be undertaken in the early stages of the negotiations.

Like earlier rounds, these negotiations are to be conducted in accordance with the principles of mutual advantage and commitment, overall reciprocity, and most-favored-nation treatment. The negotiations will also seek additional benefits for the trade of the developing countries in order to facilitate a substantial increase in their foreign exchange earnings and the diversification of their exports. The Declaration recognized that the particular problems of the least developed of the developing countries should be given special attention in the context of measures designed to benefit the developing countries in general.

A major accomplishment in the GATT in 1973 was the negotiation of a new Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles. The new arrangement, which replaces one covering trade in cotton textiles only, provides for the regulation of world trade in cotton, wool, and manmade fiber textiles to ensure the orderly growth of trade in textiles while averting disruption or the threat thereof to domestic markets. The arrangement was concluded on December 20 by some 50 governments, including the United States, and entered into force on



January 1, 1974. Achievement of the multifiber arrangement, a long-standing objective of the Administration, represented the fulfillment of a commitment to the Congress and to the U.S. textile industry. The United States was able to obtain all the provisions it considered essential in an agreement of this magnitude.

The GATT continued to review the regional trading arrangements between the European Community (EC) and other nations to determine their compatibility with GATT rules and procedures governing international trade. Of particular importance were GATT discussions concerning the enlargement of the EC from six to nine with the accession of Denmark, Ireland, and the United Kingdom. Examination of the accession treaties, which began in 1972, was suspended early in 1973 pending conclusion of the renegotiation of the tariff commitments of the three acceding countries. These renegotiations had not concluded by the end of the year.

Separate GATT working parties also examined the free trade agreements reached between the EC and five member countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) which did not accede to the Community. These agreements are with Austria, Iceland, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland (with Liechtenstein adhering to the Swiss agreement).

The United States and a number of other contracting parties found some aspects of the agreements inconsistent with GATT provisions and expressed particular concern regarding the new EC/EFTA rules of origin, which were stricter than the earlier EFTA rules. In December 1973 the United States, with the support of several other contracting parties, requested formal consultations under GATT Article XXII:1<sup>5</sup> to seek a satisfactory solution to the rules of origin problem.

Examinations of EC free trade agreements with Finland and Norway were initiated in 1973 but had not been completed by the end of the year.

Under GATT auspices the United States successfully resolved long-standing differences with the United Kingdom concerning import restrictions maintained on certain products from the so-called dollar area countries. The United States and the United Kingdom, taking into account the interest of all countries concerned, agreed bilaterally to the phasing-out of these quotas. In addition, the United States brought a complaint against certain income tax practices by Belgium, France, and the Netherlands which exempt export sales from domestic income taxes, a practice contrary to provisions of the General Agreement. The GATT Council established special working parties to examine each of these complaints. These examinations continued into 1974.

#### COMMODITY TRADE

Much of the intergovernmental activity and cooperation on trade problems of primary commodities has occurred within the framework of the United Nations. FAO's Committee on Commodity Problems reviews current issues and developments in world agricultural production and trade and sponsors meetings on particular products through

<sup>5</sup> Article XXII:1 says "Each contracting party shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for consultation regarding, such representations as may be made by another contracting party with respect to any matter affecting the operation of this Agreement."

formally established study groups (bananas; citrus; grains; rice; jute, kenaf, and allied fibers; hard fibers; meat; oilseeds, oils, and fats; and tea).

UNCTAD's Committee on Commodity Problems reviews all intergovernmental commodity activities under the purview of UNCTAD and has available for its consideration reports from the FAO, the autonomous commodity study groups (lead-zinc, rubber, cotton, and wool), the independent commodity councils (coffee, tin, sugar, wheat, cocoa, and olive oil), and the UN Committee on Tungsten. The UNCTAD Secretary General may also convene, upon request from the interested parties, commodity conferences to negotiate formal commodity agreements.

Petroleum is not covered as a commodity by a formal study group within the UN system. However, UN bodies have considered petroleum exploration and refining problems, and they issue energy statistics and evaluate energy problems and matters within the context of broad economic issues.

The United States participates in most intergovernmental commodity activities. Although not a party to the international agreements for cocoa, sugar, olive oil, and tin, the United States cooperates, as appropriate, with the administering councils of these agreements.

World commodity trade changed dramatically in 1973 from surpluses in most commodities to a situation of increasingly tight supply and, in some instances, shortages. Upward pressure on prices for industrial raw materials and agricultural commodities resulted from record demand and supply difficulties due to bad weather and other factors. Petroleum shortages led to a shortage of synthetic materials produced from petroleum-based feed stocks. The shortage in synthetic materials produced a shift to alternative natural commodities, with resultant pressure on supplies and prices of these items.

Pressures from the developing countries for commodity agreements to stabilize and increase earnings slackened significantly, and existing commodity agreements were renegotiated without the former economic provisions designed to support prices.

Following are highlights of the year's activities on commodity trade.

### *Wheat*

The International Wheat Council met twice in 1973 and at each meeting considered the feasibility of negotiating price provisions as envisaged under Article 21 and related rights and obligations for the Wheat Trade Convention of the 1971 International Wheat Agreement. These provisions are not in the Agreement because the negotiating conference in early 1971 had not been able to decide on the selection of a reference wheat or a desirable price level for internationally-traded wheat.

As at earlier meetings, the Council concluded that the time was not appropriate for a successful negotiation of these issues. The Council had recognized at its November 1972 session that the international currency situation, the enlargement of the European Community, and the plans for the multilateral trade negotiations had added to the original problems preventing agreement on substantive provisions for the Convention. In 1973 the tight world supply situation and the accelerating price increases for wheat represented a further obstacle to a successful negotiation within the life of the Convention, which

was scheduled to expire on June 30, 1974. The consensus of the June 1973 meeting of the Council was that the Convention should be extended for 1 or 2 years. The Council therefore authorized the secretariat to draft suitable documents to this end for review by the Executive Committee and presentation to the Council in November. The Food Aid Committee, established by the 1971 Food Aid Convention—the sister convention of the Wheat Trade Convention—authorized the secretariat to make similar preparation for extending the Convention.

A conference of governments was to follow the November meetings of the Wheat Council and Food Aid Committee but this was not held since the European Community had not yet reached a decision on the Food Aid Convention. The United States and some other governments took the position that both conventions should be considered together and that the maximum amount of time, consistent with the time needed for authenticating, signing, and ratifying procedures, should be given to the Community to reach a definitive decision. A special meeting of the Council and the Food Aid Committee was therefore scheduled for February 1974, with a conference of governments to follow immediately, if appropriate.

#### *Coffee*

The 1968 International Coffee Agreement expired in September 1973 but was extended in part. The extension was accepted by 58 producing and consuming nations, including the United States. However, all of the operative economic provisions of the 1968 Agreement (e.g., diversification fund, production goals, promotion fund, export quotas, limitation of imports from non-members, certificates of origin) were deleted.

The serious overproduction and accumulated surpluses which prevailed when the 1962 and 1968 coffee agreements were negotiated no longer exist. The outlook over the next few years for either a relative balance between supply and demand or a tight supply situation made the supply-restraining provisions of the 1968 Agreement less appropriate than before. By December 1972 these provisions had become inconsistent with the increasingly tight market and high price situation and were abandoned. Planned negotiations for a new operative agreement with economic provisions did not prove feasible at that time. Against this background, in the first half of 1973 it was agreed that the 1968 Agreement would be extended without its operative economic provisions in order to maintain the existence of the International Coffee Organization, principally as a center for gathering statistics and as a forum for negotiating an operative agreement. The extension is for 2 years. The United States has taken no position on the form of any new agreement. It has, however, expressed its willingness to participate in the negotiations within the International Coffee Organization toward such an agreement.

#### *Sugar*

The 1973 UN Sugar Conference adjourned in October 1973 without reaching agreement on an operative successor instrument to the 1968 International Sugar Amendment. There were wide differences between the exporters and importers on the issue of what price ranges should be included. Without agreement on price, other important issues, such

as the operation of the quota mechanism, could not be resolved either. The Conference did, however, adopt an agreement (without economic provisions) that will keep intact the International Sugar Organization for at least the next 2 years to serve as a forum for discussing sugar questions and for collecting statistical data. It will also consult with its members and others and, when appropriate, request the Secretary General of UNCTAD to convene a new conference. However, no attempt to reach agreement on such issues as prices and quotas is anticipated before 1975 when the future sugar policies of the European Community and the United States are expected to have been determined.

### *Cocoa*

The International Cocoa Agreement entered into force on June 30, 1973. The International Cocoa Organization, established by the Agreement to administer it, is now in the process of organization. High world cocoa prices have obviated the need for operation of the buffer stock and export quota provisions in the Agreement. The United States actively participated in the conferences leading to the Agreement, but after a careful assessment of the costs and benefits of participation, decided not to sign.

## POPULATION

### *Preparations for Conference and Year*

On May 18 ECOSOC accepted the invitation of the Government of Romania to hold the World Population Conference in Bucharest in August 1974. The Population Commission,<sup>6</sup> designated by ECOSOC as the intergovernmental preparatory body for the World Population Year in 1974 and the World Population Conference, met in special session in New York in March and in regular session in Geneva in October–November 1973.

The first draft of the World Population Plan of Action, requested by ECOSOC to be placed before the Conference, was reviewed by the Population Commission at its November 1973 session. The Commission, with observers from other nations including, for the first time, the People's Republic of China, was appreciative of the background work that had been done by the Secretary General, with the assistance of an advisory committee of experts, to prepare the draft. The Commission recommended, however, extensive revisions in order to bring the document into a shorter, more sharply focused format which would both permit easy understanding and provide clear calls for action.

The Commission was also charged with preparing the rules of procedure for the Conference. In this connection a controversy arose over a Romanian proposal, supported by Eastern European and some Latin American delegations, that "certain important matters" be adopted by consensus. The majority, including the United States, insisted that while consensus was desirable on the final World Population Plan of Action, votes might be required to deal with component parts of the Plan. The UN Legal Counsel's opinion that a consensus rule in advance

<sup>6</sup> A functional commission of ECOSOC. In 1973 its members were Barbados, Brazil, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, France, Gabon, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

of actual consensus would be a break with UN tradition supported the U.S. position and helped prevent the adoption of the Romanian proposal.

Responsibility within the United Nations for the World Population Year lies with the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), which in mid-1973 established a separate secretariat to stimulate, promote, and finance projects in connection with the Year. The secretariat worked vigorously and effectively during 1973 to prepare the community of nations for the forthcoming Year.

#### *Fund for Population Activities*

The UNFPA was established in 1967 by the Secretary General as a special trust fund, but was transferred by the General Assembly in 1972 to be under its authority. The Assembly also decided to place the UNFPA under the Governing Council of the UNDP, thereby providing UNFPA with an intergovernmental governing body. While both UNFPA and UNDP are subject to ECOSOC's overall policy review, the General Assembly specifically instructed the UNDP Governing Council to "concern itself with the financial and administrative policies relating to the work program, the fund-raising methods, and the annual budget of the Fund."

Fund-raising by the UNFPA is based on voluntary contributions by governments. In 1973 a total of \$42 million was raised, of which the United States contributed \$18 million.

UNFPA used its funds to underwrite over 500 projects in 78 countries. The majority of these projects were carried out by other UN bodies, such as WHO, ILO, UNICEF, UNESCO, FAO, and the United Nations itself through the Population Division of the Secretariat and the regional economic commissions. The specialized agencies and UNICEF are principally involved with projects related to family planning, population dynamics, and population education, while the other UN organizations are more concerned with censuses, demographic aspects of development planning, and economic and social activities related to population.

UNFPA has made good use of the flexibility which the United States sought for it from the beginning and seeks to preserve. This has permitted it to make increasing use of non-UN organizations as executing agents for some of its projects. Grants were made in 1973, for example, to the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Press Foundation of Asia, the World Assembly of Youth, and law and population research studies in several developing countries.

On May 18, 1973, ECOSOC adopted by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions, an extremely important resolution which made explicit the aims and purposes of UNFPA. They are: (1) to build up the knowledge and capacity needed to respond to the needs in the population and family planning fields; (2) to promote awareness in both developed and developing countries of the social, economic, and environmental implications of population problems; (3) to extend assistance to developing countries; and (4) to promote population programs and to coordinate projects supported by the UNFPA. Furthermore, the ECOSOC resolution decided that UNFPA should invite countries "to utilize the most appropriate implementing agents for their programs, recognizing that the primary responsibility for implementing rests with the countries concerned." The effect of this

is to allow the UNFPA to fund directly country projects of the multi-sector type widely sought by developing countries and supported by the United States.

## SOCIAL ISSUES

### DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

In 1973 UN organizations intensified their activities on a number of fronts to combat drug abuse, the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control completed its second year of operational activities, and international conventions controlling drugs continued to acquire adherents.

#### *Commission and ECOSOC*

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs,<sup>7</sup> enlarged by ECOSOC in 1972 from 24 to 30 members, held its 25th regular session in Geneva January 22-February 9. It approved several important resolutions later adopted or endorsed by ECOSOC and focused the attention of international organizations on actions required to meet the drug menace. The United States led discussions resulting in a consensus on guidelines and procedures for improving the annual reports required from governments on their implementation of drug treaties.

The progressive involvement of the United Nations in international drug abuse control was demonstrated by the actions of both ECOSOC at its 54th session and the General Assembly at its 28th session. In his statement to ECOSOC on May 2 at the beginning of its consideration of narcotics control, the U.S. Representative, Harvey R. Wellman, noted that the organizational phase for such control was over and declared:

“. . . The United Nations is now at the critical stage of execution and operation of programs and concrete projects. It is up to the United Nations to demonstrate that it can respond to the needs of countries for international assistance—for the assistance which they may require to comply with their international obligations to limit the production and use of drugs to medical and other legitimate purposes.”

On May 18 ECOSOC adopted 10 resolutions concerning narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances that urged states to adhere to international treaties for their control and approved various arrangements and measures to improve the control over such drugs. Four of the resolutions were particularly significant.

The first, adopted by a vote of 23 (U.S.) to 3, with no abstentions, authorized the establishment by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of a Subcommission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East. The Subcommission replaced an *Ad Hoc* Committee created in 1972, but has the same membership—Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, Sweden, and Turkey.

The second resolution, adopted by a vote of 23 (U.S.) to 4, with no abstentions, welcomed the establishment by the Commission of an *Ad Hoc* Committee for the Far East Region and authorized the Committee to make a study tour of the countries of the region. The Committee, composed of Australia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Thailand, and the

<sup>7</sup> Members in 1973 were Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia.

United Kingdom, undertook the study tour from October 7 to November 7. It visited Hong Kong, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Viet-Nam, Singapore, Sri Lanka, and Thailand in order to be able to report to the Commission the most suitable means of promoting more effective cooperation and mutual assistance in the suppression of the illicit drug traffic within the region. The Committee concluded after its tour that efforts to suppress opium trafficking were well underway and that a formal regional organization was not required to achieve the objectives. It recommended that regular meetings under UN auspices should be held for regional enforcement officers.

The third resolution, adopted by a vote of 23 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions, invited WHO to assist the Commission on Narcotic Drugs by preparing timely analytical reports on epidemiological patterns of drug abuse and requested the Secretary General to make available to WHO all relevant information on drug abuse.

The fourth resolution, adopted by a vote of 23 (U.S.) to 4, with no abstentions, decided to convene a special session of the Commission in 1974 in addition to its regular biennial session in 1975.

#### *General Assembly*

The Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the portion of ECOSOC's report concerned with drug control on November 28 and 29. In a statement on November 28 the U.S. Representative, Congressman John H. Buchanan, Jr., reviewed developments during the year and concluded:

"Extraordinary efforts are required, but the hope of success is real if we maintain our national commitments and continue our cooperation with other nations and with international organizations. I pledge that my government will carry on with its efforts both within the United States and in cooperation with other nations to reduce drug abuse and bring it under effective control."

The Committee approved three resolutions, all cosponsored by the United States, which were subsequently adopted by the Assembly on December 14. The first resolution, introduced by Afghanistan and ultimately sponsored by 11 states, urged all states to assist developing countries in the field of narcotics control, both directly and through the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control. It was approved by the Committee by a vote of 89 (U.S.) to 0, with 8 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 118 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions.

The second resolution, introduced by the United States and sponsored by 15 states, urgently appealed to governments for "sustained support and increased voluntary contributions to the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control." It was approved in the Committee by a vote of 91 (U.S.) to 0, with 8 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 119 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions.

The third resolution, also introduced by the United States and sponsored by 12 states, stressed the importance of universal accession to drug control treaties. It was approved by a vote of 93 (U.S.) to 0, with 9 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 119 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions. By the end of the year 102 states (including the United States) were parties to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs; 24 (including the United States) had

ratified or acceded to the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention, which will enter into force 30 days after the deposit of the 40th ratification or accession; and 17 were parties to the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, which will enter into force 90 days after the deposit of the 40th ratification or accession. The United States has not yet ratified the Convention on Psychotropic Substances

### *Fund for Drug Abuse Control*

The UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control, a trust fund supported by voluntary contributions, was established by the Secretary General in 1971 to provide the international drug control system with an organ capable of launching action programs against drug abuse. The Fund was designed to promote and assist programs affecting the supply of illicit drugs in remote areas where narcotics are grown, the smuggling routes through which the drugs travel, and the demand for illicit drugs at their actual or potential points of destination. On April 1, 1973, the Secretary General designated Dr. Sten Martens (Sweden), Director of the UN Division of Narcotic Drugs, as Acting Executive Director of the Fund replacing Dr. Carl W. A. Schurmann (Netherlands) whose term expired.

The Fund has launched a host of programs of various sizes and natures. From a total budget of \$2.5 million in 1973 it spent about 34% on programs for substituting other crops for opium and cannabis in Thailand and Lebanon. About 28% was spent to improve control measures through programs encouraging international cooperation, such as the *Ad Hoc* Committee's visit to the Far East, referred to above: strengthening law enforcement in various countries by training programs and assistance to narcotics laboratories; and assisting countries that want to improve national programs, planning, and legislation. About 9% of the Fund's expenditures were for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs; 7% for chemical, pharmacological, medical, sociological, and other research; 12% for program development; and 10% for Fund administration.

The U.S. Government has provided \$8 million of the \$10 million contributed so far to the Fund.

### *Specialized Agencies*

Coordination of drug related activity within the UN family was advanced significantly by the establishment within the framework of the ACC of an Inter-Agency Advisory Committee to review and appraise activities within the drug abuse area; to take or recommend steps to develop and improve coordination; to make recommendations on broad objectives in drug abuse control and contribute to the formulation of programs; and to advise the Executive Director of the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control on criteria and procedures for funding projects and on the participation of appropriate UN agencies in project execution. The Committee held its first meeting in Geneva, September 17-19, and examined in detail the short-term (2-year) and medium-term (4-year) objectives of the United Nations in the area of controlling drug abuse.

The Fund continues to associate appropriate specialized agencies and international bodies with its activities. For example, in the Thailand program, the FAO, WHO, ILO, and UNESCO are cooperating



with the UN Division of Narcotic Drugs in program execution. The program in Lebanon was the result of a joint mission of the FAO and the Division, and is being executed by the FAO.

#### DISASTER RELIEF

The United Nations continued to respond to calls for assistance from disaster-stricken countries in 1973. The UN Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO), authorized by the General Assembly on December 14, 1971, provided assistance and helped coordinate relief efforts in a number of disaster situations. In addressing the Third Committee of the General Assembly on November 27, the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, Faruk N. Berkol of Turkey, noted that UNDRO had acted in a total of 33 disaster situations. During 1973 these had included floods in Pakistan, Algeria, Ecuador, and Tunisia; famine in Chad, Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, and Upper Volta; epidemics in Bahrain, Malawi, Nepal, Tunisia, and the Yemen Arab Republic; a cyclone in Tonga; volcanic eruption in Iceland; and fires in Gambia. UNDRO's actions had taken such forms as gathering accurate information on disasters, assessing needs, informing donors—governments and nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations—of the needs, and channeling funds for emergency assistance. In addition, the Office is charged with promoting pre-disaster planning and preparedness.

The operations of UNDRO were discussed by the General Assembly's Third Committee on November 27 and 28. The Committee expressed general satisfaction with UNDRO's work and adopted by acclamation a resolution authorizing the Secretary General, as an interim measure, to draw on the working capital fund in the amount of \$45,000 in 1974 and \$60,000 in 1975 for pre-disaster planning. The resolution was adopted by the 28th General Assembly on December 14 without objection.

Earlier in the session the Fifth Committee had approved a budget, subsequently adopted by the General Assembly, of \$1,018,000 for UNDRO for 1974-75. Included in the budget was \$400,000 for emergency assistance funding that the Coordinator may provide to disaster-stricken countries. Normally not more than \$20,000 would be provided in any one disaster, but this symbolic amount, especially if given quickly, can help fill a gap or meet an urgent need.

In many major disasters, several agencies of the UN system are involved in relief activities. During the Ethiopian famine in 1973, for example, UN organizations working with the Ethiopian government to assess requirements and mobilize substantial relief shipments included the FAO, WFP, UNDP, and UNICEF. Similarly, international aid to Pakistan following disastrous floods there in August 1973 was forthcoming from many UN agencies as well as from governments and voluntary agencies. The U.S. Government, within the first 2 months after the Pakistan floods, provided emergency assistance in cash, goods, and services totaling more than \$24 million. U.S. voluntary agencies provided more than \$500,000 in the same period. Organizations in the UN system—the Secretary General's fund, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO, and WFP—gave more than \$3 million.

*Sahelian Drought*

By 1973 the drought that had plagued the Sudano-Sahelian region of Africa (Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, and Upper Volta) for several years had assumed catastrophic proportions. Tenuous subsistence economies, already strained by five successive droughts, reduced harvests and by near-famine, did not have the reserve stocks or the foreign exchange to meet expected needs.

A series of initiatives taken throughout the UN system sought to assist in overcoming the drought disaster. The Secretary General designated the FAO to serve as the focal point for UN emergency aid to the region and vested responsibility for the coordination of medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation assistance in the Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, Bradford Morse.

Aid to the Sudano-Sahelian populations threatened with famine was given priority attention by the General Assembly, which adopted without objection on October 17 a resolution recommended by its Second Committee on measures to be taken for the benefit of the region. The resolution noted with interest the establishment of two coordinating bodies, a Special Sahelian Office within the UN Secretariat in New York and the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel at Ouagadougou, Upper Volta. The resolution further urged medium- and long-term financial, development, and research assistance from member governments, UN specialized agencies, and international financing institutions. For the shorter term, the UN Secretary General and the Director General of FAO were requested to continue advance planning and provision of temporary assistance in order to overcome the problems of supply, storage, and distribution in 1974.

A second resolution, approved by acclamation in the Third Committee on November 28 and adopted by the General Assembly without objection on December 14, appealed to member states and UN organs and specialized agencies to consider increasing their assistance to the Sudano-Sahelian countries, making particular reference to a joint appeal for emergency assistance issued on November 26 by the UN Secretary General and the FAO Director General.

The United Nations and its specialized agencies surveyed the regional requirements and established machinery to coordinate donor efforts. The FAO Director General requested contributions toward an FAO Sahelian Drought Trust Fund of \$15 million. In response to this appeal, donors contributed about \$10 million in cash and kind during the first phase of Sahelian emergency relief. UNICEF and WHO provided high-protein foods and medicines for particularly vulnerable groups—the aged, the infirm, and children. In addition, the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator provided a cash grant of \$100,000. The UNDP, UNEP, and FAO coordinated their approaches to mid- and long-term Sahelian programs.

The U.S. Government provided substantial assistance for all phases of the Sahelian recovery program, in cooperation with other bilateral donors and multilateral organizations. By the end of 1973, the \$15 million trust fund was almost entirely subscribed and included \$5 million from U.S. voluntary organizations. Apart from this multi-

lateral effort, the U.S. Government provided \$80 million bilaterally for Sahelian relief and rehabilitation.

#### *Relief Operation in Dacca*

The UN Relief Operation in Dacca (UNROD) began in 1971 following the outbreak of hostilities between India and Pakistan to assist in restoring an adequate food distribution system and a transportation and communications infrastructure in Bangladesh. UNROD's chief operational responsibilities during 1972 and the beginning of 1973 were assessment of the food situation, global appeals for foodgrain contributions, and scheduling and distribution of foodgrain deliveries. Although it was originally anticipated that the emergency relief operation would be completed by March 31, 1973, it became apparent at the beginning of the year that substantial imports of foodgrains would continue to be required. The operational responsibilities and name of the program were modified after March 1973, when UNROD became the UN Special Relief Office in Bangladesh (UNROB). UNROB gradually phased out its operation, turning over its responsibilities, including handling and scheduling of foodgrain deliveries, to Bangladesh authorities. The office in Dacca terminated its operations on December 31, 1973, and in the words of the UN Secretary General "attained all its basic objectives." According to figures compiled by UNROB, the international community had contributed some \$1.3 billion (including \$432 million from the U.S. Government through fiscal year 1973) for Bangladesh relief.

#### UN HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

The fundamental mission of the UNHCR<sup>8</sup> is to provide legal and political protection for refugees and to promote permanent solutions to refugee problems. These tasks are carried out on behalf of (1) refugees falling within the scope of the statute of his office as defined by the General Assembly in 1950, and (2) refugees whom he assists through his good offices under authority contained in pertinent resolutions adopted by the General Assembly or at the request of the Secretary General.

An Executive Committee of 31 nations, including the United States, reviews and supervises the High Commissioner's activities. The 24th session of the Executive Committee was held in Geneva, October 8-16, 1973. The U.S. Representative at the session was Francis L. Kellogg, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs.

#### *Legal and Political Protection*

International protection of refugees is the High Commissioner's most important function, the foundation of which is strengthening and assuring the institution of asylum and preventing forcible repatriation. The basic legal implements of protection are the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol that extends the application of the Convention by removing the limitation on eligibility to persons who become refugees "as a result of events occurring before 1951." By the end of 1973, 64 states were

<sup>8</sup> Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan (Iran) is the High Commissioner for Refugees.

parties to the Convention and 57, including the United States, to the Protocol.

These international treaties explicitly prohibit the return of a refugee, in any manner whatsoever, to any country in which his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion. The treaties also set forth specific obligations, to be accepted by contracting states, concerning the refugee's status and rights in the country of asylum, e.g., the right to work, education, freedom of religion, access to courts and social security, the right to leave and return to the country of asylum, and specified rights to equal treatment and protection of the law. Possession of these rights protects the legal, political, and social position of the refugee in the country of refuge and facilitates his reestablishment on a basis of self-support and dignity.

### *Special Project on the Asian Subcontinent*

At the request of the Secretary General, the UNHCR acted as "focal point" for the UN emergency relief program in India from April 1971 to March 1972. This coordinated UN effort terminated with the repatriation and resettlement in their homelands of approximately 9.8 million Bengalis. The successful completion of this program, however, did not bring stability to South Asia. The continued existence of captive persons remained a source of tension in both Pakistan and Bangladesh which adversely affected the prospects for a movement toward stability in that area.

The August 28, 1973, agreement signed in New Delhi by Pakistan and India with the concurrence of Bangladesh paved the way for an exchange of captive populations between Bangladesh and Pakistan. Prior to the agreement, however, the UNHCR carried out limited repatriation movements of groups of persons from Pakistan to Bangladesh and from Nepal to Pakistan. On September 16, the Secretary General requested the UNHCR to continue as "executing agent" in the movement of over 200,000 persons to their homelands in Pakistan and Bangladesh. The UNHCR immediately launched a worldwide appeal for \$14.3 million to implement the mass repatriation by airlift. The United States contributed \$2.15 million toward this effort.

By the end of 1973 the UNHCR, with the supporting assistance of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) and the ICRC had facilitated the repatriation of 100,000 persons between Pakistan and Bangladesh. Concerned voluntary agencies also participated in this program.

### *Material Assistance Program*

The High Commissioner's program of material assistance is directed toward promoting permanent solutions to refugee problems. Since its inception in 1955, this program has provided emergency relief, facilitated voluntary repatriation, and promoted resettlement in different countries. It has also provided assistance to severely handicapped refugees needing care in institutions, an area in which UNHCR has performed especially notable work.

UNHCR material assistance is rendered in response to a host government's request for such assistance. The UNHCR takes into account

the measure of assistance given by that government and other sources, the urgency of the situation, and the prevailing local conditions. In 1973, the trend of recent years continued with a relatively low level of assistance in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, moderately increasing assistance in the Middle East, and significantly increasing assistance in Africa.

*Europe.*—The refugee population in Europe remained relatively stable during the year and the UNHCR therefore continued his previous year's modest level of assistance. Although the High Commissioner continued to carry out projects in Spain such as local settlement, counselling, emergency relief, and temporary accommodations for refugees from the Caribbean area, there was a progressively decreasing caseload of refugees. Refugees from the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European countries continued to emigrate to Western European countries throughout 1973. However, these refugees required only limited UNHCR aid as host governments and voluntary agencies rendered assistance to them and ICEM and the U.S. Refugee Program (USRP) facilitated the resettlement of a majority in other countries.

*Asia.*—During 1973 the UNHCR material assistance program in India was being gradually phased out as the Government of India and voluntary agencies assumed increasing responsibilities for such assistance. During 1973 UNHCR assistance benefitted refugees of European origin temporarily residing in Hong Kong after leaving China. In Southeast Asia, assistance was extended by the UNHCR to the Vietnamese Red Cross for emergency relief and rural settlement of refugees in Vietnam. The UNHCR began to establish and strengthen contacts with Southeast Asian governments in order to determine the types of further assistance needed by refugees in this area. At the 24th session of the UNHCR Executive Committee the United States made a commitment to contribute \$100,000 to the UNHCR on behalf of Cambodian refugees in Vietnam.

*Latin America.*—After the change of government in Chile in September 1973, the international community and the High Commissioner's office developed a deep interest in the resettlement of the foreign refugees in that country and in insuring that such refugees were not forcibly repatriated to their respective countries of origin.

The UNHCR immediately sought and received from the new Government of Chile assurances that it would observe its obligations under the Convention and the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, and dispatched his Latin American representative to Santiago to assess the refugee problem and to work there to facilitate resettlement. The new government has cooperated with the UNHCR efforts to assure safe conduct of refugees out of Chile to other countries of resettlement.

The UNHCR also carried out a successful appeal to governments to provide resettlement opportunities on behalf of refugees in Chile. As of the end of 1973, approximately one-half of an estimated 3,000 registered refugees in Chile had been resettled.

Approximately 130,000 other refugees within UNHCR concern were scattered throughout Latin America. An estimated 90% of these refugees were of European origin, while the remainder were Latin American. The UNHCR began to phase out the revolving funds which in past years had financed vocational training, rehabilitation, pensions

loans, and medical care. During 1973, the UNHCR instead cooperated principally with committees of voluntary agencies and with governmental services to appraise refugee needs and to render assistance where particularly needed.

*Middle East.*—The number of refugees of UNHCR concern during 1973 in Lebanon, Cyprus, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, and Syria was estimated at 11,000. These refugees were mainly stateless Assyrians, stateless Armenians, and members of other minority groups. In addition, the 3,500 refugees in Egypt included several hundred refugees of European origin and a number of student refugees of African origin. The General Assembly decided in 1950 that the competence of the High Commissioner should not apply to any person who received protection or assistance from other organs or agencies of the United Nations. The Palestinian refugees, who receive assistance from UNRWA, therefore do not fall within the concern of UNHCR.

Throughout 1973, the UNHCR worked toward local settlement of refugees in the Middle East. UNHCR assistance funds for Middle East refugees were allocated for supplementary aid and counselling of refugees, the location of refugees in existing homes for the aged, medical care, vocational training and educational assistance, the construction of a new home for the aged, and the construction of a poultry and dairy farm.

Because adequate low cost housing is particularly necessary for a satisfactory solution to the refugee problem in this area, the UNHCR worked with the Government of Lebanon and voluntary agencies toward implementing a pilot housing scheme in Lebanon.

*Africa.*—The continent of Africa, where there are refugee problems involving more than 1 million persons, continued to present the greatest need for UNHCR assistance. More than 60% of the UNHCR assistance budget was allocated to Africa during 1973.

The successful return to their homes in the southern Sudan of an estimated 143,800 Sudanese refugees from neighboring countries and more than 300,000 persons displaced within Sudan made 1973 a landmark year. The effectiveness of the UNHCR as coordinator of the UN Immediate Relief Program and the massive aid furnished by the international community and private organizations made this return movement possible. Financial assistance specifically donated by governments and on-the-scene assistance by voluntary organizations helped provide farm tools and seeds, the reconstruction of health and educational facilities, the repair of buildings and roads, and the airlift to transport many of these essentials. When the UNHCR's task as coordinator of the emergency phase of the Sudanese refugee problem ended late in 1973, a smooth transition was made to more permanent measures of reconstruction within the Sudan under the aegis of the UNDP.

Various groups of refugees from colonial territories in Africa comprised in 1973 about half of the refugees on the continent. These groups included 421,000 refugees from Angola in Zaire, Botswana, and Zambia; 82,000 from Portuguese Guinea in Senegal; 44,500 from Mozambique in Tanzania and Zambia; and 1,000 from Namibia in Zambia. In many of these countries, including Zambia, Tanzania, Botswana, Zaire, and Senegal, the UNHCR contributed to emergency relief, medical care, community development, primary education, and strength-

ening the economic integration of refugees in rural and urban areas. The UNHCR assistance was supplementary as the host governments assumed or planned to assume the financial responsibilities to assist these refugees in becoming self-sufficient.

An estimated 135,000 refugees from Rwanda in Zaire, Tanzania, Burundi, and Uganda comprised the second largest group of refugees in Africa. Allocations from the UNHCR Emergency Fund; food from the WFP, and financial assistance and supplies from voluntary agencies furnished these refugees with medical supplies, food, shelter, seed for crops, and materials for the construction of housing and roads. Moreover, contributions from the UNHCR Refugee Education Account helped Rwandan refugees pursue secondary and higher studies and paid the salaries of primary school teachers within various refugee settlements.

There were an estimated 90,000 refugees from Burundi in Tanzania, Rwanda, and Zaire. The UNHCR continued to provide emergency relief to the refugees in Rwanda and Zaire, assisted Tanzania in the expansion and strengthening of the infrastructure of existing settlements, and helped establish an essential new refugee settlement in Tanzania. In time, this settlement is expected to become agriculturally self-sufficient. In Rwanda, it became necessary to move 10,000 Burundi refugees onto new sites in the extreme northeast of the country away from border tension areas. The UNHCR and other UN organizations provided assistance to these refugees and supervised their move.

Other UNHCR projects in Africa included assistance for refugees from Ethiopia and Zaire in the Sudan, from Zaire in Uganda, from the Sudan in Ethiopia, and refugees of various origins in Kenya and the countries of West and Central Africa.

### *Finances*

The basic UNHCR budget for the administration of the UNHCR Program and its global representation and activities is part of the regular UN budget. The UNCHR Material Assistance Program is financed by voluntary contributions. Most of the funds for the 1973 Material Assistance Program of \$7,839,400 came from 71 governments, including the United States. Various nongovernmental sources also contributed. In addition the UNHCR has a \$500,000 Emergency Fund, authorized by the General Assembly in 1957, which enables him to act swiftly in the initial phase of new refugee situations. The Fund is regularly replenished by the repayment of refugee loans and by voluntary contributions. At the 24th session of the Executive Committee a budget of \$8,739,000 was approved for the 1974 Material Assistance Program.

The United States contributed \$1 million toward the 1973 UNHCR Material Assistance Program, \$2.15 million to the program for the exchange of persons on the Asian subcontinent, \$50,000 for newly arriving refugees in the Middle East, and \$75,000 for the 6th Biennial World Conference of the World Peace Through Law Center which devoted major attention to the subject of refugee protection. In addition the United States provided more than \$190 million through other channels to refugees of concern to the UNHCR including \$52,307,000 for refugees from the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, \$135.4 million for Cuban refugees in the United States, \$500,000 for Chinese refugees

in Hong Kong and Macao, \$225,000 for southern African refugee students, \$1,750,000 through ICEM, and significant quantities of agricultural commodities for various categories of refugees.

### *Cooperation with Other UN Bodies*

The UNHCR continued to work with other UN organizations to lessen the time required for refugees to become self-sufficient. These other organizations included FAO and WHO which assisted in agricultural and health matters; UNESCO which helped educate and train refugees; UNICEF which concentrated on the welfare of children; WFP which supplied food; the UNDP which consolidated the positions of refugees settled in new rural communities; and ITU and WMO which provided technical assistance in their particular fields.

### *General Assembly Action*

On December 14 the 28th General Assembly adopted without objection a resolution recommended by its Third Committee which expressed the Assembly's deep satisfaction with the work of the High Commissioner and urged all governments to support his humanitarian work.

In preambular paragraphs, the resolution, which was sponsored in the Third Committee by 43 states, including the United States, recognized the importance of voluntary repatriation as a permanent solution to refugee problems, and noted the increasing number of governments contributing to the UNHCR Material Assistance Program and the generous attitudes of governments toward supporting UNHCR activities. In its main operative paragraphs the resolution requested the High Commissioner to continue his cooperation with governments, UN bodies, and voluntary agencies to promote permanent and speedy solutions through voluntary repatriation, assistance in rehabilitation when necessary, and integration in countries of asylum or resettlement in other countries.

Delegates from many countries commended the High Commissioner on the completion of a difficult operation in the Sudan, for his efforts in providing care, maintenance and finding resettlement opportunities for stateless Asians, and on his role as "executing agent" for the ongoing repatriation on the Asian subcontinent.

On December 1, the Assembly approved by acclamation the Secretary General's recommendation that the term of office of Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan be extended a further 5 years to December 31, 1978.

### UNICEF

The UN Children's Fund was established by the General Assembly in 1946 as a temporary body to provide emergency assistance after World War II. In 1953 the Assembly made the Fund permanent and charged it with giving assistance in the development of permanent child health and welfare services. Its activities are directed by an Executive Board of 30 states<sup>9</sup> which meets annually. In 1973 it met at UN Headquarters in New York from April 30 through May 11.

<sup>9</sup> Members in 1973 were Algeria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Gabon, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Malawi, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.



*Program Activities*

In 1973 the Executive Board approved \$69.5 million in new commitments for projects in 52 countries and for regional projects. With previous commitments this provided UNICEF assistance for children in 111 countries and territories—38 in Africa, 32 in the Americas, 26 in Asia, 14 in the Eastern Mediterranean, and 1 in Europe. There were an estimated 780 million children (through the age of 15) in these countries.

UNICEF assistance was provided in a variety of ways. Almost 100,000 institutions and centers providing services for children received UNICEF equipment and supplies during 1973. Over 220,000 national personnel received UNICEF stipends for training to work in services benefiting children. Some 95% of those receiving UNICEF stipends were trained in short courses of 3 months or less, reflecting UNICEF's emphasis on the training of auxiliary and middle-level workers and on refresher and reorientation courses.

In recent years the UNICEF Executive Board has stressed that particular attention should be given to the least developed countries, and to the disadvantaged areas of poor and populous countries that are not effectively serviced with health facilities and schools. During 1973 UNICEF assisted 23 of the 25 countries designated by the United Nations at least developed (see footnote on p. 87) as well as three other countries that are considered least developed for purposes of UNICEF's program. In these countries, each with an average annual per capita income of \$80 or less, the amount of assistance per child was about twice that delivered to countries with a per capita income of \$80-\$400. UNICEF's goal is to raise that proportion of aid for the least developed areas to three times that for the next higher income level.

Maternal and child health has continued to be the largest UNICEF program area with 53% of 1973 expenditures going for health projects in 97 countries. WHO, in cooperation with UNICEF, began a study of patterns of delivery of health services to disadvantaged areas, the findings of which will be presented to the Executive Board in 1975, after consideration by the UNICEF/WHO Joint Committee on Health Policy. An important aspect of the health program is family planning. The Executive Board in 1973 authorized the Executive Director to accept financing by UNFPA of family planning components of UNICEF assisted projects. In 1973 UNFPA allocated \$4.8 million to UNICEF. Sixteen countries in all geographic areas received UNICEF assistance specifically for family planning projects. In addition, in about 30 countries UNICEF closely integrated family planning services with its ongoing maternal and child health projects.

Other special health emphases included the provision of clean drinking water, which is one of the most important factors affecting the health of young children. About 13% of total UNICEF expenditures in 1973 went toward helping village drinking water programs in 68 countries. An effort at preventing blindness due to vitamin A deficiency, which began in 1971, was being carried out in Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines. Under this project, high-potency vitamin A capsules are given once every 6 months. By the end of 1973 distribution of the capsules had reached about two-thirds of the 15 million children under the age of 5 in Bangladesh.

Education was the second largest program area, with 20% of 1973 expenditures going for projects in 91 countries. During 1973 the Board also considered an interim report entitled, "Non-Formal Education for Rural Development: Strengthening Learning Opportunities for Children and Youth." The report, sponsored and largely financed by UNICEF, was prepared by the International Council for Educational Development. It concluded that rural children in developing countries were even more educationally deprived than was generally assumed and that nothing short of a massive and innovative effort over the next 20 years would correct the situation. The report also contained preliminary recommendations for developing a long-range educational program for these children. The Executive Board decided to place consideration of the final report on its agenda for 1974.

WHO has estimated that almost one-quarter of the children up to age 5 in developing countries are suffering from moderate or severe protein-calorie malnutrition. Some 7% of expenditures went for nutrition projects in 64 countries. UNICEF supported applied nutrition programs in rural areas, the production of weaning foods, the processing of milk, and the channeling of donated supplementary food for children through maternal and child health centers and schools. Emphasis in 1973 was placed on improving the production of weaning foods that would be acceptable to mothers as well as nutritionally sound for infants.

During 1973 about 10% of UNICEF's program expenditures were for prompt, flexible assistance to children and their mothers in disaster situations. These included floods in Pakistan, drought in Ethiopia and the Sahelian region of Africa, and war in the Middle East. The Executive Board unanimously approved a recommendation by the Executive Director, Henry R. Labouisse (U.S.), for relief and rehabilitation for mothers and children in the war-torn areas of Indochina. This included \$3 million from UNICEF's general resources for the purpose of continuing and expanding projects in the Khmer Republic, Laos, and the Republic of Viet-Nam. The Executive Director also received authority to make a special appeal to countries that had indicated their wish to assist in a program for the whole of Indochina, including North Viet-Nam and areas controlled by the self-styled "Provisional Revolutionary Government in South Viet-Nam." The U.S. Representative, during the debate, urged that this aid be channelled through the International Red Cross to assure that the special assistance would go to needy mothers and children as intended. The United States did not contribute to this special appeal.

### *Financial Support*

In 1973, UNICEF's income was \$95.8 million of which 124 governments contributed \$52.7 million to the general resources and another \$9.8 million for designated projects. The United States contributed \$15 million (plus an additional \$2.4 million worth of P.L. 480 commodities and shipping). An additional \$8.7 million was available from funds in trust. Contributions worldwide from nongovernmental sources were \$9.8 million, the profit from the sale of greeting cards was \$7 million, and \$7.8 million came from other sources.

Because of its concern that UNICEF might not reach its goal of \$100 million for commitments by the Executive Board in 1975, the

Board in 1973 requested ECOSOC to recommend that the General Assembly convene a special pledging conference for UNICEF in 1974. In a resolution adopted by consensus on August 9 the 55th ECOSOC made such a recommendation. The 28th General Assembly on December 13 adopted with a vote a resolution reaffirming its support for UNICEF and requesting the Secretary General to convene during the 29th General Assembly the special pledging conference "to facilitate the attainment of the target figure of \$100 million in the Fund's resources by 1975."

### *Administrative Matters*

During its 1973 meeting, the Executive Board authorized a study of UNICEF by a firm of outside management consultants. The study will have the broad objective of determining how UNICEF might secure more benefits for children for each unit of money and time spent. The study, which the United States supported, will reexamine UNICEF's delivery mechanisms, especially in view of the prospective expansion of its program level to \$100 million in 1975. Other considerations will be the definition of program and administrative costs; the level of these costs in comparison to workload; long-range recruitment and personnel policy; engagement of women in higher level positions; greater employment of national staff and the use of more volunteers; and the examination of headquarters and regional operations and of country programming assistance down to the village level.

### SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The 32-member Commission for Social Development,<sup>10</sup> a functional commission of ECOSOC which meets biennially, held its 23d session at UN Headquarters, February 12–March 2, 1973. Much of its attention focused on consideration of social factors as an integral part of the development process.

### *Experience in Achieving Social Change*

On the initiative of the U.S.S.R., the Commission and ECOSOC in 1971 had requested the Secretary General to prepare a "Report on National Experience in Achieving Far-Reaching Social and Economic Changes for Purposes of Social Progress." The report was based on replies from 44 governments to a UN questionnaire requesting information on the relevant experience during the past 20 years.

The Commission approved two resolutions on the report which it recommended to ECOSOC for adoption. The first, sponsored by Italy and the United Kingdom, concluded that the economic, political, and cultural differences among countries limited the scope for utilizing the experience gained by other countries. At the same time it emphasized the importance, for governments who were adopting measures designed to achieve far-reaching social and economic changes, of the free interchange of experiences and ideas between their nationals and those of other countries. This resolution, which did not call for any

<sup>10</sup> Members during 1973 were Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Mauritania, New Zealand, Nigeria, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

further action on the report, was adopted by the Commission by a vote of 12 (U.S.) to 7, with 5 abstentions.

The second resolution, sponsored by Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R., stressed the great importance of fundamental internal socio-economic changes to safeguard national independence and to ensure improvement in the well-being of the population, recommended that the Secretary General "continue and intensify" the study, and requested that the report be considered at the 55th (summer) session of ECOSOC and the 28th General Assembly. The Commission approved this resolution by a vote of 13 to 4, with 8 abstentions (U.S.).

ECOSOC considered the Secretary's report during its 54th (spring) session, and instead of adopting either of the resolutions recommended by the Commission adopted a new resolution sponsored by Pakistan and 10 other states that sought to merge the two. This resolution, *inter alia*, (1) recommended that appropriate measures be taken at all levels to insure more active participation by the entire population in the policies and programs designed to achieve social progress, taking into account the experience of other governments in this field; (2) recommended that the Secretary General, in consultation with the UN Research Institute for Social Development,<sup>11</sup> continue the study of national experience in carrying out fundamental democratic social and economic changes, make a detailed analysis of this question in his periodic reports on the world social situation, and include the question in the work program of the Commission for Social Development; and (3) decided to include the question on the agenda of the 56th ECOSOC and recommended its inclusion on the agenda of the 29th General Assembly. This resolution was adopted on May 16 by a vote of 24 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.). The United States abstained because it objected to references in the preambular section to multinational corporations and to the "obligations" of the developed toward the developing countries.

#### *Unified Approach to Development Analysis and Planning*

The need for an approach to development analysis and planning that will fully integrate both the economic and social factors is of primary concern to the United States. The Commission had before it during its consideration of this topic a preliminary report by the Secretary General and a report on the meeting in Stockholm in November 1972 of an expert group on this subject. The Secretary General's study is being carried out in response to 1970 requests from ECOSOC and the General Assembly that he suggest specific measures for the refinement and unification of methods for collecting and evaluating social data and evolve methods and techniques for the application of a unified approach to development.

The Commission came to the unanimous conclusion that nationwide unified planning was a means of promoting balanced social and economic development and that the utilization in practice of a comprehensive and unified approach to development planning could involve socio-economic structural reforms. But many Commission members, including the United States, believed that the preliminary report was

<sup>11</sup>The UN Research Institute for Social Development undertakes research into the interrelationship of economic and social development and methods of social planning. The Institute, which started operations in 1964, was established on the basis of a special contribution by the Netherlands. It is financed by voluntary contributions.

too theoretical and the Commission generally agreed that the final report should put greater stress on provisions for the implementation of the unified approach, including concrete practical measures.

On February 27 the Commission unanimously approved a draft resolution sponsored by Egypt and the U.S.S.R. that would have ECOSOC, *inter alia*, (1) consider it appropriate to regard comprehensive and unified national planning as a means of achieving balanced social and economic development; (2) recommend that governments "examine their development strategies, national plans, and structures from the point of view of their conformity with the requirements of a unified approach and the principles of social development and peace in the world"; (3) request the Secretary General to complete the study on the unified approach submitting it, together with suitable recommendations, to ECOSOC in 1974 and to the Commission in 1975; and (4) request the Secretary General to inscribe the question of the unified approach on the agenda of the 29th General Assembly.

The proposed resolution, after some minor modifications, was adopted by ECOSOC on May 16 by a vote of 25 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention.

#### *Implementation of the International Development Strategy*

In considering the question of the review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade, the Commission had before it a report by the Secretary General on the social objectives and related policies and programs in the national plans of 33 selected developing countries. The report was the first of several in which it was proposed to assess the successes and difficulties encountered in achieving the social objectives of the Decade.

During the debate the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Jean Picker, noted that one of the most important conclusions in the report was that there was a need for even further improvement in relating programs to objectives and a corresponding need to improve internal coordination among programs in various sectors of society. She observed that this reinforced the importance of the unified approach to development and urged the Commission to play the leading role, as requested by both ECOSOC and the General Assembly, to ensure the integration of social factors in the implementation of the strategy.

A number of members believed, however, that the report, which was just a first analysis of the plans of a limited number of developing countries, was inadequate for the Commission to make a meaningful contribution. They believed that not only all documents directly assessing the Development Decade but also those on special social problems must be available to the Commission.

France, with six cosponsors, introduced a draft resolution observing that the Commission could not fully discharge the function assigned it by ECOSOC and the General Assembly because of insufficient documentation and requesting ECOSOC to ask the Secretariat, for the next session of the Commission, to provide the necessary documents to enable the Commission to make its contribution to the review and appraisal of the strategy.

The Commission adopted the resolution on February 23 by a vote of 25 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention. ECOSOC considered the resolution at its 54th session and amplified it by inviting the specialized agencies and the regional economic commissions to cooperate in the preparation of the relevant data and requesting the UN Research Institute for Social Development to undertake further studies on the establishment of social standards and indicators for the use of the Commission in the review and appraisal process. ECOSOC adopted the expanded resolution without objection on May 16.

The Commission adopted unanimously on March 1 a second resolution, sponsored by France and seven other states, requesting ECOSOC to consider, as "preliminary comments and proposals," that (1) there should be effective coordination and cooperation in the review and appraisal process between the United Nations and the specialized agencies; (2) studies relating to implementation of the International Development Strategy should be comprehensive; (3) the Secretariat should continue to study the methodology for a unified socio-economic examination of development; (4) the organs responsible for appraisal should take into account the general social objectives of integrated development; and (5) UN members should follow a unified approach to development planning and implementation.

#### *Migrant Workers*

During consideration of its work program, the Commission on March 1 unanimously approved a draft resolution sponsored by Jamaica, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia that was recommended for adoption by ECOSOC. The resolution (1) invited governments of both emigrant and immigrant countries (a) to take action aimed at improving the position of migrant workers and their families, protecting them from discrimination and various hardships, and creating job opportunities for them in the countries of emigration and (b) to ensure migrant workers the protection of social security, appropriate housing, ethnic integrity, and protection from large-scale dismissal; and (2) decided to include the subject on the agendas of the Commission and ECOSOC in 1975. After minor amendments, ECOSOC unanimously adopted the resolution on May 16.

#### *Adoption Law*

In 1972 the General Assembly had adopted, on the initiative of Liberia, a resolution requesting the Commission on Social Development to consider the question of convening a UN conference for an international convention on adoption law and to make recommendations for the preparation of a report to the Assembly in 1974 that would include (1) policies, programs, and comparative law concerning the protection of children for adoption and foster placement, and (2) comments on the question of sponsoring an international conference for the purpose of elaborating an international convention on adoption law.

On March 1, by a vote of 26 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention, the Commission approved for adoption by ECOSOC a draft resolution, sponsored by Nigeria and the United Kingdom, that requested the Secretary General to (1) obtain the necessary information by means of a questionnaire to governments, (2) bring up to date the study published

in 1956 entitled "Comparative Analysis of Adoption Laws," and (3) prepare a concise report for consideration by ECOSOC and the General Assembly in 1974. ECOSOC adopted the resolution on May 16 by a vote of 19 (U.S.) to 0, with 8 abstentions.

### *Needs and Aspirations of Youth*

In June 1969 ECOSOC had requested the Secretary General, in collaboration with specialized agencies and organizations concerned with young people, to prepare an analytical study of the world social situation of youth. The Secretary General's 150-page report, based in part on interviews with young people, presented proposals for action by UN and other organizations, governments, and young people.

The Commission for Social Development considered the report at its 23d session and on March 1 approved, by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions, a draft resolution, sponsored by Yugoslavia and six other states, that it recommended for adoption by ECOSOC. On May 16, after minor amendments, ECOSOC adopted the resolution by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions.

The resolution took note of the action proposals in the Secretary General's report and recommended them to governments. In particular it recommended that governments (1) gear their educational policies and programs to the task of ensuring that education is more relevant to preparing youth for full participation in all aspects of life and development; (2) formulate health policies and implement health programs to ensure that young people will be physically able to take advantage of the opportunities open to them; (3) adopt all possible means to increase job opportunities for young people; and (4) increase opportunities for youth to participate in all aspects of national and international life. It recommended that governments and organizations appraise their policies and programs for youth in light of the Secretary General's report with a view to enabling youth to play a more effective role in promoting economic and social development and peace in the world. The resolution also urged that UN organizations (1) give special attention, in the process of reviewing and appraising the International Development Strategy, to questions of youth in development; and (2) strengthen their advisory services at national, regional, and international levels devoting particular attention to the participation of youth in economic and social development.

The Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the world social situation of youth at eight meetings between November 14 and 20, approving two resolutions on the latter day.

The first resolution, introduced by Romania and sponsored by 26 states in its final form, was titled "Concerted Action on the National and International Levels to Meet the Needs and Aspirations of Youth and to Promote their Participation in National and International Development." *Inter alia* it (1) recommended that UN reports on youth give more attention to the role of youth in the world of today; (2) requested the competent and concerned organizations of the UN system to give continued attention to regional and international meetings on the major problems of concern to the young generations; (3) requested ECOSOC to invite the Commission on Social Development to study the possibility of redefining an international policy concerning the involvement of youth at the national and international levels;

and (4) requested the Secretary General, in cooperation with governments, specialized agencies, and nongovernmental organizations to assemble data on the problems confronting youth and the manner in which they are being treated by UN bodies and to prepare a report designed to facilitate planning, especially for developing countries.

The second resolution, titled "Youth, its Education and its Responsibilities in the World Today," was introduced by Sierra Leone and sponsored by 18 states. *Inter alia* it urged governments to ensure to youth (1) more favorable conditions in the fields of education, training, health, social welfare, and employment; (2) an appropriate opportunity to participate in the preparation and implementation of national development plans and in programs of international cooperation; and (3) the possibility of participating in decisions on questions of national interest, particularly those that concern youth.

Both resolutions were adopted by the General Assembly without vote on December 14.

#### *Question of the Elderly and Aged*

The General Assembly in 1971 had requested the Secretary General to prepare a report on the aged and social change. A progress report was before the Commission in 1973.

On February 28 the Commission approved, for adoption by ECOSOC, a draft resolution sponsored by Jamaica, New Zealand, and the Ukrainian S.S.R. The resolution, *inter alia*, (1) recommended that governments introduce and expand social security schemes, provide sufficient institutions for the care of aged persons requiring medical treatment, and seek to ensure that aged persons protected by social welfare programs could participate in creative activities which would give them moral satisfaction; (2) requested the Commission to include the subject on its work program; (3) requested the Secretary General to consult with the ILO on the preparation of a comparative study of social security systems; and (4) decided to consider the question at the 56th ECOSOC in 1974. The Commission approved the resolution by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions, and ECOSOC adopted it on May 16 without objection.

The Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the question of the elderly and the aged at four meetings between November 9 and 14. It had before it the Secretary General's final report on the subject, containing information on conditions, needs, and services and suggested guidelines for national policies and international action concerning the elderly. On November 14 the Committee approved without objection two draft resolutions which the Assembly subsequently adopted without objection on December 14.

The first resolution, introduced by Malta and in its final form sponsored by 15 states, including the United States, *inter alia* requested the Secretary General to (1) assist governments on questions of planning for the elderly in the context of overall development programs and help them develop the manpower needed to provide various functions in the field of aging; (2) undertake studies on the interrelationships between demographic, social, and economic factors in aging; (3) promote research, at the international and national levels, for further development of policies and standards, planning and evaluation methods, and practical action in the field of the aging; and (4)



submit a progress report on the action taken under the present resolution to ECOSOC, through the Commission for Social Development, in 1977.

The second resolution, sponsored by the Ukrainian S.S.R. and Burundi, *inter alia* recommended that governments should carry out, to the extent national circumstances permit, the necessary social security measures within the framework of general planning, seeking to insure among other things that in city and district planning adequate attention is paid to architectural facilities for the aged and disabled. The resolution also invited ECOSOC to request the Commission for Social Development to include in its work program for 1974-77 questions relating to the place of social security in the system of social and economic planning and development.

#### CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The Committee on Crime Prevention and Control<sup>12</sup> held its second session May 14-23 at UN Headquarters in New York.

Following instructions from the 27th General Assembly, the Committee began to develop an international plan of action for controlling crime worldwide and decided to establish four subcommittees to deal with different aspects of the plan: (1) international violence and hijacking, (2) correctional practices for the prevention of crime, (3) law enforcement in relation to the prevention of crime, and (4) judicial procedures in relation to crime prevention.

The Committee also discussed the questions of drug abuse and criminality, equality in the administration of justice, and the agenda for the Fifth UN Congress on Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, which is scheduled for Toronto, Canada in 1975.

The issue of drug abuse and control proved of considerable complexity because distinctions had to be made among the kinds of drugs in use, their effects on the user, and the varying social attitudes in countries toward their use. It was generally agreed, however, that the problem has not received adequate attention, and it was strongly recommended that interdisciplinary studies on the relationships between drug abuse and criminality be sponsored.

In the Committee's view, equality in the administration of justice was dependent upon an individual's awareness of his rights and the availability of legal aid for all accused persons. Recognizing that this issue deserved attention, it recommended that regional institutes continue the development of courses on human rights and the administration of justice. In the meantime, the Committee decided to direct its attention toward formulating standard minimum rules for insuring equality of treatment. (See also *Human Rights*, p. 144.)

The Committee approved an agenda for the UN Congress that included the following items: (1) changes in forms and dimensions of criminality—transnational and national; (2) improvement in criminal legislation, law enforcement, judicial administration, and correctional systems with a view to the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders in the community; (3) emerging roles of the police and

<sup>12</sup> Fifteen experts appointed by ECOSOC for 3-year terms. Norman A. Carlson, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, is a member.

other law enforcement agencies with special reference to changing expectations and minimum standards of performance; (4) treatment of offenders in custody, with special reference to the implementation of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners; (5) economic and social consequences of crime: new challenges for research and planning.

The Third Committee of the General Assembly considered the question of "crime prevention and control" on November 19 and 20. On the latter day it approved without objection a resolution introduced by Canada, and also sponsored by Cameroon, Japan, Trinidad and Tobago, and United Kingdom, that reaffirmed the Assembly's wish that the Congress make an important and useful contribution to the solution of problems related to crime prevention and control and requested the Secretary General to ensure that the Secretariat's preparatory work for the Congress was adequate for its successful outcome. The Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote on December 14.

#### HOUSING, BUILDING, AND PLANNING

The Committee on Housing, Building, and Planning, a 27-member<sup>13</sup> standing committee of ECOSOC which meets biennially, held its eighth session in Geneva, October 15-26, 1973. It discussed, *inter alia*, a World Housing Survey, which had been prepared in response to a resolution adopted by the 24th General Assembly in 1969; UN technical cooperation activities in the field of housing, building, and planning; human environment as it relates to human settlements; and research projects being carried out by the Center for Housing, Building, and Planning (a part of the UN Secretariat).

The Committee adopted without a vote several resolutions, the most important of which (1) expressed full support for the UN Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements in 1976 and offered the Committee's expertise to the preparatory committee for the Conference-Exposition (see also p. 126); (2) took note of the General Assembly's consideration of the question of a 10% reduction in the military budgets of permanent members of the Security Council (see p. 43) and requested that, if such a reduction took place, an adequate share of the funds released be allocated to human settlements; and (3) urged that special attention be given by the Secretary General to studies on the production, use, and distribution of building materials and components derived from petroleum, particularly polymers, for low-cost housing.

#### SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND RESEARCH

##### UN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM

##### *Governing Council*

Recommended by the UN Conference on the Human Environment at Stockholm in 1972 and established by the 27th General Assembly, UNEP came into formal existence in temporary headquarters in

<sup>13</sup> Members in 1973 were Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Finland, France, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Libya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Spain, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

Geneva on January 1, 1973, under the leadership of Maurice Strong of Canada as Executive Director.

Utilizing temporary staff drawn from various parts of the UN system, and with the cooperation of the specialized agencies, the IAEA, and other UN bodies, UNEP began immediately to prepare for the first session of its 58-member Governing Council.<sup>14</sup> This session convened in Geneva June 12-22, 1973, to lay the ground work for the new program. The U.S. delegation was headed by Christian A. Herter, Jr., Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Environmental Affairs. Ingemund Bengtsson of Sweden, who had presided over the Stockholm Conference, was elected President of the Council's first session.

At its first session the Governing Council adopted procedures to govern the administration of the Environment Fund, established a set of priorities for action, and instructed the Executive Director to draw up a long-range program. In addition, it authorized the expenditure of \$5.5 million from the Environment Fund to initiate action on its program decisions.

The Council identified seven areas for priority action: (1) human settlements, human health, habitat, and well-being (including a request that the Executive Director take immediate action to complete the report requested by the General Assembly in 1972 on the proposed establishment of an international human settlements fund); (2) land, water, and desertification; (3) education, training, assistance, and information; (4) trade, economics, technology, and transfer of technology; (5) oceans (including urging IMCO to set a time-limit for complete prohibition of international oil discharge in the seas); (6) conservation of nature, wildlife, and genetic resources; and (7) energy (including a request that the Executive Director collect detailed information to present at the next session of the Governing Council).

The Council endorsed the early initiation of the monitoring portion of "Earthwatch," a global program for monitoring pollutants. In this connection it authorized the Executive Director to convene an inter-governmental working group early in 1974 to identify priority pollutants of worldwide significance and to define the aims, general principles, and other requirements for the monitoring system. The Council also authorized the Executive Director to initiate the pilot phase of the International Referral System for expediting the exchange of information and expertise among countries.

Finally, the Council adopted a resolution making recommendations to the General Assembly concerning the preparation and funding for the UN Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements which the 27th General Assembly had decided to hold in Vancouver, Canada.

The Council agreed that its second session would be convened in 1974 in Nairobi, Kenya, where UNEP's permanent headquarters were subsequently formally opened on October 1, 1973.

<sup>14</sup> Members in 1973 were Argentina, Austria, Australia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malagasy Republic, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

*General Assembly*

The Second Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the report of the UNEP Governing Council at 10 meetings between November 20 and 29. More than 40 states and representatives of international organizations took part in the debate which was notable for its generally constructive tone. Practically all speakers endorsed the general objectives of the new program and the decisions taken by the Governing Council. The U.S. Representative, Mark Evans, on November 21 strongly endorsed the coordinating role assigned to UNEP and noted the importance of full cooperation between UNEP and the other members of the UN system in attaining the broad environmental objectives recommended at the Stockholm Conference and subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly. He emphasized the importance that the United States attached to the development of an environment program which would be responsive on the broadest possible basis to the concerns of all countries, bearing in mind the regional and global objectives of the Stockholm Conference.

The Second Committee approved six draft resolutions on November 27 and 29 which were subsequently adopted by the General Assembly on December 13.

Two of the resolutions were adopted without vote in either Committee or plenary. The first, introduced by Jamaica and sponsored by 18 states including the United States, took note of the UNEP report and endorsed the decisions of the Governing Council. The second, introduced by Sweden and sponsored by 16 states including the United States, appealed to governments to support the Environment Fund by making voluntary contributions.

A third resolution, introduced by Canada and sponsored by 34 states from all areas, was approved in the Committee by a vote of 80 (U.S.) to 0, with 9 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 0, with 11 abstentions. In its preambular paragraphs the resolution *inter alia* noted the full support for the Conference-Exposition expressed by the Committee on Housing, Building, and Planning and the offer of its expertise. In its operative paragraphs it decided to hold the UN Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements from May 31 to June 11, 1976, in Vancouver, Canada; endorsed the recommendations of the UNEP Governing Council for the Conference-Exposition, including the system of financing whereby the cost would be borne in large measure by the UN regular budget but partly by the Environment Fund, with the latter applied primarily toward the Exposition; established a 58-member (including the United States) preparatory committee to undertake the preparations for the Conference-Exposition; and requested the UN Secretary General to assume overall responsibility for the Conference-Exposition and to appoint a secretary general for the conference to report through the Executive Director of UNEP.

A fourth resolution, introduced by Jamaica and sponsored by six states, called for a further study by the Secretary General of criteria for multilateral financing of human settlements. The Committee approved the draft by a vote of 83 to 3, with 37 abstentions (U.S.), and the Assembly adopted it by a recorded vote of 89 to 0 with 38 absten-

tions (U.S.). The United States abstained because it believed the study called for would only duplicate studies already done.

The fifth resolution, introduced by Iceland and also sponsored by Canada, Ghana, and Cyprus, emphasized the importance of UNEP's projected activities in the protection of the marine environment. It was approved in the Second Committee by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 118 (U.S.) to 0, with 9 abstentions.

The last resolution, introduced by Yugoslavia and sponsored by 54 states from all areas, dealt with the obligation of prior consultation with respect to the environmental consequences flowing from the use of natural resources shared by two or more states. The resolution had its origin in a question between Argentina and Brazil regarding the development of the Paraná River which flows through both countries. The resolution was approved by a vote of 78 to 6, with 41 abstentions (U.S.), and adopted by a vote of 77 to 5, with 43 abstentions (U.S.). The principle of international cooperation embodied in the resolution was one which the United States generally endorsed. Nevertheless, the U.S. Representative abstained in the vote because either an affirmative or a negative vote on the part of the United States could have been interpreted as a vote against a friendly nation.

UNEP is financed from the regular UN budget. The General Assembly approved a total of \$6,090,000 for UNEP for the 1974-75 biennium, including \$1,717,000 for preparations for the Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements.

By the end of 1973, \$10,984,000 had been contributed to the voluntary Environment Fund, of which the United States contributed \$4,300,000.

#### EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION

The UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation<sup>15</sup> was established by the General Assembly in 1955 to provide continuous review and evaluation of the effects of ionizing radiation on man and his environment. Radiation in this context covers both natural and manmade environmental radiation (i.e., radiation from nuclear weapons tests, nuclear power plants, and peaceful nuclear explosions) and medical and occupational exposures.

UNSCEAR was not scheduled to meet in 1973. However, at the initiative of France the General Assembly on November 9 adopted by a vote of 86 to 0, with 13 abstentions (U.S.), a resolution recommended by its Special Political Committee requesting UNSCEAR to hold a special meeting before the end of the 28th General Assembly to examine "the most recent documents" on levels of atmospheric radiation. The United States abstained because it doubted the usefulness of a meeting called on such short notice.

Dr. H. D. Brunner, Special Assistant to the Chairman of the AEC, represented the United States when UNSCEAR met on November 26 and 27. UNSCEAR gave particular attention to radioactive contamination of the environment by nuclear weapons tests carried out between the end of 1970 and the date of its session. While most of the data on

<sup>15</sup> The 15 members of UNSCEAR in 1973 were Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

levels of radioactivity through 1972 was available, the information for 1973 was very limited and only a preliminary assessment was possible. The Committee expressed the intention of continuing at its next session, in October 1974, its work of review and assessment of levels, effects, and risks of radiation from all sources.

The UNSCEAR report was considered by the General Assembly's Special Political Committee, which approved three resolutions on December 3 that were subsequently adopted by the Assembly on December 14.

The first resolution, introduced by Australia and sponsored by 12 Pacific, Latin American, and African states, deplored environmental pollution by ionizing radiation from the testing of nuclear weapons. It was approved by the Special Political Committee by a vote of 71 to 0, with 22 abstentions (U.S.), and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 86 to 0, with 28 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained because the resolution did not distinguish between atmospheric testing and underground testing, which is not in violation of the Limited Test Ban Treaty.

The second resolution, sponsored by France, noted with appreciation the UNSCEAR report and commended the Committee's work. It was approved by the Special Political Committee by a vote of 91 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 117 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions.

The third resolution, introduced by Peru and sponsored by 13 states, mostly Latin American, provided for an increase in the membership of UNSCEAR from 15 to a maximum of 20, with the new members to be selected (if there were more than five candidates) on the basis of equitable geographic distribution. In addition, the resolution provided that UNSCEAR, on the request of a country in a nuclear testing area or exposed to radiation from nuclear testing, might appoint an expert group from its members to visit that country and consult with its scientific authorities. The Special Political Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 72 to 0, with 29 abstentions (U.S.), and the Assembly adopted it by a vote of 91 to 0, with 33 abstentions (U.S.). The U.S. abstention was based on its position that a change in the membership and terms of reference of UNSCEAR should not be made without prior consultation with the members of the Committee and a careful study of the implications for the effectiveness of its work.

Later in December, while considering the budget, the Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) took up a proposal by the Secretary General to transfer the small UNSCEAR secretariat from New York to Geneva. The justification for the proposed transfer was that the center of activity for UN pollution-monitoring activities would be in Geneva and that the move of UNSCEAR's scientific staff would enable a closer coordination with other UN organizations in this work. The United States questioned whether the UNSCEAR secretariat was expected to undertake new activities as a result of the proposed move and expressed concern that any new responsibilities might conflict with or duplicate the activities of other UN bodies, particularly the IAEA. In the course of the debate Austria made a counter-proposal that the UNSCEAR secretariat be transferred to

Vienna, pointing out that office space was more readily available in Vienna than in Geneva; that the costs of the transfer would be less; and that coordination with the IAEA, which is headquartered in Vienna, would be facilitated. The Austrian proposal won support and was approved by the Fifth Committee without objection on December 12. The General Assembly on December 18 approved without objection the transfer of UNSCEAR to Vienna, effective January 1, 1974.

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

##### *Committed on science and technology for development*

ECOSOC's 54-member standing Committee on Science and Technology for Development<sup>16</sup> held its first session in New York, March 12-31, 1973, with a resumed session on April 9 to complete its report. Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of Rockefeller University, headed the U.S. delegation. The Committee approved one recommendation and three resolutions for adoption by ECOSOC.

By a vote of 26 to 13 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions, the Committee approved a recommendation sponsored by 28 developing states to suggest revisions in the Science and Technology portion of the International Development Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade in order to include quantified targets for developed country assistance in this area to the developing countries. The United States opposed the recommendation, as did the other developed countries, because it believes that scientific and technological activities are difficult to quantify and classify and that a more positive approach would be to identify policies and programs that would help overcome practical problems of applying science and technology to development. The recommended revisions, together with relevant Committee documentation, were forwarded to the Committee on Review and Appraisal for consideration at its second session.

In a related action, the Committee approved, by a vote of 33 (U.S.) to 4, with 2 abstentions, a resolution sponsored by the United States that requested the Secretary General to convene an intergovernmental group of experts to clarify the problems associated with quantifying scientific and technological activities. ECOSOC adopted this resolution with minor changes on August 10 by a vote of 11 (U.S.) to 4, with 1 abstention. The expert group, which included an American, Dr. David Z. Beckler, Assistant to the President, U.S. National Academy of Sciences, met in Paris December 3-7. It considered the technical problems associated with classifying and measuring resources devoted to science and technology, particularly research and development activities in the developed countries that are applicable to the problems of developing countries.

The Committee approved without objection a resolution, sponsored by 13 developed and developing states, that made recommendations to the Secretary General, member states, and organizations in the UN

<sup>16</sup> Members in 1973 were Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian S.S.R., Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen (Aden), and Yugoslavia. There were six vacancies.

system for action for the review, promotion, and implementation of the World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development. This comprehensive Plan, the culmination of several years work by ACASTD (see below) and other scientific bodies in the UN system, was published in 1971. It identified priority areas in which science and technology could significantly promote economic progress. ECOSOC adopted the resolution unanimously on August 10.

The third resolution, sponsored by 13 states and approved without a vote, requested the Secretary General to recommend measures for the application of computer technology to development. This, too, was unanimously adopted by ECOSOC on August 10.

#### *Advisory Committee*

The Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development was established by ECOSOC in 1963. It consists of 24 experts from all geographic regions serving in their individual capacities and not as governmental representatives. Its purpose is to study and make recommendations to ECOSOC through the Committee on Science and Technology for Development. Dr. Bruce Billings, Vice President of the Aerospace Corporation, was a member of ACASTD in 1973.

ACASTD held two sessions during the year, its 18th, in New York from April 5 to 11, and its 19th, in Geneva from November 13 to 21. It considered such topics as (1) the continuing review and implementation of the World Plan of Action; (2) appropriate technology for the construction industry and industrial equipment design; (3) global research projects and a possible clearinghouse for research proposals of interest to developing countries; (4) problems of the human environment; (5) links between scientists in the interest of development; (6) protein malnutrition; and (7) new developments of interest to developing countries. In addition, the members of ACASTD participated in various working groups on subjects of particular interest and in regional groups to consider problems of special concern to the different geographic regions.

On August 10 ECOSOC adopted unanimously a resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom that, *inter alia*, noted the report of ACASTD and instructed the Committee on Science and Technology for Development "to ensure the allocation of sufficient time at its second session for adequate consideration of its relationship with the Advisory Committee."

#### *ECOSOC*

In addition to the resolutions described above flowing from the actions of its standing Committee and the Advisory Committee, ECOSOC on August 10 unanimously adopted a resolution, sponsored by 11 states from all geographic regions, entitled "The role of modern science and technology in the development of nations and the need to strengthen economic, technical, and scientific cooperation among states." The resolution, *inter alia*, (1) urged developed countries and competent UN bodies to intensify and increase their efforts to assist developing countries in the area of science and technology; (2) considered it necessary to initiate new actions to intensify international cooperation permitting all countries to benefit from the achievements



of modern science and technology for the acceleration of economic and social progress; (3) affirmed that the Committee on Science and Technology for Development should be the focal point for the elaboration and continuing evaluation of UN policy in this field and that other organizations in the UN system should cooperate with the Committee for the fulfillment of its tasks; (4) decided to evaluate, through the Committee, the uses of modern science and technology for development and on this basis to appraise the results achieved by the time of the mid-term review of the goals and policies of the Second UN Development Decade and to prepare biennial evaluations thereafter; and (5) requested the Committee at its second session to examine the advisability of convening a UN conference on science and technology.

#### *General Assembly*

On December 17, the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on science and technology recommended by its Second Committee.

The first resolution, sponsored by 27 states, was approved by the Committee on November 27 and adopted by the Assembly without vote. It endorsed the views of the ECOSOC in its general resolution on the role of modern science and technology; requested ECOSOC to give priority, through the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, to the consideration of the issues related to the role of modern science and technology in the development of nations; and noted that ECOSOC would consider the advisability of convening a UN conference on science and technology.

The second resolution, sponsored by 35 developing states, was approved by the Committee on December 10 and adopted by the Assembly without vote. After recalling the recommendation of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development to revise the International Development Strategy, it (1) requested ECOSOC to instruct the Committee to give priority at its second session to the subject of quantitative targets in the field of science and technology; and (2) decided to include on the agenda of the 29th Assembly an item entitled "Quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development, including the definition of the quantitative targets contemplated in paragraph 63 of the International Development Strategy."

#### NATURAL RESOURCES

There were important activities related to natural resources in several UN forums during 1973.

ECOSOC's 54-member Committee on Natural Resources,<sup>17</sup> established in 1970, held its third session in New Delhi from February 6 to 17. Attending that session were 43 Committee members, six observer delegations (including one from the United States), and representatives from a large number of UN specialized agencies. This session was generally considered the most successful so far. One of the major agenda items concerned the coordination of UN activities in the natural resources field. The members agreed that this should be a prime respon-

<sup>17</sup> Members in 1973 were Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Egypt, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and Zaire. There was one vacancy on the committee.

sibility of the Committee and that although no new UN coordinating mechanisms were needed, there was room for improvement in the existing ones. The Committee also conducted several in-depth technical discussions on such subjects as the projection of natural resource reserves, new sources of energy, training for young scientists, and recent technical innovations of use in the field of natural resources.

#### *Fund for Natural Resources Exploration*

The Committee considered, as it had at its previous session, the creation of a revolving fund for natural resources exploration. It again urged that such a fund be established, but noted that details on the fund's operations should be worked out first. ECOSOC considered the fund at its 54th session and on May 18, by a vote of 17 to 0, with 9 abstentions (U.S.), adopted a resolution, sponsored by Japan and seven other states, (1) recommending that the General Assembly establish the revolving fund as a trust fund in the charge of the Secretary General and administered on his behalf by the Administrator of the UNDP, and (2) setting out general principles and objectives for the fund. The United States abstained because it doubted that the fund's proposed ties to the UNDP were sufficiently strong and because there were still insufficient details on such aspects of the fund's operation as methods and rates of repayment.

When the 28th General Assembly considered the proposed fund, Kenya introduced in the Second Committee a draft resolution, sponsored by 13 states, that, *inter alia*, (1) decided to establish the UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration based on the principles and objectives set out by ECOSOC; (2) requested the Secretary General, in close collaboration with the Administration of the UNDP, to prepare the operational procedures and administrative arrangements of the revolving fund for approval by the UNDP Governing Council in 1974; (3) requested the Secretary General to intensify his efforts aimed at exploring sources of financial assistance to the revolving fund; and (4) requested the Administrator of the UNDP to start operational activities in 1974, as soon as the preparation of the procedural arrangements had been completed. These amplifications enabled the United States to support establishment of the revolving fund, which was approved by the Second Committee on November 26 by a vote of 98 (U.S.) to 0, with 21 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly on December 17 by a vote of 106 (U.S.) to 0, with 18 abstentions. A working group began shortly after the resolution's adoption to draft the operating procedures to be submitted to the 18th UNDP Governing Council for approval.

#### *UN Water Conference*

The Committee on Natural Resources also considered, on the basis of a report by an intergovernmental panel of specialists (on which the United States had participated), the calling of a UN water conference. The Committee had approved such a conference in principle in 1972. During the debate the United States and others expressed the views that it would be a mistake to call the conference as early as 1976—as proposed by the panel—since a number of other meetings dealing with various aspects of water resources development were already scheduled for 1974 and 1975, and the UN Conference-

Exposition on Human Settlements was already scheduled for 1976. The United States and others also believed that the draft agenda for the conference was too broad since it overlapped other activities in the UN system in the field of water development. At the end of the debate the Committee recommended to ECOSOC that the conference be held in 1977, that Argentina's invitation to host the conference in Buenos Aires be accepted, and that the Secretary General be requested to take the necessary preparatory steps, including establishing close liaison with other UN bodies with a view to coordinating their inputs and avoiding overlapping and duplication. On May 18 the 54th ECOSOC adopted without objection a resolution generally approving the Committee's recommendations and further requesting the Secretary General to consult with member states on ways and means to prepare for the conference and to explore the possibility of convening regional conferences or seminars as part of the preparatory process.

#### *Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources*

The question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources has been considered regularly in various bodies of the United Nations for more than a decade, including the Security Council during its meetings in Panama in March 1973 (see p. 20). In the Committee on Natural Resources a majority of the developing countries led the discussion, even though several developed countries objected that the Committee was not the proper forum for such a politically oriented discussion. At the conclusion of its debate the Committee recommended to ECOSOC that it reaffirm the right of states to permanent sovereignty over all their natural resources.

On May 4 ECOSOC adopted, by a vote of 20 to 2, with 4 abstentions (U.S.), a resolution that, *inter alia*, (1) reaffirmed the right of states to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources, on land within their natural boundaries, "as well as those of the seabed and the subsoil thereof within their national jurisdiction and in the superjacent waters"; (2) recognized that one of the most effective ways for developing countries to protect their natural resources would be to promote machinery for cooperation to concert pricing policies, improve conditions of access to markets, and coordinate production policies; and (3) requested the Secretary General to complete a study of the political, economic, social, and legal aspects of the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources. The United States abstained because it believed that any resolution on this subject must be balanced with respect for international law, especially as it applied to foreign investment agreements, and because it did not believe that ECOSOC should pronounce on ocean aspects in advance of the law of the sea conference (see p. 53).

The 28th General Assembly also adopted two resolutions on permanent sovereignty over natural resources. The first, introduced in the Second Committee by Iceland and eventually sponsored by 17 states, was in the direct line from the ones adopted by the Security Council and ECOSOC and, *inter alia*, affirmed that any disputes arising from nationalization activities should be settled in accordance with the national legislation of the state carrying out such measures. The Second Committee approved the resolution on December 4 by a

vote of 99 to 1, with 15 abstentions (U.S.), and the Assembly adopted it on December 17 by a vote of 108 to 1, with 16 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained because it considered the resolution seriously out of balance by protecting the rights of countries where natural resources exist, while ignoring the rights under international law of countries having contractual arrangements related to those resources.

The second resolution combined the issue of permanent sovereignty with the Arab-Israeli dispute. Introduced in the Second Committee by Pakistan and sponsored by 18 states, it (1) affirmed the right of the Arab states and peoples whose territories were occupied to permanent sovereignty over all their natural resources; (2) reaffirmed that all measures taken by Israel to exploit the human and natural resources of the occupied Arab territories were illegal and called on Israel to halt such measures forthwith; (3) affirmed the right of the Arab states and peoples to restitution of, and full compensation for, the exploitation of the natural and human resources of the occupied territories; and (4) further declared that these principles applied to "all states, territories, and peoples under foreign occupation, colonial rule, or apartheid." The resolution was approved by the Second Committee on December 6 by a rollcall vote of 91 to 5 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly on December 17 by a vote of 90 to 5 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions.

#### *Geothermal Symposium*

During 1973, the United States and the Resources and Transport Division of the UN Secretariat reached general agreement on cosponsoring a UN Geothermal Symposium and began to prepare for the event which is scheduled to be held in California in 1975.

#### UN INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH

In reporting to the Second Committee of the 28th General Assembly on October 19, the Executive Director noted that the Secretary General had revised the statute of UNITAR to provide for up to 24 appointed members of the Board of Trustees (previously the maximum was 18) and had appointed a new Board for a 3-year term beginning July 1. Dr. Harvey Picker, Dean of the Columbia University School of International Affairs, was appointed from the United States.

During a 4-day meeting in September, the Board had reviewed UNITAR's work and approved a budget for 1974. The Board's discussions focussed primarily on the "project on the future," on a viable method for providing international staff training, on relationships with the new UN University, and on the finances of the Institute.

The Executive Director noted that the Board had deferred any major commitment to the "project on the future," which provided for continuous examination of major trends that may require future responses from the UN system, until it had a clearer picture of the scope of such work and until contributions of special funds were made available. In the meantime UNITAR's staff was continuing to establish a worldwide information network on futures studies and to outline possible projects on forecasting in the UN system, the changing role of the United Nations in the light of political and economic trends,

and national long-range planning and its implications for global problems. A UNITAR working group was scheduled to meet in Moscow in 1974 to explore further the utility of the futures project.

The Executive Director also reported that the Board proposed that UNITAR embark upon a series of courses to train the international staff of the United Nations and other UN agencies in advanced management skills, budgeting techniques, and better understanding of the many functions of the UN system. Such courses, to be financed by UNITAR, the United Nations, the UNDP, and the specialized agencies, would be instituted on a more modest level than the UN Staff College scheme which had been considered by the General Assembly in previous years.

In reviewing UNITAR's finances, the Board noted that income had been relatively static for some years while costs were increasing. The Institute could expand its useful work if additional voluntary contributions were forthcoming from governments and private foundations. The advent of the UN University and its need for financial support was seen by some as having an unfavorable impact on UNITAR's income.

The Executive Director then reviewed research activities of UNITAR on such topics as the so-called "brain-drain," the transfer of technology, methodology for evaluating UN development aid, and the relationships of international bodies both within and outside the UN framework. He cited instances in which such studies were utilized by UN committees and agencies in their work.

Most of the 34 representatives who participated in the Second Committee's debate endorsed UNITAR's activities and future plans and expressed the hope that increased financial support would be forthcoming. Australia and Ireland stated that their governments would contribute to UNITAR for the first time, while Austria and Norway announced increases in their annual pledges.

Speakers from several less developed countries urged that UNITAR give increased attention to studies and training programs directly related to economic development, and the Brazilian Representative cautioned that the scope of UNITAR's activities should not be defined by donor countries.

The sharpest criticism came from the U.S.S.R. which complained of the diffusiveness of UNITAR's program, considered that more stress should be placed on the struggle against colonialism and racism, questioned the need for international training courses that could lead to the creation of what it termed an ossified cast of bureaucratic officials, and charged that UNITAR did not take full advantage of Soviet expertise.

The U.S. Representative, Mark Evans, endorsed UNITAR's concentration on selected subjects where it could contribute practically to the improvement of the United Nations, mentioning studies on the peaceful settlements of disputes, with particular reference to differences between states in the fields of natural resources and environment. He noted that with respect to the "project on the future," it was the U.S. view that UNITAR should proceed only when it became clear that it could play a useful role among the many institutions already active in this area, and after a special purpose fund had been made available. He stated that his government had consistently supported the idea of in-house training for staff in the middle and higher echelons

of the secretariats and hoped that such training could be instituted within UNITAR. Recalling that the Executive Director had raised the question of the undefined relationship between UNITAR and the new UN University, he suggested that this relationship should be made explicit and that overlapping and duplication between the two institutions should be avoided.

The Committee's consideration ended with the approval, without objection, of a draft resolution commending UNITAR's work and endorsing the hope of the Board of Trustees that the Institute would have greater and wider financial support. The resolution was subsequently adopted without objection by the General Assembly on November 9.

The revised scheme for providing international staff training through the creation of a new division within UNITAR, financed by contributions from the UN regular budget and from other agencies, was considered by the Fifth Committee on December 13. The Committee learned that the ACABQ's previous doubts about the utility of the training program as outlined by UNITAR had not been allayed, and that it recommended that UNITAR inaugurate the program with its own resources, supplemented if necessary by user-charges paid by the United Nations and other agencies. In these circumstances, the ACABQ advised against the appropriation of \$50,000 annually from the UN budget as a contribution to the training program. The Fifth Committee accepted that recommendation without objection and included it in its report which was adopted by the General Assembly on December 18.

#### UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

Interest mounted during 1973 in the impending creation of a network of advanced research and training centers that will be known as the United Nations University (UNU). Jointly sponsored by the United Nations and UNESCO, UNU moved closer to reality with the adoption of a charter and some substantial offers of support from a number of interested countries.

The charter was drafted by a Founding Committee of experts chaired by Dr. Andrew W. Cordier of the United States, former UN Under Secretary General and former President of Columbia University. It was then reviewed by the UNESCO Executive Board, ECOSOC, and the Second and Fifth Committees of the 28th General Assembly. The United States expressed concern at these meetings over the articles in the draft charter dealing with academic freedom, autonomy, voluntary contributions, and the integration of the UNU into the world's university community which it believed should be clarified and strengthened. When revised language was adopted for the charter, the United States joined in its support.

Japan and 20 other states sponsored a draft resolution in the Second Committee that *inter alia* adopted the charter as revised; invited the University Council (UNU's governing board) to consider the observations made in the Assembly with a view to proposing amendments to the charter as appropriate; and decided that the headquarters of UNU, which will house the program and coordination center, will be located in the environs of Tokyo. The resolution was approved in the Committee on November 7 by a vote of 98 (U.S.) to 0, with 8 abstentions,

and adopted by the Assembly on December 6 by a vote of 118 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions (Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R.). On the same day, and by the same vote, the Assembly decided, on the recommendation of its Fifth Committee, to approve the articles of the draft charter concerned with UNU's budget and method of finance, which will be entirely from voluntary sources.

A number of nations responded favorably to the Secretary General's January 31, 1973, request for financial and other support to UNU. The offer of the Japanese Government, involving full capital costs for the center and a contribution of \$100 million toward the proposed endowment fund, subject to certain matching conditions, was the most concrete and substantial of the offers made.

The United States told the Secretary General in February that it had no plans at the time to make a financial or other contribution toward the capital or recurrent costs of UNU, but suggested that non-governmental sources in the United States, such as foundations, universities, and individual citizens, might wish to contribute.

It was expected that UNU would be formally established in 1974 after the appointment by the UN Secretary General and the UNESCO Director General of the 24 members of the University Council and the rector.

#### STATISTICAL ACTIVITIES

##### *Working Group on Programs and Coordination*

ECOSOC's Statistical Commission did not meet in 1973, but its Working Group on International Statistical Programs and Coordination held its fifth session in Geneva, October 7-18. This Working Group was established in 1968 to assist the Commission in its efforts to improve coordination in the statistical work of the United Nations and other international organizations.

The Working Group devoted particular attention to (1) preparation of the framework of an integrated 5-year scheme of technical assistance in statistics; (2) priorities for development statistics; and (3) statistical questions related to implementation of the International Development Strategy. The United States believes that the Group's discussion of these topics will be very helpful in their further consideration by the Statistical Commission and other bodies.

Another topic at the session of particular interest to the United States concerned arrangements for electronic data processing of statistical information in the United Nations. At the 17th session of the Statistical Commission, in 1972, dissatisfaction had been expressed by several members of the Commission, including the United States, over the increasing delays in the response to states' requests for UN data after the transfer of some data processing operations from the UN Statistical Office in New York to the International Computing Center in Geneva. The Working Group suggested a number of steps to alleviate problems in the existing arrangements, including redesigning computer programs and data files of the UN Statistical Office and rendering the workload of the international trade statistics staff in Geneva more manageable. The Working Group also considered a number of

other matters, including plans for review of statistical publications and steps to evaluate and improve the reliability of the data available for publication by the United Nations.

#### *Conference of European Statisticians*

The United States continued to participate actively in the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, which is composed of the top statistical officers of the states that are members of ECE. The Conference plays an important role in developing international statistical standards and undertaking studies prior to action by the UN Statistical Commission.

During 1973 the Conference worked on a wide range of subjects, including (1) national economic accounts, with particular attention to balance sheets, revaluation accounts, and methodology for a system of price and quantity statistics; (2) proposals for subsections of the System of Social and Demographic Statistics; (3) aspects of electronic data processing, such as specifications for the integrated statistical information system that is being developed, methodology of data entry systems, and data structure and data storage technology; (4) statistics of internal and international migration; and (5) statistics for environmental studies and policies.

#### *Seminar on Statistical Organization*

An important event during the year was the second Interregional Seminar on Statistical Organization, held in Ottawa, Canada, October 3-12. In 1970, on the initiative of the United States, the 16th session of the Statistical Commission approved a resolution requesting the Secretary General to arrange, if possible, with the help of the UNDP, a seminar on the organization of national statistical services, primarily for the benefit of developing countries. The UNDP agreed to the proposal in 1972, and the Government of Canada agreed to serve as host for the seminar. Experts from a broad spectrum of international organizations and national statistical offices (including two from the United States) prepared discussion papers for the seminar on all significant aspects of statistical organization and administration. The seminar attracted participants from both developing and developed countries in all parts of the world and is believed to have served effectively the purposes for which it was planned.

#### *World Fertility Survey*

Planning and organization of the World Fertility Survey was substantially advanced during 1973. This survey, a major international program dealing with human fertility behavior, is being undertaken by the International Statistical Institute in collaboration with the United Nations and the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. It is supported financially by AID and the UNFPA. The purposes of the Survey, which was planned as part of World Population Year, are to provide data which will enable countries to describe and interpret the fertility of their populations and, to the extent possible, to make analytical comparisons of fertility and the factors affecting it in different countries and regions.

#### *Other Subjects*

The United States continued during the year its support of efforts at the international level to improve the adequacy and international



comparability of statistics on other economic and social subjects, such as the use of national economic accounts for the coordination of economic statistics, identifying sources of error and reasons for discrepancies in the external trade statistics of trading partners, and preparations for the UN world program of industrial statistics. U.S. experts participated in such efforts in a variety of ways, including serving as members of expert groups, attending working party meetings, preparing working papers, and supplying data in response to statistical questions.

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The 25th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was in 1973 and the occasion was marked by a special commemorative meeting of the 28th General Assembly on December 10. Six UN Human Rights Prizes were awarded at this meeting to individuals who had made outstanding contributions to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The recipients were Professor Taha Hussein of Egypt (posthumously), who had been Professor of Literature and Minister of Public Education; Wilfred Jenks of the United Kingdom (posthumously), former Director General of the ILO; Professor Maria Lavalle-Urbina of Mexico, lawyer, professor, and prominent public official; Bishop Abel Muzorewa of Southern Rhodesia, President of the African National Council of Zimbabwe; Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, Prime Minister of Mauritius; and U Thant of Burma, former UN Secretary General.

The year 1973 was one of accomplishment in a number of human rights fields of special interest to the United States. There was a welcome broadening of perspective in the agendas of human rights bodies. While the serious questions relating to race and colonialism continued to occupy a major portion of time in human rights discussions, increased attention was given to other problem areas. It has been an aim of U.S. participation in the UN human rights organs to encourage attention to a more balanced range of serious issues.

The 32-member UN Commission on Human Rights<sup>18</sup> held its 29th regular session in Geneva, February 26–April 6. Aspects of its work were further considered in ECOSOC and the General Assembly.

## ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

### *Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination*

The Commission's discussion of racial discrimination focused on a program for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. In 1972 the General Assembly had requested the Commission to give highest priority to considering the draft program prepared by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities<sup>19</sup> and to submit it to the General Assembly

<sup>18</sup> Members during 1973 were Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Lebanon, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Tanzania, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and Zaire.

<sup>19</sup> The Subcommittee is composed of 26 experts, serving in their individual capacity, elected by the Commission on Human Rights for 3-year terms. W. Beverly Carter, Jr., of the United States is a member.

for final action in 1973. Consideration of the draft program, while led by the African and Asian members of the Commission, featured the active participation of the United States and the Western European states, demonstrating the high importance attached to the formulation of a program that could be unanimously adopted. The discussion was noteworthy for the avoidance of extremes which frequently characterize resolutions dealing with colonialism and racial problems. The resolution submitting a draft program to the General Assembly was adopted without a vote. The draft program was subsequently approved without objection by the 54th ECOSOC on May 18.

The first order of business of the Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly was the program for the Decade. The Committee devoted 13 meetings between September 28 and October 9 to this question, during which firm support for the draft program was expressed by the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Margaret B. Young. In a statement on September 28 she said :

“The United States endorses this document, acknowledging that we still have many serious problems. While one can be proud of past achievements in race relations, we realize that we must measure our progress not in terms of how far we have come but of how far we have to go.

“. . . The decade of the sixties was a frustrating but exciting period for all of us involved in that struggle. Now, in the seventies, the aim is to make secure the gains that have been made, to exercise our voting rights, and to stress preparedness and excellence on the part of our black youth for the gains yet to be won. At the same time, the unmet aspirations of the American Indian, Spanish-speaking Americans, and underprivileged white citizens are not to be ignored.”

The resolution, which was adopted without objection by the Committee on October 8 and without a vote by the General Assembly on November 2, designated the 10 years beginning December 10, 1973, as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination; called on all states to cooperate in every possible way in the implementation of the program for the Decade; and requested ECOSOC, with the assistance of the Secretary General, to assume responsibility for coordinating and evaluating the activities carried out under the program for the Decade. The approved program sets out the goals and objectives for the Decade in achieving the eradication of racial prejudice, racism, and racial discrimination. It lists measures on the national, regional, and international levels for achieving these goals and objectives, and calls for regular reports from governments on actions taken under the program. As a major feature of the Decade, the program provides for the General Assembly to convene, not later than 1978, a world conference on combating racial discrimination. ECOSOC will be the preparatory committee for the world conference.

#### *Convention on Apartheid*

A draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of apartheid was introduced at the 26th General Assembly in 1971 by Guinea and the U.S.S.R. A revised text was submitted by the U.S.S.R., Guinea, and Nigeria to the 27th Assembly, which requested

the Commission on Human Rights to examine it on a priority basis and submit the results of its examination to the 28th Assembly. During 1973 the draft convention was thoroughly studied by a working group and, in turn, by the full Commission, which adopted a resolution approving the draft convention. Support for the convention, which was approved by a vote of 21 to 2 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions, came from all Commission members except the United States and the Western European states. Their problems with the convention, the United States and Western Europeans indicated, were founded upon legal and technical grounds, which pertained principally to the difficulties of defining the concept of apartheid for the purposes of making it an international crime and to the jurisdictional basis for prosecuting offenders under the convention. The U.S. Representative, Philip E. Hoffman, in explaining the U.S. inability to support the draft convention, expressed the view that its effect would be illusory in the absence of a system of international criminal jurisdiction. He also recalled that the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, already in force, completely outlawed apartheid. This made another legal instrument on the subject superfluous.

The Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the draft convention article by article at seven meetings between October 19 and 26, approving it on the latter date by a recorded vote of 93 to 1, with 24 abstentions (U.S.). The General Assembly adopted the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid on November 30 by a vote of 91 to 4 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. The United States changed its vote from abstention because of its strong legal objections. In an explanation of vote the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., pointed out that the Convention was in several respects inconsistent with concepts basic to the American legal system, such as the protection of individual rights. He noted that the Convention purported to extend international criminal jurisdiction in a broad and ill-defined manner even to cases where there were no significant contacts between the offenders and the prosecuting state. Ambassador Ferguson noted that the United States could not accept such provisions as being consistent with basic norms of fairness and due process, which are essential in criminal law. Finally, he expressed doubts about the provision of the Convention that assigned implementation functions to the UN Commission on Human Rights. This provision raised the serious question of whether a separate treaty not accepted by all UN members should confer powers upon an organ created under the UN Charter. The Commission could thus be put in the difficult position of having to discharge functions under a convention which many of its members did not support.

#### EXPLOITATION OF LABOR

A new subject arising out of a current human rights abuse, the exploitation of labor through illicit and clandestine trafficking, was taken up by the Commission on Human Rights in 1973. This matter had first been brought to the attention of ECOSOC in the summer of 1972 by Kenya, at a time when the European press was publicizing the smuggling of African workers from certain African countries into Europe.

At that time ECOSOC had noted these reports with alarm and indignation and instructed the Commission on Human Rights to consider the question and to prepare appropriate recommendations. The same matter was raised again at the 27th General Assembly which reinforced the ECOSOC request that the Commission look into the matter.

At the Commission's session in 1973 there was considerable discussion of this subject, particularly by the Western European members. While the prime focus of attention was the traffic in labor from Africa to Europe, the discussion touched as well upon the problems being met in Europe by foreign laborers from Turkey and in the United States by migrant labor from Mexico. There was general agreement among the speakers that the ILO should play the primary role in dealing with the problem, but that the human rights aspects should be considered by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

On March 13 the Commission approved without a vote a resolution for adoption by ECOSOC, urging states to ratify the relevant ILO conventions, in particular the Migration for Employment Convention; welcoming the work being done by the ILO in the field; requesting the Subcommittee to consider the question as a matter of priority at its next meeting and to recommend what further measures might be necessary for the protection without distinction of human rights of foreign workers; and requested the Commission on the Status of Women to examine the question as well. The 54th ECOSOC adopted the resolution without objection on May 18.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS OF NON-CITIZENS

Another question, related to that of traffic in illicit labor, which the Commission also explored for the first time in 1973, concerned the human rights of people not citizens of the countries in which they live. The question was raised by the U.K. Representative who was following up on a similar initiative taken the previous year by the British expert in the Subcommittee. Concern over this matter, although not expressly stated, arose out of the expulsions in 1972 of non-citizen Asians from Uganda. The same general problem had been raised, but not discussed, at the previous Commission session by Iran in connection with the expulsion of Iranian nationals from Iraq.

The Commission's debate on this item was marked by the competing concerns of the rights of individuals as against the sovereign rights of states, with the Eastern European and African states particularly emphasizing the obligations of non-citizens to the states in which they reside.

By a vote of 16 (U.S.) to 0, with 11 abstentions, the Commission on March 21 approved for adoption by ECOSOC a resolution which (1) requested the Subcommittee to consider as a matter of priority the problem of the applicability of existing international provisions for the protection of human rights to individuals who are not citizens of the countries in which they live and to consider what measures in the field of human rights would be desirable; and (2) urged states to accord the highest practicable level of protection to all individuals

who are not citizens but who are nevertheless under their jurisdiction. The resolution was adopted by ECOSOC on May 18 by a vote of 20 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

This question arose on the first day of the session when the shooting down by Israel of a Libyan commercial aircraft, which had occurred on February 21, 1973, was raised as an urgent question. The Commission, without a vote, decided on February 27 to send a telegram to the Government of Israel expressing its extreme distress at what it called the cruel and unjust act. In the telegram the Commission condemned the massacre of innocent people and called upon the Government of Israel to "respect and implement canons of civilized and humanitarian behavior among peoples and states."

On March 5 another incident of violence in the Middle East, the murder of Belgian and U.S. diplomats in Khartoum, was brought before the Commission. The brief discussion, in which many members deplored the violent action, was ended by the Chairman, Ambassador Radha Krishna Ramphul of Mauritius, who, on behalf of the Commission, conveyed to the U.S. Representative and the Belgian observer the Commission's condolences to the families of the victims. The Chairman stated his hope that every step would be taken to avoid the recurrence of such acts, which jeopardized international relations, the quest for peace, and human rights. The Commission observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of the victims of the events in Khartoum.

The Commission's debate on the alleged human rights violations in the occupied territories of the Middle East, a debate that has recurred annually since 1968, was relatively brief and occupied only five meetings. Arab members of the Commission, together with a number of Arab observers and the Israeli observer, carried the burden of the debate. A resolution presented for adoption by the Commission was along the lines of those adopted in earlier years. Its first operative paragraph was especially objectionable to the United States and the Western European and Latin American states since it deplored "Israel's continued grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention in the occupied Arab territories, which were considered by the Commission on Human Rights as war crimes and an affront to humanity." This paragraph was put to a separate vote and adopted by a rollcall vote of 17 to 9 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was then adopted by a vote of 18 to 2 (Dominican Republic, U.S.), with 10 abstentions. In addition to the objectionable first operative paragraph, the resolution contained a number of other operative paragraphs charging Israeli violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention. In an explanation of vote, Mr. Hoffman stressed the continuing U.S. concern over reports of human rights violations throughout the region affected by the 1967 conflict. He noted, however, that charges of violations by Israel, as listed in the resolution, had not been substantiated and urged that the best solution to the human rights problems in the region would be the achievement of a peaceful settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 of November 22, 1967.

A principal method employed for many years by the Commission in carrying out its mandate of promoting human rights has been the expert study. By this device it has been possible for the Commission to examine individual rights on a worldwide basis and to bring to bear upon its inquiry into the observance of these rights information from sources other than governments. The studies are carried out under the responsibility of an expert rapporteur, usually a member of the Subcommission, who presents the study in his own name. His sources are not limited to governments, but include as well writings of scholars and material supplied by nongovernmental organizations. Because the Commission in recent years has been heavily involved with other items, previously requested and completed studies have been on its agenda without receiving the Commission's attention. In order to take care of this unfortunate backlog, ECOSOC authorized the Commission to extend its 1973 session by a week. The Commission used this extra time to good advantage, completing action on four of the expert studies. The debate marked a welcome shift in the Commission's attention from only those few regional issues it has tended to concentrate on in recent years to other basic human rights of more general concern.

#### *Political Rights*

The "Study of Discrimination in the Matter of Political Rights and Draft General Principles on Freedom and Nondiscrimination in the Matter of Political Rights" had been completed by the special rapporteur, Hernán Santa Cruz (Chile), in 1962. It investigated the observance of political rights throughout the world, principally the right of everyone to take part in the government of his country, and presented a set of general principles which served as important reaffirmations of basic rights such as freedom of opinion and association, equality, and universality of suffrage. Much of the substance covered by these principles has been overtaken by the completion in 1966 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Commission approved without a vote on March 20 a resolution generally endorsing the draft principles on freedom and nondiscrimination in the matter of political rights and deciding to retain the question of the realization of political rights on its agenda. ECOSOC adopted the resolution on May 18 without objection.

#### *Equality in the Administration of Justice*

The study on this subject had been completed by the special rapporteur, Mohammed Ahmed Abu Rannat (Sudan), in 1972. Presented with the study was an important set of draft principles covering such basic elements as access to courts, independence of the judiciary, independence and impartiality of lawyers, and procedure before courts. While there was strong sentiment in the Commission for the drafting of an international instrument on equality in the administration of justice, the majority preferred not to embark on such a complicated undertaking in view of the wide divergence of legislation in this area existing in various countries.

The Commission finally approved without a vote a resolution calling upon member states to give due consideration to the draft prin-

ciples in formulating their legislation and in taking other measures affecting equality in the administration of justice. Unlike the resolution on political rights, which was only addressed to the ECOSOC, this resolution was recommended for final adoption by the General Assembly.

At the 28th General Assembly the resolution as recommended by the Commission and approved by ECOSOC was broadened, on the initiative of six Western European and one Latin American states, to relate generally to human rights in the administration of justice. The endorsement of the draft principles was coupled with an appeal for implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders. This resolution was approved by the Third Committee on November 29 by a vote of 59 (U.S.) to 1, with 41 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly on December 14 by a vote of 107 (U.S.) to 0, with 20 abstentions.

#### *Right to Leave and to Return*

The "Study of Discrimination in Respect of the Right of Everyone to Leave Any Country, Including His Own, and to Return to His Country," completed in 1963 by José Ingles (Philippines), had the most timely interest and gave rise to the most controversy in the Commission. Included with the study was a set of draft principles on freedom and nondiscrimination in respect of the right to leave. The debate was relatively free of political content, but the behind-the-scenes negotiations demonstrated the acute political sensitivity involved in relation to such problems as Soviet Jewry and Palestine refugees.

The draft resolution which was finally adopted represented an amalgam of one sponsored by the United States and another sponsored by Ecuador, Ghana, India, and Pakistan. The U.S. draft *inter alia* deplored the existence of arbitrary barriers to travel and migration imposed by many countries contrary to Article 13 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The four-power draft, similar to the draft resolutions relating to the other expert studies, expressed general appreciation for the study and endorsement of the draft principles, and drew the attention of governments and other interested bodies to these principles when considering legislation or other international instruments. The United States and the other sponsors consulted intensively to develop the single text that eventually emerged. The new text, which was sponsored by all the original sponsors, including the United States, plus Nigeria, included an affirmation of "the importance of the rights mentioned in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the enjoyment of which is essential."<sup>20</sup> The resolution also (1) affirmed the need for governments to bear in mind the relevant international standards with respect to this important right and (2) drew the draft principles to the attention of governments and other interested bodies to be considered along with the relevant provisions of other international instruments when preparing legislation or regulations dealing with the right to leave or to return. One minor point of contention arose with a pro-

<sup>20</sup> Article 13 says: "(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

posed provision from the U.S. draft placing the item on the agenda of the next Commission session. In the interest of securing as wide agreement as possible, this paragraph was not included. The final text of the resolution was approved by a vote of 25 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions.

When the resolution was considered by the Social Committee of the 54th ECOSOC, the question of placing the item on the agenda of future sessions of the Commission was raised again by Italy, Denmark, Sweden, and Trinidad and Tobago who proposed adding a paragraph deciding that the Commission should retain the question on its agenda and should consider it at 3-year intervals coinciding with its discussion of the periodic reports on civil and political rights. The U.S.S.R. noted that the Human Rights Commission had adopted the draft resolution as a compromise, that the right in question was not a fundamental human right, and that inclusion of the item on the Commission's agenda was not sufficiently justified. It therefore appealed to the sponsors not to push the amendment to a vote. The amendment was nevertheless adopted. When the draft resolution, as recommended by the Social Committee, was considered by ECOSOC the U.S.S.R. requested a separate vote on this paragraph which was adopted by a vote of 12 (U.S.) to 5, with 7 abstentions. The amended draft resolution was then adopted on May 18 by a vote of 19 (U.S.) to 4, with 2 abstentions.

#### *Persons Born Out of Wedlock*

The fourth study, which received only token attention by the Commission, was the "Study of Discrimination Against Persons Born Out of Wedlock," completed in 1967 by Voitto Saario (Finland). The Commission approved without a vote a resolution requesting the Secretary General to transmit the draft principles contained in the study to governments and interested agencies for their comments and observations. The Commission will consider the item again at its 31st session in 1975. This resolution was adopted without objection on May 18.

#### WAR CRIMINALS

The Commission on Human Rights has repeatedly considered the question of the punishment of war criminals and of persons who have committed crimes against humanity. It has been an item used chiefly by the Communist states of Eastern Europe to emphasize their concern over Nazi war criminals. At its 29th session, the Commission focused on a set of draft principles of international cooperation in the detection, arrest, extradition, and punishment of persons guilty of such crimes, which the Byelorussian S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Yemen (Aden) had submitted to the General Assembly in 1972 and the Assembly had transmitted to the Commission for further elaboration.

During the Commission's consideration the U.S.S.R. evidenced the high importance it attached to the draft principles by the extensive negotiations it carried on for the purpose of securing unanimous agreement. In order to attract the support of western countries, including the United States, the U.S.S.R. extensively altered a number of provisions, primarily references to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes



Against Humanity, a convention which the United States has consistently opposed. It also deleted any reference to the characterization of apartheid as a crime against humanity. A revised set of principles was eventually submitted by the Byelorussian S.S.R., and after a debate during which they were further revised to take into account additional objections put forward by the United Kingdom the Commission approved without a vote a draft resolution endorsing the draft principles and referring them to ECOSOC and the General Assembly.

The United States joined in the consensus, but explained that its support depended upon two points of interpretation. The principles provide for cooperation in the extradition of persons charged with war crimes and for their trial, "as a general rule" in the countries in which they committed the crimes. The U.S. Representative noted that the extradition of persons accused of war crimes must be pursuant to national legislation and treaties in force. He further expressed the U.S. understanding that the trial of persons accused of war crimes could take place in the country of which the accused was a national as well as in the country in which the crime was committed.

On May 18 the 54th ECOSOC, by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions, approved the draft resolution endorsing and forwarding the principles to the General Assembly.

The Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly debated the draft principles at four meetings from November 7 to 9. It approved, by a vote of 75 (U.S.) to 1, with 30 abstentions, a resolution in which the General Assembly declared that the UN proclaimed the principles "in pursuance of the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter concerning the promotion of cooperation between peoples and the maintenance of international peace and security." The U.S. Representative expressed the same statements of understanding as had been made at the Commission on Human Rights. The resolution was adopted by the Assembly on December 3 by a recorded vote of 94 (U.S.) to 0, with 29 abstentions.

#### RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

The 27th General Assembly had decided to take up the item of religious intolerance, which has been on its agenda for many years, and to give priority to the completion of a Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance. This important decision was taken in the face of strong opposition led by the Communist states of Eastern Europe who argued that priority should be given to the completion of a draft convention on the subject. Progress on a convention is inevitably slower because drafting is more complicated than for a declaration. Pursuant to the General Assembly's resolution, the Secretary General requested and received from governments their comments upon the draft declaration, which had earlier been prepared partly by the Subcommission and partly by the Commission on Human Rights.

At the 28th General Assembly the U.S.S.R. and other like-minded states again tried to shift attention to the convention, but were again unsuccessful. The Assembly's Third Committee devoted seven meetings between October 25 and November 1 to the subject, completing

an article-by-article consideration of the draft. The very complicated nature of the subject matter, however, together with the large number of amendments, prevented the Committee's completion of its work on the draft declaration. The committee debate was therefore concluded with the approval by consensus of a resolution inviting ECOSOC to request the Commission on Human Rights at its next session to take up, as a matter of priority, the elaboration of a draft declaration and, if possible, to submit a single draft declaration to the Assembly in 1974. Further, the resolution decided to include the item on the agenda of the 29th Assembly with a view to completing and adopting, if possible, a declaration. The resolution was subsequently adopted by the Assembly without objection on November 30.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN ARMED CONFLICTS

##### *Protection of Journalists*

The protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions in areas of armed conflict, a subitem of the overall subject of human rights in armed conflicts, has been on the General Assembly's agenda since 1970. Debate has centered on a draft convention strongly supported by France and a number of other states. The Commission completed a detailed study of the draft convention in 1972, but the 27th General Assembly had adjourned its debate on the draft convention until the 28th Assembly.

The Third Committee of the 28th Assembly devoted eight meetings from October 9 to 15 to this item and embarked upon an article-by-article examination of the draft convention. The discussion was cut off when Brazil proposed a resolution, also sponsored by Pakistan and Tunisia, transmitting the draft articles and amendments to the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, inviting the Conference to submit its comments and advice on the text, and deciding to continue the examination of the question at the 29th Assembly as a matter of priority, "having regard to the deliberations and findings of the Diplomatic Conference." This Conference had been convened by the Swiss Government to meet in Geneva in February-March 1974 to examine draft protocols to the four Geneva conventions on the protection of war victims. (For background of this Conference, see "Human Rights in Armed Conflicts" in Part IV of this report, p. 237.) The Third Committee approved the resolution by consensus and the Assembly adopted it without objection on November 2.

#### HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The proposal to create the post of UN High Commissioner for Human Rights was last discussed by the General Assembly at its 26th session in 1971. Due to lack of time, the Assembly was unable to conclude its study of the item then and decided to take it up again at its 28th session. In 1973 it was considered at three meetings of the Third Committee on December 3 and 4. The discussion followed the lines of previous Assembly sessions, with a number of positive statements being made by those members, including the United States, who have consistently given the proposal their strong support. The opposition was led by the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European states together

with a number of Arab states. Costa Rica and Sweden, subsequently joined by Uruguay, put forward a draft resolution which would have had the Assembly decide to establish the post of High Commissioner. A competing draft, sponsored by Bulgaria and Yemen (Aden), would have had the Assembly decide to refrain from further consideration of the item. The middle ground, which ultimately became the focus of attention, was embodied in a draft resolution put forward by Ireland.

The Irish draft presented an innovation in that it provided for a shift of attention from the single idea of a High Commissioner for Human Rights to consideration of the general problems of appropriate machinery and procedures and ways and means by which the United Nations might improve the effective enjoyment of human rights. The Irish resolution was slightly revised during the discussion, principally to substitute the phrase "alternative approaches" for "appropriate machinery" in the operative paragraphs describing the new focus and to defer future consideration of the item until the 30th General Assembly in 1975. The resolution was finally approved by the Committee on December 4 by a vote of 75 to 0, with 25 abstentions (U.S.).

In a statement after the vote, the U.S. Representative, William F. Buckley, Jr., said:

"It is our understanding that the purpose of this committee is to devise means of promoting human rights around the world. The argument of those opposed to the creation of a High Commissioner appeared to center on the concern that said High Commissioner would interfere in the internal affairs of their countries. Our understanding was that suitable precautions against such interferences, in violation of the United Nations Charter, were built into the pending proposal. On the other hand, we cannot deny that there is a sense in which the mere espousal of human rights in an international organization is to interfere philosophically with the internal affairs of some countries. Human rights is an ideal to which we all pay lip service. Even the best intentioned among us serve that ideal asymptotically; in some societies, with such studied unsuccess as to call into question whether we can really call human rights a shared ideal. Among those who spoke yesterday in opposition to a High Commissioner for Human Rights were states who would have you believe that such is the congestion of human rights within their frontiers that it is necessary to surround themselves with great walls and oceans to prevent these human rights from emigrating.

"My government registers its sorrow that all the work that in the last eight years has gone into the concept of a High Commissioner, who might have proved technically useful in promoting human rights, has apparently been of no avail. We regret that the noble resolution proposed by the distinguished delegates of Sweden and Costa Rica, for which we intended enthusiastically to vote, was not submitted for action in this chamber."

Mr. Buckley explained that the United States had abstained because of the ambiguity of the phrase "alternative approaches," and he emphasized the U.S. understanding that these approaches continued to include the idea of a High Commissioner. He further pointed out that the United States could not vote for a resolution that would put off the question until 1975.

The resolution was adopted by the Assembly in plenary session on December 14 by a recorded vote of 105 (U.S.) to 0, with 23 abstentions.

The United States shifted to an affirmative vote in plenary because of its desire to demonstrate its continuing support for the idea of the High Commissioner as well as for the need to find more effective human rights machinery in the United Nations.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS AND SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Although the Human Rights Commission had before it several reports prepared by the Secretary General, including two new ones, only one meeting was devoted to this item which, after a brief discussion, was postponed. One of the reports prepared for the 1973 session dealt with the impact of science and technology upon the right to work and certain related rights and upon the right to housing. The second report, focusing on one of the principal concerns underlying the Assembly's original decision to investigate the subject, concerned respect for the privacy of individuals in light of the advances in recording and other techniques. It was largely because this second report, which had been issued late in the session, was considered to be of such importance that there was wide sentiment to put off debate until the members had more opportunity to study it.

The Third Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered this question at five meetings between November 13 and 30 and adopted two substantive resolutions and a procedural resolution requesting the Commission to give high priority to the consideration of the item at its session in 1974.

The first substantive resolution, dealing with the preservation and further development of cultural values, was sponsored by Poland and 10 other states and approved on November 29 by a vote of 100 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions. In its principal operative paragraphs the resolution requested the Director General of UNESCO to make a study on the protection of cultural values, (2) recommended that the Director General initiate the preparation of an interdisciplinary research program in this field, and (3) decided to include the question on the agenda of the 31st Assembly in 1976. The Assembly adopted the resolution on December 14 by a vote of 123 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions.

The second resolution, sponsored by Byelorussian S.S.R. and three others, related to the use of scientific and technological developments in the interest of peace and social development. The debate featured considerable critical comment from Western countries because of the negative tone of the resolution, the operative paragraphs of which emphasized the allegedly harmful effects of scientific and technological developments, while seeming to denigrate the positive values. After the adoption of some amendments proposed by the United Kingdom, the resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote of 81 to 0, with 22 abstentions (U.S.), and adopted by the Assembly on December 14 by a vote of 112 to 0, with 17 abstentions (U.S.).

#### SUBCOMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

The 26th regular session of the Subcommission was held in Geneva, September 3-21, 1973. It was a landmark session because, for the first

time, the Subcommission acted to carry out its new responsibilities under a resolution adopted by ECOSOC at its 48th session in 1970. This resolution requested the Subcommission to consider in private meetings pursuant to procedures laid down therein the private communications received by the United Nations relating to violations of human rights throughout the world. In accordance with these procedures, the Subcommission examined a number of cases which had been brought to its attention by its special working group which had met for 10 days prior to the 26th session, examining the thousands of private petitions which had been received during the preceding year. The Subcommission decided to refer to the Commission on Human Rights for its attention a number of particular situations that appeared to the Subcommission to reveal a consistent pattern of gross and reliably attested violations of human rights and which, in its judgment, required consideration by the Commission. The nature of the situations referred to the Commission under ECOSOC's resolution are required to be kept confidential.

The Subcommission also acted upon a request from the Commission and ECOSOC that it examine the problem of the exploitation of labor through illicit and clandestine trafficking. It entrusted to its member from Morocco, Mrs. Halima Warzazi, the preparation of a study on this question and requested that the study be submitted to its next session in 1974.

The Subcommission also received progress reports on other studies presently in train on the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations; the rights of persons belonging to ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities; and the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. In a decision of potential significance, the Subcommission requested the Commission's authorization for it to include on its agenda an item related to the problem of torture, entitled "The question of the human rights of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment."

The 28th General Assembly subsequently adopted unanimously on November 2 a resolution on the subject of torture recommended unanimously by its Third Committee. In the resolution the Assembly, after taking note of the Subcommission's request, (1) rejected any form of torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment; (2) urged all governments to become parties to existing international instruments relating to the prohibition of such treatment; (3) asked to be kept informed of any consideration of this question by the Subcommission or other bodies; and (4) decided to examine the question at a future session.

## SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE IAEA

### WORLD BANK GROUP

#### *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Development Association*

The IBRD's membership rose to 123 in 1973 with the addition of The Bahamas and the IDA's membership rose to 112 with the addition of Oman.

The IBRD approved 73 loans totally \$2.05 billion in 42 countries in fiscal 1973, while the IDA extended 75 credits totally \$1.36 billion to 43 countries. For the second year in a row the Bank's disbursements exceeded \$1 billion. The IDA disbursed \$493 million during the year, an increase of 89% over 1972.

The World Bank Group's steady expansion resulted in its exceeding its goal for program growth during the 1969-73 period; instead of doubling the level of operations over the average for the previous 5 years it increased that level by 128%. Lending to Africa rose 214% during the 5 years and lending to Latin America rose 128%. In the fields of agriculture and education, the Bank increased its lending 317% and 362% respectively. The Bank has been taking a much more comprehensive view of the development process. This has led to marked diversification of the Bank's activities with respect to new projects such as population planning, urban development, tourism, and new types of projects in such traditional sectors as agriculture, transportation, and industry. In each case, the emphasis has been on innovation and flexibility in responding to the special needs of the country in question.

The Bank continued in 1973 to work on the problems of unemployment in less developed countries and on finding projects that would benefit the poorest 40% of the less developed countries' population, with special emphasis on projects involving small farmers. To this end it reviewed the IDA's lending policies, alternative incentive systems (such as tariffs, quotas, and credit preferences), and capital-labor substitution in road construction and civil works.

In addition, the Executive Directors discussed and began implementing a series of policy papers prepared by the Bank staff on a wide range of issues, including income distribution, employment, rural development, urbanization, and regional development for less developed countries. These papers provide a coherent standard against which to evaluate the Bank's activities in the sectors covered.

The United States continued to be the largest donor in the IBRD, with subscriptions amounting to approximately one-fourth of the Bank's total. The United States was also the largest contributor to IDA, having provided some 40% of total contributions.

The IBRD also has recourse to borrowings in the international capital market for its financial resources. Borrowings increased slightly in fiscal 1973 to \$1.723 billion. Most of this sum was borrowed in Japan, Western Europe, and Kuwait; none of it was borrowed in the United States. IDA, on the other hand, depends on contributions from its members and on the annual allocation of a share in IBRD profits. The United States made its second contribution of \$320 million to the third replenishment of IDA.

Development lending by the IBRD and IDA combined in fiscal 1973 focused on the following principal areas:

Sector	Number of loans	Number of countries	Amount (millions)
Agriculture.....	47	35	\$237.7
Transportation.....	36	31	682.4
Electric power.....	10	10	321.5
Development finance companies.....	10	9	310.0
Education.....	17	17	276.1
Telecommunications.....	7	7	247.8
Industry.....	4	4	67.2

*International Finance Corporation*

With the accession in 1973 of Oman, the IFC's membership rose to 98.

An affiliate of the World Bank, the IFC encourages the development of private enterprise in the developing countries by lending to and making direct equity investment in private business activities. Since the basic thrust for economic development must come from the private sector, the IFC is an essential complement to the lending operations of the IBRD and IDA. The IFC also develops local and regional capital markets and promotes privately owned development finance corporations. These efforts help increase investment opportunities and the availability of capital in order to broaden the ownership of private enterprise.

Its total subscriptions were \$107.2 million, of which the United States subscribed \$35.2 million, or 32.8%. Besides capital subscriptions, the IFC obtains funds from repayments of investments, sales of equity and loan investments, net income, and borrowings. During fiscal year 1973, the IFC borrowed \$40 million from the IBRD and received \$65 million from sales of commitments.

IFC investment commitments totalled \$154.3 million in fiscal year 1973, of which \$136 million was for loans and \$10.7 million for equity investments. (Exchange rate adjustment on existing commitments increased the total by \$7.6 million.) Some of the 1973 investments were for development finance institutions in the Philippines, Turkey, Afghanistan, and Ecuador; cement plants in Mexico, Indonesia, and Cyprus; pulp and paper mills in Yugoslavia; and tourism projects in Indonesia, Kenya, Tunisia, and Turkey.

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The membership of the IMF increased from 125 to 126 during 1973 with the accession of The Bahamas. Fund quotas totalled 29,189 billion in terms of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs),<sup>21</sup> with the U.S. quota 6.7 billion SDRs. This represented 22.95% of total voting power in the general account and 23.31% of total voting power in the Special Drawing account.

During 1973 the IMF experienced a reduction of demands for foreign exchange to help its members cover short-term balance of payments needs. This reflected the fact that many members had less need for reserves because their currencies were on a floating rate basis. Drawings in 1973 totaled only 733 million in SDRs, down from 1.612 billion in SDRs in 1972.

No additional SDRs were created or distributed in 1973 since consultations by the Managing Director did not reveal any consensus among the members that there was a need for the creation of additional liquidity. An important element in members' thinking was the fact that the U.S. balance of payments deficit in 1972 had appreciably added to world liquidity by increasing the dollar holdings of other countries.

The second term of Pierre-Paul Schweitzer (France) as Managing Director of the IMF expired on September 1, 1973. He was succeeded

<sup>21</sup> One SDR equals the gold content of one 1944 U.S. dollar and equals \$1.206 present U.S. dollars based on a U.S. gold price of \$42.22 per ounce.

by H. Johannes Witteveen (Netherlands), a former Finance Minister and Professor of Economics. In the latter part of 1973, the Deputy Managing Director of the Fund, Frank A. Southard (U.S.), announced that he would retire early in 1974, and on November 27 it was announced that William B. Dale, who had been U.S. Executive Director of the Fund since 1962, would succeed Mr. Southard on March 1, 1974.

During 1973 the U.S. Congress passed an amendment to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended, which dropped the requirement that the same person hold the U.S. Alternate Governorships on both the IMF and the IBRD. Accordingly, when Deputy Secretary of State John N. Irwin II resigned he was succeeded as U.S. Alternate Governor of the IMF by Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The United States was a member of the IMF's Committee on Reform of the International Monetary System and Related Issues (Committee of 20), which, with its Deputies, studied throughout 1973 the various elements of its assignment. The Deputies held six meetings during the year, and the Committee itself met three times. The Committee meetings and all but the last of the Deputies' meetings formed the basis for the preparation of the "First Outline of Reform," which was prepared by the Chairman, C. Jeremy Morse (U.K.), and the Vice Chairmen of the Deputies. The Chairman of the Committee of 20, Ali Wardhana (Indonesia), forwarded the "Outline" to the Governors at the annual meeting of the IMF at Nairobi, Kenya in September 1973. In so doing he stated that in his opinion the "First Outline of Reform" reflected the stage reached in the preceding Committee of 20 discussions. According to the Chairman, the "Outline" dealt with the chief aspects of monetary reform; it did not differentiate between changes requiring amendment of the IMF Articles of Agreement and those that would not require such action. He also pointed out that it did not deal with changes in the quota structure and general account and included little on the structure of the Fund. The Chairman said that the general shape of the reformed system had been defined and significant progress made on some important issues. He indicated that in the "Outline" arrangements for adjustment and convertibility were designed to be effective in avoiding the protracted imbalances which led to the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system; they were symmetrical in relation to all member countries, large or small, developed or developing, in surplus or in deficit, and they were consistent with each other and with the volume of global liquidity. The "Outline" envisaged that the SDR would become the principal reserve asset of the reformed system, with the roles of gold and of reserve currencies being reduced. The "Outline" also indicated that economic development and the flow of real resources from developed to developing countries were to be promoted. The Chairman further pointed out that even where agreement was shown in the "Outline" it was subject, especially as regards adjustment and convertibility, to further agreement on operational provisions as well as to eventual agreement on monetary reform as a whole.

During the annual meeting the Governors focused their discussion on the "Outline" and announced the objective of reaching agreement on the principles of a new world monetary system by July 1, 1974.



The final meeting of the Deputies in 1973 took place in Nairobi on September 27 and was devoted to a discussion of their future work plans. They agreed to establish four technical groups on the subjects of (1) adjustment, with particular reference to a reserve indicator structure and financial pressures; (2) settlement, with particular reference to a possible multicurrency intervention system; (3) global liquidity and consolidation; and (4) the transfer of real resources from developed to developing countries. The technical groups began meeting promptly in Washington and Paris. Work on other subjects, such as aspects of the SDR, continued in the Executive Board of the Fund.

#### FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

During 1973 the FAO expanded its membership to 131. The People's Republic of China took its seat on April 1, and in November the FAO Conference elected Albania, Bangladesh, Mongolia, the United Arab Emirates, and Guinea-Bissau (Portuguese Guinea) to membership. FAO's activities during the year were marked by concern over the adequacy of world food supplies. Special attention was given to world food security, to international agricultural adjustment, and to preparations for a world food conference. In addition, FAO was designated by the UN Secretary General as the focal point for UN relief efforts in response to the Sahelian drought. (See also p. 108.)

#### *World Food Situation*

The world food situation in 1973 was the most difficult since the years immediately following the devastation of World War II. Widespread unfavorable weather in 1972 had brought agricultural production below even the indifferent agricultural production of 1971, and for the first time since World War II production dropped below the previous year's level. The U.S.S.R. had suffered the worst weather for agriculture in a century. Thus, 1973 was marked by a sharply lower level of grain reserves, by substantially increased grain prices, by scarce meat supplies, and by steeply climbing prices for meat. At the same time, efforts to increase production by greater use of fertilizers were thwarted by scarce supplies.

Early reports on 1973 crops were more encouraging, and the FAO Conference was informed in November 1973 that world food production might well increase by 3 or 4% over the 1972 level. However, it was clear that the tight supply situation, especially for cereals, would persist for at least another season, and that it would be some time yet before stock could again be built up to safe levels.

The world agricultural situation was naturally of major concern to FAO, whose objectives are to raise levels of nutrition, to improve agricultural production, and to stimulate more effective distribution and utilization of food and agricultural products. Thus, in addition to continuing its regular program and its field program, the organization's biennial Conference took a number of steps aimed at bringing about improvements in the world food situation.

#### *World Food Security*

The 17th session of the FAO Conference, which is the organization's supreme governing body, was held at FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy, from November 10 to 29, 1973. After examining the overall

situation in key agricultural commodities, and taking into account the depletion of world food stocks that had occurred in 1972-73, the Conference considered a proposal by FAO Director General Addeke H. Boerma for an international undertaking on world food security.

The proposal was aimed at having governments: (1) follow national stock policies that, in combination, would maintain a minimum safe level of basic food stocks for the world as a whole; (2) ensure carry-over stocks at the end of each marketing year at levels necessary to meet domestic requirements and, where appropriate, export requirements, including a security margin for emergency needs in cases of crop failure or natural disasters; and (3) ensure replenishment of national stocks whenever they fell below safe levels.

The Conference generally endorsed the basic principles and objectives of the proposal and decided to approach the matter in a series of steps. The Director General was to convene a working party, open to all member governments of FAO and of the United Nations having a substantial interest in the production, consumption, and trade of cereals, to review the undertaking and to prepare a revised text of the proposal. The revised text would be reviewed by the FAO Council's Committee on Commodity Problems and finally reviewed and adopted by the FAO Council in November 1974. The approved text would then be transmitted to all member governments of FAO and the non-members having a substantial interest in world cereals production, consumption, and trade, inviting them to signify their readiness to adhere to the undertaking. The FAO Council, with the assistance of the Committee on Commodity Problems, the Intergovernmental Groups on Grains and Rice, and the International Wheat Council, would make regular evaluations of the current and prospective world cereals stock.

#### *Proposal for a World Food Conference*

In his address to the UN General Assembly on September 24, 1973, Secretary of State Kissinger, after emphasizing that a world community must assure that all people are fed, and noting that no one country can cope with this problem, proposed that "a World Food Conference be organized under United Nations auspices in 1974 to discuss ways to maintain adequate food supplies, and to harness the efforts of all nations to meet the hunger and malnutrition resulting from natural disasters."

This proposal, in addition to being taken up in ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly, was discussed by the FAO Conference in November. The Conference recognized that the world food problem, which had seriously deteriorated during the previous year, could not be solved within the agricultural sector alone. A determined and cooperative effort was needed to deal with the problem in all its aspects, some of which were beyond the competence of FAO. The Conference welcomed and supported the proposal for a World Food Conference under UN auspices and expressed the view that it should be at the ministerial level and that all member countries of the organizations in the UN system should be invited to participate.

The FAO Conference decided that the organization's working capital fund might be drawn upon, up to \$500,000, to assist in pre-

paring for and holding the World Food Conference. It was proposed that, owing to the availability of FAO's expertise in Rome, the Conference be held there and that it be scheduled for November 1974. The UN General Assembly agreed to these proposals in a resolution adopted without a vote on December 17. (See also p. 75.)

#### *International Agricultural Adjustment*

In 1971 the 16th session of the FAO Conference selected international agricultural adjustment, which is designed to remove impediments to the efficient production and distribution of agricultural products, as one of the subjects to be discussed at the 17th session in 1973. The subject was chosen at a time of agricultural surpluses, but the subsequent two years were characterized by fluctuations, falling stocks, and, at least temporarily, shortages. Production had lagged in developing countries.

Against this background, the FAO Conference in 1973 agreed that present shortages should not lead to postponement of the development of an approach to international agricultural adjustment, which must be regarded as a long-term and evolutionary process. The Conference, therefore, concluded that FAO should evolve a proposed strategy and requested the Director General to prepare a draft of such a strategy including guidelines, indicators, and arrangements for periodic review and appraisal of progress. The draft strategy was to be presented to the FAO Council, together with the comments of the Committee on Commodity Problems, in mid-1975 and submitted to the 18th session of the FAO Conference in November 1975.

#### *Establishment of Commission on Fertilizers*

Recognizing that the world's food supply would be adversely affected by the shortage of fertilizers and that the energy crisis could contribute further to limiting the supply of fertilizers, the Director General in October 1973 convened an *ad hoc* consultation on fertilizers, in which the United States participated. One of the recommendations of this consultation was that a Commission on Fertilizers be established.

At its 61st session, in Rome in early November, the FAO Council took formal action to establish such a commission to review, analyze, and disseminate current information on production, consumption, and trade in fertilizers; to review economic factors related to fertilizer use; to consider measures to promote production to meet estimated demand; and to consider any special difficulties that may exist in relation to fertilizer production, consumption, and trade.

#### *Actions of the FAO Conference and Council*

To finance FAO's regular program activities, the 17th session of the FAO Conference voted a budget for the 1974-75 biennium of \$106.7 million. Much of the increase over the budget for the 1972-73 biennium reflected increased costs resulting from inflation and currency realignments.

In addition, the Conference acted to limit the percentage contribution of the largest contributor, the United States, to 25% in 1974-75, as compared with 31.52% in 1972-73.

As a result of the increase in the membership of FAO in recent years, the size of the FAO Council was increased from 34 to 42 states. The

eight new seats were allocated by FAO regions, with two seats each going to Africa, Asia and the Far East, and Latin America, and one each to Europe and the Near East. The North American region, which includes only Canada and the United States, continued to have two seats. The Conference without opposition elected Gonzalo Bula Hoyos of Colombia as chairman of the Council for the 1974-75 biennium. The Council, in turn, elected Ralph W. Phillips of the United States as chairman of its Program Committee and Frank Shefrin of Canada as chairman of its Finance Committee.

Four committees of the Council—Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Fisheries, Committee on Forestry, and Committee on Commodity Problems—are open to all member countries desiring to participate. The United States has an active interest in the work of all these committees and was appointed to membership on each of them by the Council for the 1974-75 biennium.

#### *Development Assistance*

The FAO Conference also reviewed the operations of the organization's field program, which is financed by the UNDP. During 1973 the FAO administered, under this program, about 500 large-scale and about 650 small-scale projects in 110 countries and territories. FAO specialists helped draw up 47 country programs approved in 1973 and helped prepare 42 more for consideration in 1974 and 1975. FAO had 57 senior agricultural advisers located in the field, serving more than 70 countries and territories.

The number of projects under FAO/Government cooperative programs rose to 149, of which 74 dealt with training. They represented a total value of \$36 million, of which \$8 million was for new projects approved in 1973.

The Associate Expert Scheme continued to expand in 1973 as agreements signed with Ireland, Italy, and Switzerland brought the total number of participating countries to 15, including the United States. About 350 young associate experts were on assignment and about 100 more were being recruited. Grants from donor countries for this activity totaled \$6.4 million.

During 1973 FAO gave technical support to 240 projects in 92 countries assisted by UNICEF. FAO also gave assistance to the International Coffee Organization on diversification projects for coffee producing countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia and the Far East, and it cooperated with the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control in sending missions to Thailand, Burma, Afghanistan, Lebanon, and Nepal.

#### *Other Programs*

Livestock development and the expansion of meat and dairy production received increased attention in 1973. More than 200 field projects, covering applied research activities, training programs, and country and regional surveys were carried out. Among other things an intensive study of beef production in Eastern Europe was started, with the direct participation of the United States. This is a follow-up to a study on the relationship between milk and beef production in Europe, which indicated that there could be a considerable deficit in beef in Western Europe by 1980 and that Eastern Europe has the potential for meeting part of the shortage.

FAO's major plant production and protection activities in 1973 were designed to improve grazing resources in arid areas, increase interest in seed improvement measures, expand food and industrial crops, and control plant diseases and pests.

By the end of 1973, evaluations of seed situations had been carried out in 98 countries, together with identification of deficiencies in certain countries in pursuance of FAO's efforts to improve seed production and distribution. Also, FAO's program of seed and planting material exchange, the only international service of its kind in the world, continued at an increasing rate. More than 30,000 samples were distributed to member countries from FAO headquarters.

In 1973, FAO was responsible for 139 field projects in 58 countries in land and water development. The increasing realization of the value of ground-water for irrigation has caused developing countries to request more FAO guidance and information on ground-water management.

The FAO Fishery Department continued to expand its activities, and at the end of the year FAO was providing operational assistance to 117 projects manned by about 200 international specialists in marine and fresh water fishery biology, stock assessment, exploratory and experimental fishing, cooperatives, fishing harbor engineering, technology, and marketing. In addition FAO held several technical conferences and seminars on various aspects of fishery problems.

Forestry activities in FAO also continued to expand. At the end of 1973, FAO was carrying out 80 large-scale forestry or forestry-related projects, with a budget of about \$59 million spread over 2 to 5 years. The Forestry Department continued to place emphasis on building and strengthening forestry institutions in developing countries. The first computerized model for forest planning in developing countries was used in Malaysia in 1973. A first attempt at automatic mapping of forest vegetation was initiated in Colombia using satellite imagery from the U.S. experimental earth resources technology satellite, ERTS-1. Trials with automatic vegetation mapping using the same method were carried out in the Sudan.

During 1973 the FAO Committee on Commodity Problems and its intergovernmental sub-groups provided market information on specific products. Commodity production and trade statistics compiled by FAO are used by the United States and others in developing trade policies and programs. U.S. industry representatives also took part in the meetings of these groups during the year.

The Codex Alimentarius Commission, the plenary body of the FAO/WHO Food Standards Program, and its technical committees continued their work of developing international standards to protect health, harmonize national food legislation, and insure fair practices in food trade. More than 100 international food standards and seven codes of hygienic practice have been adopted concerning, among other things, pesticide residue tolerances, labeling of packaged foods, and such specific foods as edible fats and oils, processed fruit and vegetables, sugar, and fishery products. In 1973, the Commission was working on about 200 additional standards and codes. In addition, approximately 500 food additives have been toxicologically examined. A joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts has drawn up a code

of principles for milk and milk products, adopted by more than 70 countries.

Closer links between the governments of developing countries and industry in developed countries are fostered by FAO's Industry Cooperative Program, which provides an international channel for managerial, marketing, and technical skills in the fields of agriculture and agricultural industry development. At the end of 1973, the program had more than 90 member companies, all specializing in the agro-industrial sector. About 20 U.S. companies were participating in the program.

Investment in agriculture in developing countries is pursued by FAO's Investment Center through cooperative programs with the World Bank and other public as well as private financing agencies. During 1973, loans and credits totalling \$217 million were approved in 17 countries.

A new Natural Resources for Food and Agriculture Program aimed at associating the FAO's normal work with the activities of UNEP was established in 1973. The program is two-fold. One part covers FAO work in data collection, statistics, and assessment concerning the state of natural resources for food and agriculture. The second part of the program covers "ecological management" activities, such as the biological control of pests, recycling of agricultural and agricultural industries waste, and control of soil and food consumption, together with institutional and legal aspects of such activities.

### *Publications*

FAO continued to be the world's leading publisher of material relating to international aspects of agriculture, fisheries, and forestry. Major publications during 1973 included the "Production Yearbook," the "Trade Yearbook," and the "State of Food and Agriculture," which are of broad general interest, and many specialized publications in fields falling within FAO's terms of reference. In addition to distribution within the U.S. Government, copies of these publications are supplied to the land-grant colleges and universities and to selected depository libraries. They thus have a wide geographic distribution within the United States.

### *World Food Program*

The WFP is a joint undertaking of the United Nations and the FAO. Its purpose is to channel food to developing countries to support economic and social development projects and to meet emergency situations. The United States has played a major role in the WFP since it began operations in 1963. Despite a tight grain situation, the United States expected to fulfill its commitments to the WFP for the fourth pledge period (1971-72).

The WFP observed its 10th anniversary in 1973 as a time for evaluation of the past and probable future of the Program. On the whole, the first 10 years were regarded as a success in terms both of operations and of experience gained. The number of contributing countries increased from 29 to more than 100, and pledges grew from \$85 million in the first 3-year period to \$355 million in the most recent biennium.

However, the 1973 world food crisis raised a basic issue. Did the WFP, created in an era of food surpluses, lose its justification as those

surpluses disappeared or did its mission of encouraging and supporting development by channeling food to people engaged in development projects give it a continuing justification despite increasingly widespread shortages? The answer to this question would lie in the collective judgment of governments whether WFP operations were truly effective and worth continuing at considerable cost. The U.S. position has been to continue to support WFP, and indications in 1973 were that other governments agreed. However, along with this support came a strong concern that the WFP should concentrate its activities where the need was greatest, give top priority to economic and social development, and phase out projects in countries where the need was no longer so great.

The major immediate issue facing the WFP in 1973 was the maintenance of food supplies. Because of the sudden rise in commodity costs and devaluation of the dollar, Executive Director Francisco Aquino (El Salvador) estimated that the Program faced a deficit of \$57 million in meeting current obligations through 1974, without taking into account new commitments. Consequently, he suspended approval of all new projects.

This situation strongly influenced decisions regarding the pledge target for the next biennium, on which a decision had to be made in 1973. The U.S. position was that the target should be realistic and attainable. The Intergovernmental Committee agreed, and in October recommended a target level of \$440 million for the sixth pledge period (1975-76), which was subsequently approved by the FAO Conference, ECOSOC, and the General Assembly. This target, which exceeded that of the fifth pledge period by \$100 million, was considered the minimum needed to maintain the Program, assuming no further increase in prices. The Intergovernmental Committee further authorized the Executive Director to send a letter to UN and FAO members urging them to exceed the target if at all possible and to provide at least one-third of the total pledge in cash and services.

The year ended on an encouraging note as pledges for the 1973-74 period surpassed the \$340 million target by \$15.7 million as a result of an announced contribution by the European Community. This obligated the full \$136 million pledge of the United States, since the U.S. matching formula specified that the United States would contribute 40% of the total commodities and cash for the purchase of commodities contributed by all countries, up to a maximum of \$93 million in commodities, \$40 million in freight services, and \$3 million toward administrative expenses.

Special operations in support of relief efforts in the drought-stricken Sahelian zone of Africa presented the WFP with a new challenge, resulting in the largest single WFP contribution to any operation in its history. The WFP has been involved in the Sahelian zone since 1964, with a number of food-for-work and emergency projects. As a result it was one of the first agencies to recognize the developing crisis and signalled the situation to member countries through reports in the FAO Early Warning Bulletins. As early as April 1972 the Intergovernmental Committee had authorized the Executive Director to relax regulations with regard to food operations in the Sahel to permit the sale of commodities to finance transportation costs. In May 1973 the Intergovernmental Committee approved an increase in emergency

funds from \$10 million to \$15 million to enable the WFP to respond more fully to the disaster. By the end of the year WFP contributions to the Sahelian countries amounted to 55,900 metric tons of grain, or about 10% of total food contributions from all donors during the year. The United States worked closely with the WFP in providing this assistance.

#### INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

During 1973 no country joined the ILO, which thus continued to have 123 members.

The ILO consists of three major organs: the International Labor Conference, the Governing Body, and the International Labor Office.

##### *International Labor Conference*

The International Labor Conference is the standard-setting body of the ILO. Every member state has the right to be represented at the Conference by a tripartite national delegation of one worker, one employer, and two government representatives, each individual having a separate and equal vote. The Governing Body selects areas in which it feels international labor standards are appropriate, and the Conference then incorporates agreed-upon standards into conventions, which may ultimately influence national legislation, and recommendations, which set forth guidelines.

The 58th session of the International Labor Conference, held in Geneva, June 6-27, 1973, was attended by some 1,400 delegates and advisers from 116 member states. More than 200 speakers took part in the general debate. The Conference adopted two conventions and recommendations. The first, a convention and recommendation on the minimum age for admission to employment, requires ratifying states to take steps to raise the minimum age for employment at least to the age at which compulsory education ends, but in any case to a minimum age of 15 (developing countries may initially set the minimum age at 14). The minimum age should apply at least to work in industry, transport, and commercial agriculture. The recommendation urges that special attention be given to assuring the fair compensation, health, and safety of workers under age 18. The second convention and recommendation concerns the social repercussions of new methods of cargo handling at docks. It establishes standards designed to protect the employment, income, and safety of dockworkers in areas where new methods, such as highly mechanized unit operations, have been introduced. Preliminary discussions were also held on international standards for the control and prevention of occupational cancer and on the provision of paid educational leave for retraining workers to meet the demands of changing technology and conditions of life.

*Finances.*—The Conference adopted a net expenditure budget for the 1974-1975 biennium of \$93,569,000, and authorized an assessment on members of \$45,134,500 for 1974. The U.S. share of this assessment, at 25%, was \$11,283,625.

The 1974-75 budget, although more than 30% larger than that for 1972-73, provided for a program of operations estimated to be 2.5% lower. The increase was caused principally by the fall in the value of the dollar in relation to the Swiss franc. This relationship is important



because, although payments to the ILO are calculated in U.S. dollars, nearly 70% of ILO expenditures are made in Swiss francs. From January, when the draft budget was distributed to the Governing Body, until June, when it was approved by the Conference, the value of the dollar declined from 3.80 to 3.11 Swiss francs and was still falling. Although the dollar recovered later in the year, the budget had to be approved when the value of the dollar was low and stabilization was not in view. The currency problem was exacerbated by inflation, which was estimated at an annual rate of just under 8% in Switzerland.

The absolute increase in the cost of the 1974-75 budget stimulated an unprecedented degree of opposition. Criticism in the Conference committee was unusually lengthy and intense, and even some of the countries assessed at the minimum rate raised objections to the costs they would have to bear. The budget, on which the United States abstained, was adopted by the smallest margin any ILO budget has received.

Although the scale of assessments customarily is set for the entire budget period at the same time that the overall level of the budget is approved, a divergence of views on integrating the ILO scale with that of the United Nations led to the setting of the scale only for 1974, with determination of the 1975 scale being left to the 1974 Conference.

During 1973, the United States paid the remainder of its assessment for 1972. All other outstanding U.S. assessments had been paid previously. A subsequent Congressional appropriation provided a total of \$6,422,250 for payment on the 1973 U.S. assessment of \$8,709,250, leaving a deficit of \$2,287,000.

*Resolutions.*—In an unusual turn of events, the Conference failed to adopt any of the 21 draft resolutions submitted to its Resolutions Committee. ILO procedures require resolutions to be rank-ordered and debated one at a time. No resolution can be considered by the Conference unless it has been debated in committee. The top-ranked resolution in 1973 condemned Israel for alleged improper practices in its occupied territories. The resolution dominated committee discussion to such an extent that only one other resolution could be fully debated. During the course of the plenary session debate of the resolution on Israel, the sponsors realized that they would have to delete one paragraph in order to get it adopted. Under standing rules, however, the deadline for submitting amendments to that resolution had passed, and the President of the Conference, Mr. Bintu'a Tshiabola (Zaire) held strictly to the rules. After failing in an attempt to induce the President to reverse his decision, the supporters of the resolution left the floor and did not return until the final meeting, when the President closed the Conference. Their absence made it impossible to obtain a quorum, and no further votes on either of the eligible resolutions could be taken.

### *Governing Body*

The Governing Body acts as a board of directors for the ILO. It appoints the Director General; instructs him in the management of the International Labor Office (secretariat); fixes the agenda of the Conference; reviews and recommends the ILO budget to the Confer-

ence; appoints, convenes, and reviews the work of committees and other bodies; and reviews allegations of violations of freedom of association. It is composed of 86 representatives of governments, labor organizations, and employer's associations. There are 48 titular (full) members: 24 represent governments, 12 represent workers, and 12 represent employers. Each titular member has one vote. Of the government members, 10<sup>22</sup> hold their seats automatically by being states of chief industrial importance. The remaining 14 government members, as well as the worker and employer members, are elected by the Conference for 3-year terms. There are also 38 elected deputy members (14 government, 12 worker, 12 employer), who may participate in debate but not vote. The present Governing Body was elected in 1972. The Governing Body elected Arturo Muñoz Ledo (Mexico) as its chairman for 1973-74.

The Governing Body met three times during 1973. The sessions in February-March and in May-June were largely given over to debating the budget. The November session considered allegations of violation of trade union rights in Chile. In the absence of the most current information, the Governing Body undertook to ask the Government of Chile if it would receive an ILO fact-finding and conciliation commission. The question was still pending at year's end. The Governing Body placed two new items on the agenda of the 60th session (1975) of the International Labor Conference. One of these, in keeping with International Women's Year, will be an examination of the problems of equality of opportunity and treatment for women workers. ILO research has revealed some progress in improving the status of women in working life in recent years, but in spite of this, women still encounter discrimination and a denial of true equality of opportunity in employment throughout most of the world. The other item placed on the 1975 Conference agenda concerned the establishment of tripartite (government-employer-worker) machinery at the national level to improve the implementation of ILO standards. Examination of this item could lead to the adoption of a convention calling for the creation of tripartite bodies in member countries to ensure the effective participation of employers' organizations and trade unions in drawing up and implementing labor legislation.

The Governing Body established two new groups at the subcommittee level that reflected the awareness of members that they must have more and better information on the ILO's operations and programs in order to exercise effective control over the budget. In May the Governing Body created a Working Party on the Financing of the 1974 Budget to make a one-time examination of the effect of currency fluctuations and to search for areas in which savings could be made without damage to the program approved by the Conference. In November the Governing Body decided to extend the mandate of this working party to enable it to make a more careful examination of appropriate areas in which efficiency could be increased without compromising programs.

The Governing Body also established three subcommittees of its Committee on Operational Programs to examine ILO technical co-

<sup>22</sup> Canada, China, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy, Japan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

operation programs at the regional level in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. As a result of its examination of several in-depth program reviews and two drafts of a long-term plan, the Governing Body decided that it needed more information on the results of technical cooperation in order to play an effective role in setting priorities and evaluating the financial implications of programs in this field.

#### *International Labor Office*

The Director General of the ILO, C. Wilfred Jenks of the United Kingdom, died on October 9, 1973. Deputy Director General Dr. Abbas Ammar (Egypt) directed the affairs of the International Labor Office until the Governing Body convened in November, when it decided that the most senior available member of the ILO directorate, Deputy Director General Francis Blanchard (France), would conduct the business of the office until a new Director General had been appointed. The Governing Body decided to appoint a Director General at its session in February–March 1974.

#### *Technical Assistance*

The ILO serves as the executing agency for numerous UNDP financed technical assistance projects in the labor field. Over 750 such projects were being implemented in December 1973. Most of these projects extend over a number of years and their total programmed costs were estimated to be \$184.7 million from the UNDP and \$220 million from the recipient governments. In 1973 alone the UNDP provided \$27.2 million.

### UN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Gambia joined UNESCO in 1973, bringing its total membership to 131, with one associate member.

#### *Executive Board*

The United States continued in 1973 to be a member of UNESCO's governing body, the Executive Board, which met twice during the year at UNESCO headquarters in Paris, taking a number of significant program actions and making some major policy decisions. At its spring session, the United States submitted a proposal asking UNESCO's 18th General Conference, scheduled to meet in the fall of 1974, to assign the United States and Canada to the European regional group of UNESCO, one of five regional groups created by the General Conference in 1964 to facilitate the implementation of UNESCO's program activities on a regional scale. The impetus for the U.S. action was the growing importance of U.S. participation in European regional activities, including those related to the Conference on European Security and Cooperation. The U.S. proposal was adopted by a vote of 21 (U.S.) to 1, with 15 abstentions.

The other major political decision taken at the spring session, in response to a resolution of UNESCO's 17th General Conference in 1972, was the adoption of a resolution, by a vote of 26 to 0, with 10 abstentions (U.S.), inviting movements recognized by the OAU to participate as observers in Executive Board deliberations of concern to them and requesting the Director General to associate these movements with UNESCO activities by, *inter alia*, "seeking their assist-

ance, whenever necessary, in any study or publication concerning the state of education, science, and culture in their respective territories when it is of direct concern to them." In a separate vote requested by the United States, the United States and four other members voted against the paragraph of the resolution referring to the "respective territories" of these movements. The U.S. Representative explained that in view of paragraph 10 of Article 5 of the UNESCO Constitution, as well as paragraph 29 of the Executive Board's rules of procedure, persons invited under the resolution would be invited in their private capacity, since the Executive Board had no authority to invite them in any other capacity.

The fall session of the Executive Board undertook a technical examination of supplementary cost estimates submitted by the Director General. The estimated additional costs of \$23.7 million reflected both inflation and the devaluation of the dollar. The Director General proposed meeting the higher costs through the \$4.31 million appropriation reserve (a budget item established in 1973-74 to meet such emergencies) and \$3.53 million in budgetary economies. Contributions from new members would provide another \$1.6 million.

Since these measures still left a deficit of more than \$14.25 million, the Executive Board decided to summon an extraordinary session of the General Conference. The Board recommended that the Director General be asked to produce additional savings of \$1.6 million, with the remaining \$12.65 million to be made up by means of a supplementary appropriation financed by contributions from member states. Of the total, \$9 million would be apportioned among the members and paid together with the regular 1974 contributions; the rest would be paid "upon receipt of a communication from the Director General, to be sent with the prior approval of the Executive Board on the basis of further review, in the course of 1974, of the financial situation of the organization." The Board accepted the Director General's reservation of the right to revise the estimates upward should the dollar devalue further and to present such estimates to the 18th General Conference in October 1974.

The third extraordinary session of the General Conference adopted this recommendation by a vote of 106 (U.S.) to 1, with 14 abstentions. The additional costs to the United States for 1973 resulting from this action amounted to some \$3.72 million.

Other program actions taken by the Executive Board are described in the appropriate substantive sections below.

#### *Technical Assistance Activities*

During 1973 UNESCO received \$36.4 million from the UNDP for technical assistance projects executed by UNESCO on UNDP's behalf. This sum is part of \$256.6 million in UNDP funds, which will be supplemented by \$387.8 million from recipient countries' own resources, to cover the costs of 984 multi-year UNDP projects that were being executed by UNESCO in December 1973. UNESCO is the third largest executing agency for the UNDP, after FAO and the United Nations itself.

#### *Education*

The Second Conference of European Ministers of Education, which met in Bucharest, Romania, from November 26 to December 4, brought

together senior government representatives in the field of education from 32 European countries to focus upon the desirability of closer collaboration in higher education. The United States and Canada participated as observers. The conference adopted substantive recommendations concerning lifelong education; access to and democratization of higher education; inter-university relations; and the methods, structures, and content of higher education. Delegates expressed the desire of their governments to help the training of specialists from developing countries through courses and postgraduate studies in Europe, through research centers, and by creating scholarships and sending experts. Special attention was also paid to the potential usefulness of the European Center for Higher Education, recently created by UNESCO in Bucharest to promote the exchange of information.

The Biennial International Conference on Education, convened by UNESCO's Director General, held its 34th session in Geneva from September 19 to 27, 1973. Its principal theme was the relationship between education, training, and employment, with particular reference to secondary education, its aims, structure, and content. The conference complemented earlier conferences and touched upon contemporary U.S. concerns in the field of career education. In response to UNESCO's request to all participants, the United States, through the U.S. Office of Education, published in four languages for the use of the conference and member states a report on *Progress of Education in the U.S.A., 1970-71 and 1971-72*. The cosponsor and host of the conference, the International Bureau of Education, which became a part of UNESCO in 1970, has been playing an increasingly important role in developing improved international coordination and dissemination of educational information.

Sponsored by UNESCO, the University of Maryland, and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, a conference on the teaching of integrated science brought together on the Maryland campus over 260 participants from more than 50 countries to discuss new ways in which science can be taught and teachers trained for pre-college levels.

The special problems of migratory workers and their families were addressed by a meeting of experts convened in October in Paris to discuss and plan the contribution UNESCO could make toward improving the educational opportunities of the children of migratory workers. Although the meeting focused primarily on the plight of families in Europe that have migrated from the littoral Mediterranean countries, experts agreed that steps taken to alleviate their situation might be applicable in many areas of the world. U.S. observers found that there was considerable interest in the U.S. experience in attempting to respond to the problems of migratory workers.

### *Natural Sciences*

The United States participates in all five of UNESCO's major international cooperative science programs and, on the whole, was satisfied with their progress in 1973.

The 18-nation Steering Committee for UNISIST—the World Science Information System—held its first session in November in Paris. The committee's function is to guide the planning and execution of the program, which was established in 1972. The United States

was elected one of three vice presidents of the committee and serves on its bureau. The Committee made a number of constructive decisions, one of the most significant being the agreement to slow down development of UNISIST-related international centers until the bureau has reviewed guidelines for the development, budgeting, management, and termination of such centers. As in the case of other UNESCO programs, the United States pressed for tighter management, clear priorities, concentration of resources on fewer issues, and use of evaluation procedures, especially in training and manpower activities.

The 15-member Board for the International Geological Correlation Program held its first session in May. This is a coordinated research program focusing on fundamental problems of geology in the world's regions, with particular emphasis on more effective exploration of natural resources. The board began but did not complete the examination of project priorities. One of its major achievements was the development of several specific suggestions on ways and means to encourage participation by developing countries in the program.

The 25-state International Coordinating Council for the "Man and the Biosphere" program (MAB), UNESCO's principal environmental activity, held its second session in Paris in April. MAB is a cooperative research and education program concerned with the rational management of the environment. The United States was reelected as one of four vice presidents. In a key decision, the Council designated four of the 13 MAB projects as "core" projects, meaning that implementation of these could begin immediately because they are at a more advanced stage of preparation. The four deal with tropical forests, grasslands, coastal zones, and mountain ecosystems.

The 30-state Coordinating Council for the International Hydrological Decade held its eighth session in Paris in May. The United States, which has served on the Council since the beginning of the Decade in early 1965, was elected for the first time as one of the four vice presidents. The 1973 session was concerned primarily with activities necessary to complete the Decade by the end of 1974 and, to some extent, with the planning of a new program to be known as the International Hydrological Program, which will follow the Decade. UNESCO and WMO have already worked out arrangements to cooperate closely with each other on this program.

Two new subsidiary bodies of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) began their work in 1973: the Working Group on Training, Education, and Mutual Assistance and the International Coordination Group for the Global Investigation of Pollution in the Marine Environment (GIPME). However, the most important event during the year was the IOC's eighth Assembly in Paris in November, the biennial meeting of all 76 member states. The Assembly adopted 36 resolutions, supported on the whole by the United States. The more important of these established, for the first time, a program of work and financial requirements for the 1975-76 biennium to be submitted by the UNESCO secretariat to the 18th General Conference in 1974; rationalized the structure of the IOC subsidiary bodies; strengthened the IOC's special links of association, collaboration, and cooperation with the agencies participating in the Intersec-

retariat Committee on Scientific Programs Relating to Oceanography (United Nations, FAO, UNESCO, WMO, IMCO); urged the accelerated implementation of a comprehensive plan for GIPME; and agreed to the establishment of a Marine Pollution Monitoring Pilot Project under the Integrated Global Ocean Stations System.

### *Culture and Communication*

Appropriately, in view of its leading role in 1972 in gaining the nearly unanimous adoption of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the United States on December 7, 1973, became the first UNESCO member to ratify the Convention. The Convention, which will come into force 3 months after the deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification, acceptance, or accession, requires parties to take appropriate actions to restore and preserve cultural sites and natural areas within their own territories that may have universal significance to mankind, and to develop the scientific and financial resources necessary to protect them.

The issue of Israeli archaeological excavations in Jerusalem again arose during the spring session of the Executive Board. Arab states have been concerned that such excavations were having an adverse effect on the preservation of the traditional and historic character of cultural properties in the city. The United States voted against a strongly worded resolution reiterating the Arab states' past grievances against Israeli activities in Jerusalem, but it accepted the Director General's view that Israel, by agreeing to receive a qualified expert as the Director General's representative for Jerusalem and to extend to him all necessary facilities, had made it possible for the Director General to comply with the mandate given him by the 17th General Conference to establish a UNESCO presence in Jerusalem.

Other actions in the cultural field taken by the Executive Board during 1973 included authorization for the Director General (1) to seek to raise \$5 million in voluntary contributions for the preservation and development of the ancient site of Mohenjodero, in Pakistan; and (2) to conclude with the Lebanese Government a preliminary agreement concerning the establishment by Lebanon of an International Center for the Humanities and Development at Byblos, which UNESCO will assist in operating.

In the communications area, the fall session of the Executive Board took steps to implement the resolution of the 17th General Conference concerning the convening in 1974 of an intergovernmental conference, jointly sponsored by UNESCO and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), to draw up and adopt an appropriate international convention relating to the distribution of television signals transmitted by satellite. In a related action, the Board approved an agreement between UNESCO and WIPO that is expected to strengthen the close and cooperative working relations between the two organizations.

### *Restitution of Works of Art to Countries Victims of Expropriation*

An item on "restitution of works of art to countries victims of expropriation" was added to the agenda of the 28th General Assembly on the initiative of Zaire which explained, in the General Committee on November 8, that it wished to see reparation made for the artistic

and cultural damage that many member states had suffered at the hands of former colonial powers. The item was considered directly in plenary at two meetings on December 18.

By a vote of 113 to 0, with 17 abstentions (U.S.), the Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by Zaire and nine other states that called upon all member states to prohibit the expropriation of works of art and directed the Secretary General, in consultation with UNESCO, to submit a report to the General Assembly at its 30th session (1975) on the progress achieved toward this end.

The United States abstained because in its view the draft resolution was vague and inadequate. The U.S. Representative, Mr. Buckley, noted that it had not been referred to a main Committee for proper consideration. The resolution concerned a complex question requiring the kind of attention that the Sixth (Legal) Committee was equipped to provide. Further, it was the belief of the United States that if the General Assembly was truly interested in this question it should urge member states to ratify the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, which was adopted by UNESCO in November 1970 and came into force in August 1972. The U.S. Senate has given its advice and consent to this Convention, and the implementing legislation required before ratification is before the Congress.

#### *U.S. National Commission for UNESCO*

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO continued to emphasize programs for population control, environmental protection, and drug abuse prevention, and initiated new activities in the fields of science education, human rights, and culture.

Aided by a grant from the General Services Foundation, Inc., the Commission began an international program to promote increased awareness of the nature of the worldwide population crisis, while providing informational assistance to population agencies already at work in this critical field. The program includes the publication in English and Spanish of a newsletter, *World Population Year News Service*, which has been cosponsored by UNESCO national commissions in some 30 countries.

As an outgrowth of an earlier regional U.S. conference on environmental education, the Commission organized a national and international environmental educational program at the pre-college level in cooperation with the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior. The program, Students Toward Environmental Participation, is encouraging the training of young people in basic environmental techniques through regional conferences and problem-solving approaches to local situations. At the same time, the U.S. National Commission, working through the commissions in other UNESCO member states, organized in Chicago in April an international conference on youth and the environment, which led to the publication of an international environmental newsletter for high school students and youths.

At the request of the Department of State, the Commission established a National Committee on Man and the Biosphere, which includes representatives from 10 government agencies, 4 nongovernmental organizations, and 4 universities. The purpose of the Committee is to make the MAB program better known to the American public.



As a follow-up to earlier efforts to assist UNESCO in the formulation of an international program on drug abuse prevention, the Commission developed a special program for young Americans who have drug-abuse problems while traveling or living overseas. With financial assistance from several public and private sources the Commission began a special study in Amsterdam and Paris of drug addiction and prevention among American youths who congregate in those two cities.

The Commission participated in the organization of a UNESCO-supported conference on Cultural Innovation in Technological and Post-Industrial Societies held at the University of South Florida in October. This conference, in which some 60 American artists, educators, administrators, and government representatives participated, served as a planning session for a long-term UNESCO study of the impact of technology on the cultural development of industrialized societies. The study, to be expanded to one Asian and four European countries, will be aimed at providing scholars and policy makers with a better understanding of the dimensions and characteristics of modern cultural expression.

The Commission's Business Advisory Committee organized, in cooperation with the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a series of regional conferences on the problems of internationalizing management education. The conferences were held at the graduate schools of business of the University of Indiana, the University of Washington, and Georgia State College.

The Commission concluded the year with its annual meeting in San Francisco in November. The meeting featured a one-day symposium on the UNESCO-sponsored report, *Learning to Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow*; a public briefing on international environmental development and the U.S. role therein since the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment; and a discussion of the Commission's latest publication, *UNESCO and the U.S. National Interest: A Statement by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO*.

#### WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The German Democratic Republic, North Korea, and Swaziland joined in 1973 raising WHO's membership to 138 full and 2 associate members. Dr. Halfdan T. Mahler (Denmark), formerly Assistant Director General, was elected Director General and took office on July 20, 1973, upon the retirement of Dr. Marcolino G. Candau who had headed the organization since 1953.

##### *World Health Assembly*

The 26th World Health Assembly was held in Geneva May 7-25, 1973. It was attended by, in addition to members, official observers from the United Nations, other specialized agencies, the Order of Malta, the League of Arab States, the OAU, and the OAS. In all, more than 600 delegates and observers attended the Assembly. The U.S. delegation was headed by Dr. Charles C. Edwards, Assistant Secretary for Health, HEW.

The Assembly approved a 1974 budget totaling \$106,328,800, an increase of 9.97% over the revised 1973 budget. (The Director General's original budget proposal of \$100,250,000 was increased by \$6,078,800 to

compensate for currency revaluations.) The United States opposed the proposed budget level and the rapid rate of growth it represented but was unsuccessful in its effort to have the organization use funds from casual income and the terminal payments account to reduce the budget to \$103 million. The Director General's proposed budget was approved by a vote of 96 to 10 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The U.S. Representative explained that the United States was not voting against the level of the proposed program, but rather against the method of financing the program. He said that his delegation felt there were practical alternatives by which the rapid rise in assessments on member governments could be reduced.

The Health Assembly adopted by a vote of 54 (U.S.) to 9, with 12 abstentions, a resolution establishing as a matter of principle a maximum assessment of 25% for any one member state. The Assembly agreed that the 25% limitation would be reached as soon as practicable by using the percentage points made available from the contributions of new members and the normal increases in the percentage contributions of members resulting from increases in their national incomes. As a first step toward this goal, the U.S. contribution for the year 1974 was reduced during the Health Assembly from 30.82% to 29.18% due to new memberships.

The Assembly elected eight states to designate representatives to serve on the Executive Board for the 3-year period 1974-77: China, Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Malawi, Poland, Switzerland, United States, and Yemen (Aden). These states replaced those whose term of office expired at the end of the Assembly: Austria, Ethiopia, France, Kenya, Laos, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, and U.S.S.R. Dr. S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr., Director, Office of International Health, HEW, was subsequently appointed the U. S. Member on the Executive Board.

Two amendments to the WHO Constitution were approved which, upon ratification by two-thirds of the member states, will permit the introduction of biennial programming and budgeting. This concept, supported by the United States, was endorsed by the ACC for UN agencies several years ago.

Program matters discussed at the Health Assembly included (1) international cooperation in cancer control; (2) quality, safety, and efficacy of drugs; (3) smallpox eradication; (4) problems of the human environment; (5) the threat of famine in a number of African countries; (6) international standards and units for biological substances; (7) development and coordination of biomedical research; (8) research on epidemiology; and (9) the proposed project for research and reporting on the epidemiology of drug dependence. The Assembly also considered the 17th report of the Committee on International Surveillance of Communicable Diseases and amendments to the 1969 International Health Regulations.

### *Program Activities*

WHO is concerned primarily with coordination of international health activities, establishment of international health standards, and technical assistance to governments. In 1973 it made financial provision for over 1,448 projects, of which more than 1,156 were continued from previous years. Fellowship awards not directly related to specific programs accounted for 189 projects. Funds from sources other than its

regular budget, such as UNDP, UNICEF, and various special funds such as UNFPA, brought the total amount administered by WHO during 1973 to over \$177,200,000.

*Smallpox.*—WHO is continuing to give high priority to the global smallpox eradication program which is in its last stages. By the end of 1973 only four countries (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, and Pakistan) were believed to be endemic smallpox areas, compared to 30 in 1967 when the intensive eradication program began. Furthermore, the disease was being increasingly contained so that it was present in somewhat less than half the geographic area of the four countries. In 1973 some 132,000 cases were estimated to have occurred compared with at least 2,500,000 cases in 1967. In the Americas the last reported case occurred in April 1971. Because of the success of the global smallpox eradication program the United States no longer requires routine smallpox vaccination.

*Human Environment.*—WHO's program for the promotion of environmental health focuses on (1) the establishment of parameters with respect to environmental influences on health, and (2) coordination of epidemiological health surveillance, including worldwide environmental monitoring systems. In addition, WHO collects and disseminates environmental health information, stimulates research, and assists in the training of personnel. WHO's long-term program in this area also stresses basic sanitation with particular emphasis on safe water supply and adequate waste disposal.

In carrying out the program emphasized by the World Health Assembly, WHO collaborates with the rest of the UN system, especially UNEP and the other specialized agencies. WHO representatives attended the first session of the UNEP Governing Council held in Geneva in June 1973 and have attended many of the inter-agency working groups convened by UNEP. Together with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Commission of the European Community, WHO helped organize an international scientific symposium on "Recent Advances in the Assessment of Health Effects of Environmental Pollution" to be held in 1974.

*Cholera.*—The thrust of WHO's cholera control program lies increasingly on improved sanitation surveillance activities and early treatment by administration of oral and intravenous fluids rather than vaccine, the efficiency of which has proved to be of limited effectiveness for a limited duration of time. A continuing problem is the difficulty that affected countries have in reporting cases promptly. During 1973 the cholera pandemic which began in 1970 continued. In view of the possibility of its spread into South and Central America, WHO assisted member states there through the training of personnel in laboratory diagnosis, treatment, and surveillance techniques. WHO's program of assistance to cholera-stricken countries was aided by generous contributions from the United States and others to WHO's Voluntary Fund for Health Promotion, Cholera Special Account.

*Malaria.*—During 1973 WHO continued the coordinated malaria control and eradication campaign that began in 1955. One measure of the success of that effort is that at the end of the Second World War it was estimated that approximately 62% of the world's population

was living in areas exposed to the risk of malaria, while by 1972 the number of people still living in areas without any specific protection against transmission had decreased to only 2,070,000, most of them in Africa south of the Sahara. WHO's approach is to assist governments by providing technical guidance.

*Drug Control Activities.*—WHO carries out a variety of activities related to drug control. These include ensuring the quality, safety, and efficacy of drugs and the establishment of an effective system for collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information on drugs, particularly with regard to adverse reactions.

As its contribution to the international campaign against drug abuse WHO encourages and assists the development of effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in member countries. With the support of the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control in 1973, it began supervision of a treatment and rehabilitation project in Thailand. Also in cooperation with the Fund the organization is developing the means for international collection and exchange of information on the extent and incidence of drug dependence and on the human and environmental factors associated therewith. Planning and feasibility studies for such an epidemiological study were initiated in 1973 and will soon be implemented.

*Onchocerciasis.*—WHO has devised a strategy for an onchocerciasis (river blindness) control program to be carried out in a seven-country area of the Volta River Basin in West Africa. In this area onchocerciasis has affected over a million people of whom at least 60,000 are blind or have severe eye disorders. Control efforts include eradication of the black-fly vector. In addition to the humanitarian considerations, there are socio-economic consequences. At a time of disastrous drought to the north, large areas of otherwise productive agricultural land are lying abandoned as a result of the prevalence of this disease. Based upon the recommendations of a preparatory assistance mission established by WHO and financed by UNDP and AID, a 20-year \$120 million program to control onchocerciasis in Dahomey, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Mali, Niger, Togo, and Upper Volta has been developed. The program will be financed under the aegis of the IBRD and executed by WHO in its initial stages. The Bank will seek voluntary contributions from governments and multilateral organizations.

#### INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Oman, Swaziland, and Fiji became members of ICAO in 1973 by adhering to the 1944 Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, thus increasing ICAO's membership to 128.

#### *Aircraft Hijacking and Sabotage*

As in 1972, much of ICAO's work in 1973 was devoted to the problem of unlawful interference with international civil aviation. The United States continued a major effort in ICAO to bring about adoption of an independent convention enabling states parties to act in concert against a state, even if not a party, that harbored hijackers or saboteurs or that failed to return an aircraft, passengers, or crew. Such a convention would provide for worldwide enforcement of the

fundamental legal principles reflected in the 1970 Hague Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and the 1971 Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation.

*Legal Committee.*—Proposals for a convention providing sanctions, which the United States promoted vigorously, would have obligated states parties to impose sanctions, including suspension of air service, on states in certain situations following a hijacking. The proposal proved too controversial and failed to receive serious consideration at the 20th session of the ICAO Legal Committee, held at ICAO's headquarters in Montreal, January 9–30, 1973. The Legal Committee rejected most of the principles that would underlie a possible enforcement convention but did approve by a narrow margin the principle that parties to a convention might forward corrective recommendations to another state whether or not a party to the convention. Upon this principle, the Nordic states (Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden) constructed a proposal for a convention.

The Legal Committee did not have time to give appropriate consideration to the Nordic proposal or to three other proposals before it: one by the U.S.S.R. for an optional protocol to the Hague (hijacking) Convention and the other two by France and by Switzerland and the United Kingdom to amend the Chicago Convention. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that the ICAO Council submit the amendment proposals to an extraordinary ICAO Assembly and the Nordic and Soviet proposals to a diplomatic conference to be convened at the same time and place.

*Assembly and Conference on Air Law.*—The 20th (extraordinary) session of the ICAO Assembly and the International Conference on Air Law met in Rome from August 28 to September 21, 1973. At these meetings the United States took the position that the convention proposed by the Nordic countries, if strengthened, could be an effective means for influencing states' actions concerning hijackers and saboteurs. As an independent convention it could be brought into force rapidly with a relatively small number of ratifications. In contrast, an amendment to the Chicago Convention, which would require at least 86 ratifications to enter into force, could not be viewed as an effective measure within the foreseeable future. However, the United States endeavored to build a consensus by stressing to ICAO members that the convention and amendment proposals might be viewed as complementary measures offering near-term and long-range solutions to the problem. In the same effort to attract support for the Nordic proposal, the United States supported the Soviet proposal and a Greek proposal introduced at the Conference to enlarge the number of offenses under the Montreal Convention to include acts of violence against persons at airports.

Despite 4 weeks of work the Assembly and Conference, attended by representatives of 101 countries, failed to adopt any of the proposals made. The atmosphere of the meetings was highly charged politically because of the Middle Eastern focus of much of the international hijacking problem. While no significant group of countries took an entirely negative position on all the proposals, few countries proved willing to support more than one type of proposal. For example, the

Arab and most African countries, together with the United Kingdom and France, supported various forms of amendments to the Chicago Convention but opposed all the proposals for an independent convention. In the absence of a common purpose among a majority of the countries present, none of the proposals received sufficient support to be adopted.

*ICAO Council.*—In December 1973 the ICAO Council adopted amendments to five different ICAO technical annexes to the Chicago Convention, to the ICAO Facilitation Annex, and to the Procedures for Air Navigation Services, incorporating international standards and recommended practices and procedures for aviation security. However, a new ICAO technical annex dealing only with security failed to receive the required two-thirds majority vote of the Council and was referred back to the Council's Committee on Unlawful Interference for reconsideration.

During 1973 the Council as well as the Assembly at its 19th and 20th sessions adopted resolutions condemning Israel for shooting down a Libyan civil aircraft on February 21, 1973, which resulted in the loss of 108 lives, and for violating Lebanon's sovereignty for the forcible diversion and seizure of a Lebanese civil aircraft on August 10, 1973.

#### *19th Assembly*

The 19th (extraordinary) session of the ICAO Assembly, held at UN headquarters in New York from February 27 to March 2, 1973, was made necessary by the coming into force of an amendment to the Chicago Convention increasing the number of seats on the Council from 27 to 30. The Assembly elected the Netherlands, Pakistan, and Trinidad and Tobago to fill the three additional seats.

At U.S. request, the Council on February 5 had decided to add an additional agenda item concerning the possible adoption of the principle of a maximum assessment of 25% for any contracting state. The maximum contribution (that of the United States) was reduced by the Assembly from 28.75% to 25% and the minimum contribution reduced from .10% to .06%. These reductions were to be implemented by applying the percentage assessments of new member states and the increase in percentage assessments of other member states resulting from increases in their national incomes or civil aviation capacities. By a vote of 68 to 26 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions, the Assembly decided, in a resolution similar to one adopted in 1971 concerning South Africa, that Portugal should not be invited to attend ICAO meetings and should not receive ICAO documents and communications, other than those specifically required by the Chicago Convention, as long as it failed to implement General Assembly resolutions on decolonization.

#### *Conference on Economics of Route Air Navigation Facilities and Airports*

This meeting, attended by representatives of 54 ICAO member states, was held in Montreal from February 6 to 23 in order to review and refine ICAO principles concerning the assessment of charges against aircraft operators for the use of international air navigation facilities and airports. The Conference made a number of recommendations with regard to the determination of costs allocable to international civil aviation. The particular bases to be recommended to states

as the standard for use in assessing charges for en route facilities and services were also a subject of considerable discussion. The Conference decided that both distance flown and aircraft weight should be recommended as factors in determining charges, without any stipulation concerning their relative significance. Recommendations were made to strengthen the consultative procedures used by providers of airports and en route facilities in dealing with aeronautical users when new or revised charges are being contemplated.

The Conference recommended that the Council investigate the possibility of extending the scope of ICAO regional air navigation meetings to include consideration of economic aspects of the use of facilities required to ensure the safe and regular operation of air traffic. As proposed by the United States, the Conference also recommended that the Council institute a biennial collection of financial and traffic data from states relating to their en route facilities. The recommendations of the Conference, as amended by the Council, were to be published in a revised edition of the 1967 "Statements by the Council to Contracting States on Charges for Airports and Route Air Navigation Facilities."

#### *Joint Financing Conference*

The Second Conference on 1956 Danish and Icelandic Joint Financing Agreements was held at ICAO's regional office in Paris from March 27 to April 5 to determine whether user charges should be introduced for the facilities and services involved and, if so, the financing principles to be followed. This conference, in which 15 states parties to the Agreements and two other states whose civil aircraft fly the North Atlantic were represented, agreed that effective January 1, 1974, users should begin paying for part of the costs of the facilities and services jointly financed by governments. As provided for in Article XIV of the Agreements, it was agreed that Denmark and Iceland should institute a system of user charges for each civil aircraft crossing based on 40% of the jointly financed approved actual costs allocable to civil aviation. The 40% figure would be increased to 50% for the years 1976, 1977, and 1978. The United Kingdom offered to act as agent for Denmark and Iceland in collecting the charges. If, by the latter part of 1977, it appeared to the Council that no unified charging system for all civil aircraft flights over the North Atlantic would be in force by January 1, 1979, the Council was to call another conference in the first half of 1978 to review the user charge system established by the 1973 Conference.

#### *Facilitation Division*

The eighth session of ICAO's Facilitation Division, held in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, from March 6 to 22, was attended by representatives of 55 ICAO member states. The Division approved a body of practical recommendations on security aspects of facilitating the movement of passengers and cargo. Provision was made for the orderly completion of ICAO's work on the passport card and for study within a reasonable period of time of the problem of peak scheduling at airports. The Division also made practical recommendations for the orderly evaluation and adoption by ICAO member states of the standard airport signs endorsed by the ICAO Council. Numerous useful revisions,

clarification, and refinements were made in ICAO Annex 9, Standards and Recommended Practices for Facilitation, including elimination of passenger-manifest requirements and a new provision requesting ICAO members to make suitable arrangements for clearance of containers, pallets, and their loads at off-airport locations.

#### *Regional Air Navigation Meetings*

The ICAO Fifth Africa-Indian Ocean Regional Air Navigation Meeting was held in Rome from January 10 to February 2. The purpose of the meeting was to develop a revised air navigation plan for Africa setting forth the facilities and services required for international aviation for the next 5 years. A plan was developed, but unfortunately some of its requirements were believed to be excessive. The questions of how and when the additional requirements would be implemented, particularly in view of the large expense involved, were not resolved.

Another full-scale ICAO Regional Air Navigation Meeting was held from September 5 to 28 to review and update the plans for what ICAO termed the Asia/Pacific region. The United States was host to the meeting at Honolulu, which was highly successful. For the first time, the Soviet Union participated actively in an ICAO regional meeting covering its territory and provided information on air navigation facilities now in operation or planned in the eastern U.S.S.R. The meeting specified the facilities to be provided at 194 airports throughout the area for use by new large aircraft. Requirements for air navigation aids were revised and the meeting recommended that a worldwide ICAO meeting be held to review problems attendant upon the continued operation of the Loran A navigation system and to deal with the development and financing of future long-range navigation requirements. The meeting also broadened planning for the preparation and exchange of meteorological data, recommended communications improvements, established 70 new flight information regions, made new plans for air traffic services and for search and rescue, and explored new requirements for aeronautical information. The meeting concluded with the preparation of a program for implementation of the various recommendations on a coordinated basis.

#### *Technical Assistance Activities*

In addition to its regular activities, ICAO also serves as an executing agency for technical assistance projects funded by the UNDP. In 1973 \$7.3 million of UNDP funds were programmed by ICAO, and 175 projects were being implemented at year's end. Their total cost was estimated at \$92.2 million of which the UNDP will furnish \$40.4 million and recipient governments the balance.

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

The People's Republic of China, Sierra Leone, Zaire, Kenya, Iraq, Thailand, German Democratic Republic, Jordan, and Cyprus joined IMCO during 1973, bringing its total membership to 83 full members and one associate member (Hong Kong).

At the eighth session of IMCO's plenary body, the Assembly, which met in London November 13-23, 1973, the United States was reelected to a 2-year term on IMCO's 18-member governing body, the Council,



and to a 4-year term on the principal sub-body, the 16-member Maritime Safety Committee. The United States is also a member of all other organs of IMCO. The Assembly also approved the budget for the 1974-75 biennium, providing \$2,924,000 for 1974 and \$3,031,500 for 1975. The U.S. assessments under these budgets were \$152,450 in 1974 and \$173,787 in 1975.

On December 31 Colin Goad of the United Kingdom, IMCO's Secretary General for 6 years, retired. Selected to fill his place, with a 4-year renewable contract beginning January 1, 1974, was C. P. Srivastava, a well-known Indian shipping official who has long represented his government in international shipping matters.

At the biennial Assembly, the organization approved the creation of a new committee to deal with marine pollution. Named the Marine Environment Protection Committee, and originally proposed by the United States at the IMCO Council meeting in June 1973, it will concentrate on the organization's expanded efforts in this most important area. The Committee's primary task will be the administration of the recently concluded International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, signed in November at the end of the IMCO-sponsored 70-nation International Conference on Marine Pollution, and other IMCO conventions concerned with oil pollution. The Marine Pollution Conference also negotiated a protocol extending to casualties involving substances other than oil the 1969 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties. (This convention is not yet in force.)

The new Convention contains regulations for the control of pollution by oil, by noxious liquid substances other than oil carried in bulk, and by sewage and garbage. The regulations for the prevention of oil pollution contain both vessel construction standards, including mandatory segregated ballast provisions for new tankers greater than 70,000 tons deadweight, and stringent requirements for the control of operational discharges of oil. The regulations for the control of discharges of noxious chemicals and other substances are the first such regulations to be contained in an international agreement. These technical provisions of the Convention are a major advancement in international law for the control of maritime pollution.

In November, IMCO was host to an international conference to amend Article VII of the 1965 Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic. The Conference adopted an amendment whereby future amendments to technical annexes to that Convention may be adopted more expeditiously through a "tacit amendment" procedure, by which an amendment would become effective unless a certain percentage of parties explicitly objected to it within a specified time.

During two sessions in 1973, the Panel of Experts on Maritime Satellites concentrated on organizational, technical, and economic aspects of a maritime satellite system. A draft Convention on the Establishment of an International Maritime Satellite System, oriented toward a new independent intergovernmental organization, was developed and refined.

As in the past, significant progress was achieved in the various subcommittees of the Maritime Safety Committee.

The Subcommittee on Containers and Cargoes adopted a revised Chapter 6 (Regulations on Carriage of Grain) of the SOLAS (Safety

of Life at Sea) Convention. The intention is to include this in the new SOLAS Convention, 1974. The Regulations, which were adopted by the Assembly in November, were a major revision and corrected certain erroneous assumptions in the 1960 Regulations.

The Safety of Navigation Subcommittee continued its work of refining and amending existing traffic separation schemes so that the number of ship collisions in heavily travelled areas may be drastically reduced. In addition, it developed standards for various types of navigational equipment required by the 1968 amendments to the SOLAS Convention. It is hoped these amendments, not yet in force, will become a part of the 1974 SOLAS revision, which an *ad hoc* working group of the Maritime Safety Committee is in the process of drafting.

The Fire Protection Subcommittee produced recommendations on fire safety for tankers and combination carriers. These recommendations became amendments to the Fire Protection Code, and are considered major steps in fire safety in that they significantly update previous sections of the Code.

The relatively new Subcommittee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping achieved its initial success with the adoption by the Assembly at its Eighth Session of basic principles and operational guidelines, navigational watch standards, and a recommendation for the training and qualification of both officers and crew in ships carrying hazardous or noxious cargoes in bulk. The Subcommittee at its December meeting continued to develop IMCO's position for the discussion of training at joint IMCO/ILO meetings. A draft proposal was produced concerning mandatory minimum requirements for certification of officers in charge of a navigation watch.

The Subcommittee on Radio Communications in its two sessions in 1973 worked on the development of the maritime distress system, i.e., the various ways in which radio systems can be coordinated to enhance the safety of life at sea, and the preparation of IMCO recommendations concerning the 1974 World Administrative Radio Conference for Maritime Mobile Telecommunications.

The Committee on Technical Cooperation continued to oversee the administration of UNDP projects in various national and regional programs. During 1973 there were 31 such projects underway to be funded by \$6.3 million from the UNDP and \$10.7 million in local funds from recipient governments. Actual expenditures of UNDP funds on these projects during the year were \$1.4 million. These projects include the Eastern Mediterranean Marine Pollution Surveillance and Information Center, a ship construction project in the Republic of Korea, and national maritime training projects in Brazil, Ivory Coast, and the Malagasy Republic.

The eighth Assembly decided to convene an *Ad Hoc* Working Group in February 1974 to consider proposals and recommendations for the expansion of the Council and the Maritime Safety Committee. The conclusions reached by this Working Group will be transmitted to member states and placed before the extraordinary session of the Assembly in October 1974.

#### INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

The accession of the German Democratic Republic, Qatar, and Bangladesh to the ITU Convention in 1973 brought Union member-

ship to 146. Papua New Guinea joined the ITU as an associate member. During the year the ITU continued its work as the specialized agency responsible for maintaining and extending international cooperation for the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds. The ITU also continued to work closely with the United Nations during the year, especially in its role as an executing agency for the UNDP in the telecommunications field.

#### *Administrative Council*

The United States is a member of the 29-state ITU Administrative Council which held its 28th session in Geneva from April 28 to May 18, 1973. The Council approved a 1974 budget of 40,032,100 Swiss francs, of which the assessed U.S. share was approximately 11.3%. The Council prepared its report to the Union's Plenipotentiary Conference (discussed below), in which it described the activities and explained the problems of the Union since 1965, the date of the preceding Plenipotentiary Conference, and provided recommendations for the Conference's consideration. The Council also examined matters relating to various other conferences of the Union, including determination of the date for the 13th Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) and the procedure for the election of the Director of the CCIR; determination of the agenda and date for the first session of an administrative Low Frequency/Medium Frequency Broadcasting Conference for the region encompassing Europe and Africa; and a recommendation to the Plenipotentiary Conference that it make financial provision for a general administrative radio conference in the 1978-80 time period.

#### *Plenipotentiary Conference*

The ITU held a Plenipotentiary Conference during September and October 1973 in Torremolinos, Spain. The Plenipotentiary Conference is the supreme authority of the Union, with ultimate responsibility for all policy. The Conference examined and made revisions in the ITU Convention, in which the organization of the ITU and the obligations of membership are set forth. The new Convention will enter into force January 1, 1975. The Convention has treaty status in the United States and requires the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification. Other major actions taken by the Conference were its decisions to retain the Convention as the Union's basic instrument rather than adopt a constitution, to enlarge the membership of the Administrative Council to 36 members, to retain the voluntary contributory system by which members finance Union activities, to delete all territories from the list of members of the Union, to levy sanctions on members in arrears, and to fix the fiscal limit for the Union's expenditures until the next Plenipotentiary Conference. The Conference elected a Secretary General, Mohamed Mili of Tunisia, and a Deputy Secretary General, Richard E. Butler of Australia, both of whom took office on January 1, 1974.

#### *Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference*

During April 1973 an Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference was held in Geneva. Drawing on recommendations of the fifth Plenary Assembly of the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT), the Conference made revisions in

the Telegraph and Telephone Regulations, which are annexed to the Convention and which similarly have treaty status. These regulations lay down the general principles to be observed in the international telegraph and telephone services. The United States had previously been unable to sign the Telephone Regulations because they dealt unsatisfactorily with payments in the settlement of accounts. However, efforts in recent years succeeded in producing a more acceptable text, which, together with the revised Telegraph Regulations were to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification.

#### *Other Permanent Organs*

The permanent technical organs of the ITU—the CCITT, CCIR, and the International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB)—were all active during 1973.

The study groups of the CCITT began their studies for the period 1973–76 pursuant to the work program approved for them by the fifth Plenary Assembly in December 1972. Studies of technical operating and tariff questions with respect to telegraphy and telephony will be undertaken to further the evolution of technical standards, embodied in recommendations, which largely govern the operation of the world's telecommunication system. The first meeting of the working party established by the fifth Plenary Assembly of the CCITT World Plan Committee met in Geneva in October 1973. The function of the World Plan Committee is to provide information to members to assist in the conduct of their bilateral and multilateral telecommunications agreements. The working party is to develop recommendations for improvements in the structure, work methods, and product of the World Plan Committee. The Plan Committee for Latin America met in Brasilia from June 25 to July 6, 1973. The meeting produced useful work toward orderly development of telecommunications in Latin America.

The study groups of the CCIR continued during 1973 to update and extend CCIR studies in light of the decisions of the 1971 World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications. Particular attention was directed to preparing for study group meetings to be held in early 1974 on matters relating to the technical and operating aspects of communications satellites (both fixed satellites and mobile aeronautical/maritime satellites), space research, and broadcasting satellite services.

The essential function of the IFRB is the technical examination and registration of radio frequency notifications, including those for space satellite telecommunication systems, to insure interference-free radio operations throughout the world. The IFRB and its staff continued to carry out this function fully and effectively.

#### *Technical Assistance*

As a UNDP executing agency, the ITU assists developing nations to improve their telecommunication capabilities by the establishment and staffing of training institutes; a program of technical telecommunications seminars; and the recruitment of technical experts from developed countries, including the United States, to advise on specific telecommunications projects and to conduct studies in developing countries. Some 219 UNDP funded projects with a total cost of \$121 million were being carried out by the ITU in December 1973. Actual expenditures of UNDP funds during 1973 came to \$10 million.

## UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

During 1973 Bangladesh, the United Arab Emirates, the German Democratic Republic, and Bahrain joined the UPU, bringing total membership to 150.

The United States is a member of both the 31-member Executive Council and the 30-member Consultative Council on Postal Studies, which continued to prepare for the Centenary (17th) Congress of the UPU, to be held in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1974.

*International Postal Communications Matters*

The 1973 Executive Council, which met in Bern May 1-24, completed most of the studies assigned to it in the area of postal communications and prepared final proposals for submission to the 17th Congress to amend the 1969 Tokyo Acts of the UPU. Among these were recommendations to (1) increase basic international postage rates by 66.6% while expanding the range within which postal administrations may set their own international rates to a maximum 70% above and a minimum 50% below the basic rates; (2) update definitions of printed matter, as well as instructions for the preparation of printed matter for mailing; (3) increase the rate of reimbursement for mail imbalances between countries from .50 gold franc to 1.00 gold franc per kilogram; and (4) institute optional provisions for the collection of air conveyance dues for air mail in transit, to be determined on the basis of a weighted average distance. Other studies, conducted by the Consultative Council on Postal Studies, will result in proposals to standardize letter mail preparation to meet the requirements of optical character reading equipment in processing mail.

*Organizational, Personnel, and Financial Matters*

In 1972 the Executive Council began discussions involving the creation of a new 50-unit membership contribution class, in order to induce developed countries to meet a larger share of the expenses of the Union. In 1973 the Executive Council considered draft proposals whereby countries in the 25-unit contribution class (currently the highest) would be placed automatically in the 50-unit class unless by a set date prior to the Congress they had announced an intention to join the 25-unit lower class. The United States and other countries in the top contribution class objected to this arbitrary reclassification, and the Council decided that no change—upward or downward—in contribution class would be made except by formal request of a country.

The Finance Committee, chaired by the United States, reported a final 1973 budget for the UPU of some 8.5 million Swiss francs and an anticipated 1974 budget of 10.3 million Swiss francs, including 690,000 Swiss francs as expenses for the 17th Congress.

The Council elected Deputy Director General Anthony H. Ridge of the United Kingdom to the Director General post, which had become vacant on January 20, 1973, with the death of Michel Rahi of Egypt. The appointment was made with the understanding that the term of office would expire by the end of 1974. Dr. Zedenek Čaha of Czechoslovakia was elected to succeed Mr. Ridge as Deputy Director General, with the same term of office. The Council also decided to establish a limited but renewable term of office for the Director General and to recommend to the Congress that the Executive Council retain authority

to appoint the Director General instead of transferring that responsibility to the Congress.

### *Technical Assistance*

The UNDP granted credits to the UPU for 1973 totaling almost \$2.4 million and covering 76 projects (60 national and 16 multinational). Nineteen additional projects (17 national and 2 regional) were financed from the UPU Special Fund, in which the United States is not a participant. The Executive Council directed the preparation of a comprehensive report on UPU technical cooperation programs for submission to the 1974 Congress, with recommendations for the Union's future work program in this area.

## WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

The Bahamas, Bangladesh, and the German Democratic Republic joined the WMO during 1973, increasing the total membership to 138 (126 independent states and 12 territories maintaining their own meteorological services).

Since its founding in 1950 the WMO, which has its headquarters at Geneva, has actively pursued its statutory objectives of facilitating worldwide cooperation in the establishment of networks of meteorological observation stations, promoting the development of centers capable of providing meteorological services, promoting the rapid exchange of weather information and the standardization of meteorological observations and their publication, furthering the application of meteorology to human activities, and encouraging research and training in meteorology. The constituent bodies of the WMO are the Congress, the Executive Committee, the Regional Associations, and the Technical Commissions.

International cooperation in meteorology was inaugurated in 1873 by the First International Meteorological Congress in Vienna. The WMO celebrated the centennial anniversary in both Vienna and Geneva in September. The U.S. Permanent Representative to the WMO, Robert M. White, Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, remarked on that occasion that although the past 100 years had served as an eminent example of international cooperation, the contribution of the WMO to the well-being of the peoples of the world during the century ahead would be far greater.

### *World Weather Watch*

The year 1973 also marked an anniversary of the World Weather Watch, a successful program established in 1963 to provide all countries with the weather data and other information they need to carry out their national meteorological obligations. Countries participated in the system both by receiving and by transmitting weather information. The system has three primary goals: to know the actual state of the entire atmosphere at a given hour, to develop facilities to process the data and help minimize the delay between gathering the data and issuing forecasts, and to transmit the forecasts and related products to their users as quickly as possible.

In 1973 the world network consisted of about 9,000 surface meteorological stations, more than 6,000 ships that sent observations while plying the high seas, and a number of aircraft that took additional soundings.

### *Global Atmospheric Research Program and the Atlantic Tropical Experiment*

The WMO's primary research program, the Global Atmospheric Research Program (GARP), is being undertaken in cooperation with the International Council of Scientific Unions in support of the development of the World Weather Watch. The first GARP field experiment, in which the United States is a major participant, was scheduled for 1974 in the tropical Atlantic Ocean. Called the GARP Atlantic Tropical Experiment (GATE), it involves all modern meteorological observing techniques, including satellites, aircraft, and ocean vessels. Measurements will be taken over one-third of the world's tropical belt extending from the western part of the Indian Ocean across Africa, the Atlantic Ocean, and South and Central America to the eastern part of the Pacific Ocean. GATE's main scientific purpose is to explore the primary energy source for atmospheric circulation around the globe. This energy source lies in the tropical oceans, which store the heat received from the sun. The mechanism by which this energy is transferred to the atmosphere is obscure, involving disturbances varying from 10 to 10,000 square kilometers in size. The disturbances will be intensively observed by GATE, which, along with other experiments of GARP, will improve understanding of the mechanism. This understanding is a necessary step toward the time when advanced computer models will be able to predict the daily weather not only in the tropics but at all latitudes for periods exceeding 2 weeks.

### *Hydrology*

The WMO serves as technical secretariat for a number of International Hydrological Decade projects pertaining to hydrometeorological forecasting; measurement of precipitation, snowpack, and evaporation; atmospheric aspects of the world water balance; and research on continental drought. WMO is also cooperating in many other Decade activities, such as network planning, geographical information systems representing basins, analysis of flood data, hydrological maps, design data standardization, and education and training. As the international organization responsible for the coordination of work in the field of operational hydrology, the WMO has a Commission and an Advisory Committee for Hydrology whose members are drawn from the hydrologic services of member states.

### *Atmospheric Pollution*

The WMO has for several years been actively involved in activities relating to air pollution and long-range atmospheric changes resulting from man's use of the atmosphere. The WMO plays a significant role in the study of problems related to monitoring atmospheric pollution and in particular assessing the long-term effects of such pollution on weather and climate. During 1973 the WMO accelerated its activities in establishing global and regional monitoring networks for air pollution as part of the World Weather Watch and in cooperation with UNEP.

### *Finances*

The WMO budget is based on a 4-year period, related to its quadrennial congresses. Annual budgets within the quadrennially established ceiling are set by the Executive Committee. The Sixth Con-

gress in 1971 adopted an assessed budget for 1972-75 of \$17.3 million.

Supplements to the budget to counteract the effects of currency revaluations and changing currency exchange rates were subsequently approved by the Executive Committee in the amounts of \$400,000 in 1972 and \$700,000 in 1973. The Executive Committee estimated a budget for 1974 of \$7.5 million. The U.S. rate of assessment dropped to 23.47% of the total for 1974 because of the additional members.

In 1967 the WMO established a Voluntary Assistance Program, which is designed to fill gaps in the World Weather Watch and is supported by voluntary contributions from member states. During 1973 the United States contributed \$1.5 million to this program, \$150,000 in cash and the remainder in equipment, technical assistance, and long-term fellowships.

The WMO also serves as executing agency for UNDP projects. In December 1973 some 132 such projects were under way with a total programmed cost of \$64.7 million, of which \$34.7 million would be paid by the UNDP and the balance by the recipient countries. Actual expenditures of UNDP funds during the year were \$5.3 million.

#### INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

In 1973 the IAEA's membership increased to 104 with the accession of the German Democratic Republic and Mongolia.<sup>23</sup> The IAEA was established in 1957 following President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace proposal before the General Assembly in December 1953. The objectives of the IAEA, as set forth in its statute, are to seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world and to ensure that assistance provided by it, or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

As in past years, the United States participated in all areas of the IAEA's activities in 1973 and took the initiative in many of its programs.

#### *Safeguards*

One of the IAEA's major functions is to ensure that nuclear materials and equipment intended for peaceful use are not diverted to military purposes. This safeguarding function received a greatly increased impetus and significance through the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), which entered into force in 1970. Under the provisions of Article III of the NPT each nonnuclear-weapon state party to the Treaty undertakes to place all its source or special nuclear material in all peaceful nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. By the end of the year the IAEA Board of Governors had approved safeguards agreements under the NPT with 46 countries, including certain members of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and with EURATOM itself. Considering the large number of nuclear power installations in Europe, the EURATOM agreement of April 1973 was a major landmark. At year's end the IAEA was also negotiating such safeguards agreements with more than 20 other countries.

<sup>23</sup> In keeping with the pattern at the 1971 UN General Assembly, the IAEA Board of Governors in December 1971 recognized the People's Republic of China as the only government to represent China in the IAEA and expelled the Republic of China. However, the P.R.C. has not become a member.



The United States has transferred or is in the process of transferring to the IAEA the responsibility for safeguarding almost all of the nuclear material it has sold or leased abroad. By the end of 1973, the Agency was responsible for safeguards agreements with 68 countries, 27 of which concerned safeguards arising out of U.S. bilateral Agreements for Cooperation.

The IAEA with strong U.S. participation, carried on a safeguards research and development program aimed at coordinating national programs with its own efforts to improve safeguards techniques and instrumentation. Twenty-three research contracts in 12 countries were supported by the IAEA in this area, and several working groups met during 1973 to define the procedures to be carried out by Agency staff in their inspection activities. The number of safeguards inspections carried out almost doubled over that for the previous year.

#### *Nuclear Energy and the Environment*

The IAEA is the international organization responsible for providing guidance for the evaluation and control of the environmental impact of nuclear programs. The IAEA has had extensive experience in the environmental fields of radiological safety, waste management, and nuclear safety. In 1973 the IAEA continued to expand its activities on environmental protection, a reflection of quickening world interest, of recommendations made at the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment, and of the program suggestions advanced by a group of international experts at a meeting under IAEA auspices in November 1972. IAEA's environment program stresses such timely areas as assessment of the environmental impact of nuclear power programs, development of methods for estimating the ability of the environment to accept radioactivity, review of appropriate environmental surveillance around nuclear installations, and development of safety standards for the long-term management of radioactive wastes.

The Agency gave added impetus to these programs during 1973 through the use of special voluntary contributions from the United States and several other countries. Program priorities were reordered, and a study of appropriate organizational consequences was undertaken to enable the IAEA to meet its responsibilities in the environmental area.

Pursuant to the 1972 London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, IAEA sponsored meetings of experts, particularly an 18-member panel that met in June 1973, made significant progress in developing recommendations on the definition of high-level radioactive wastes or other high-level radioactive matter unsuitable for dumping at sea and operating procedures for dumping in the sea of radioactive materials.

In the area of waste management, the IAEA explored opportunities for increased international collaboration. It worked on the definition of criteria for disposal sites and the development of suggested practices for storing and disposing of highly radioactive waste.

The United States made a special contribution of equipment in support of expanded research on marine pollution being undertaken by the Agency's International Laboratory of Marine Radioactivity in Monaco. This Laboratory continued its support of research contracts with various national laboratories on marine pollution studies.

### *Nuclear Power and Reactors*

Conscious of the difficulties in securing conventional fuel supplies, the IAEA anticipated a considerable increase in the demand for nuclear power plants throughout the world. Accordingly, it continued to emphasize the provision of practical services to member states during the early stages of a nuclear power project, including economic studies, siting surveys, and safety evaluations.

The IAEA continued its studies of the financing of nuclear power in the developing countries, and of the technical and economic characteristics of nuclear reactors that could be used in the smaller electrical grids of these countries. It published in 1973 the results of a market survey in 14 interested developing countries to determine the future demand for reactors of less than 500 megawatts of electrical output. The survey will be valuable to countries planning the development of nuclear power plants, to international lending institutions in a position to provide capital to finance reactor construction, and to suppliers of equipment and technology. Plans were made to expand and update the survey and to maintain in the Agency the basic methods, procedures, and computer programs developed during the course of the survey.

With future requirements for electrical power in mind, the IAEA promoted the exchange of information on advanced converter and breeder reactors and on new experimental means of power generation. The Agency's International Working Group on Fast Reactors reviewed national programs on liquid metal fast breeder reactor development, coordinated international meetings on this subject, and sponsored two technical meetings on specific problems.

### *Isotopes and Radiation Sources*

The IAEA's programs in food and agriculture, life sciences, and physical sciences, which are implemented by means of research contracts, meetings, publications, and technical assistance, are of keen interest to the developing countries, which constitute two-thirds of the IAEA membership.

Under its food and agriculture program, the IAEA cooperated closely with the FAO in assisting member states, particularly the developing countries, in the use of nuclear and conventional techniques in research and development activities. These programs were aimed at increasing food production as well as protecting agricultural crops, livestock, and other products from pests or spoilage, with special attention to preventing pollution of the agricultural environment.

The physical sciences program deals with nuclear physics; those aspects of chemistry involved in the production of nuclear energy, radioisotopes, and radio pharmaceuticals; industrial uses of radioisotopes and radiation; isotope hydrology; and the dissemination of nuclear data information and coordination of national nuclear data programs.

The objective of the life science program is to develop methods for the application of radioisotopes in medicine and biology. This consists of work in dosimetry (in both medical and industrial applications), the use of isotopes in clinical medicine and medical research, and radiation biology. IAEA cooperated with WHO to extend international cooperation and to facilitate the exchange of information in several of these areas.

### *Nuclear Information*

Since its initiation in 1970, the Agency's International Nuclear Information System (INIS) has established a successful record in the collection and dissemination of information on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

By the end of 1973, INIS had extended its activities to the point that it was covering about 90% of the world's literature relating to nuclear information. Scientific bodies in 44 countries and 11 international organizations were participating by providing materials and information to INIS, which prepares bibliographic indexes, assigns keywords, and makes the data available to members on computer tapes or microfiche copies.

The United States has been a strong advocate and supporter of INIS, which is demonstrating its increasing usefulness in the international nuclear community.

### *Technical Assistance*

In connection with the IAEA technical assistance program during 1973, expert services and equipment were provided to 53 member states—14 in Africa, 8 in the Middle East, 12 in Asia, 12 in Latin America, and 7 in Europe. Member states continued to benefit from fellowships offered by the IAEA, and by the United States and other contributors. The IAEA also organized a number of interregional specialized training courses and study tours for nationals of developing member states. Two of the training courses were held in the United States—one at North Carolina State University from July 9 to August 3 on the use of tracer techniques in industry and environmental pollution studies, and the other at the University of Florida from July 2 to August 24 on the use of radioisotopes and radiation in entomology.

The United States has vigorously supported the IAEA technical assistance program over the years through the provision of experts' services, equipment, and fellowships; the support of IAEA training courses in the United States; and through cash contributions.

The United States has considered it important to assist the IAEA in maintaining a sound balance among the different components of its work. Experience has shown that the IAEA technical assistance projects act as seed capital, opening the way for larger multilateral and bilateral aid to the developing countries. The total U.S. voluntary contribution to the IAEA for 1973 was \$1,831,000 of which \$945,600 was in cash and \$885,400 was in goods and services.

The IAEA also executes projects funded by the UNDP. There were 134 such projects under way during December 1973 with a total cost of \$32.9 million, of which \$13.5 million will be supplied by the UNDP and \$19.4 million by recipient governments. Actual expenditures of UNDP funds during 1973 were \$2 million.

### *Budget*

The IAEA is financed by means of a regular budget, which is supported largely by assessments levied on the member states according to a scale based on the UN scale of assessments, modified slightly to reflect safeguards costs, and an operational budget, which is supported mainly by voluntary contributions from member states, for technical assistance projects.

The 17th General Conference of the IAEA, which met between September 18 and 24, 1973, adopted a total regular budget for 1974 of \$25,064,000, including a special contingent financing appropriation of \$4.6 million to compensate for changes in currency exchange rates. The U.S. assessment rate was established at 31.908%, compared to its 1973 rate of 31.805%. The General Conference adopted an operational budget for 1974 of \$4,209,000, of which \$3 million—the same as in 1973—was to come from voluntary contributions, with the remainder to be funded from special contributions and other sources.

#### *Organizational Matters*

Dr. Sigvard Eklund of Sweden, unanimously reappointed Director General of the IAEA by the 17th General Conference, began his fourth 4-year term on December 1, 1973. Also during the year an amendment of the IAEA statute, enlarging the Board of Governors from 25 to 34 members, came into force.

On June 12, 1973, Gerald Tape became the U.S. Representative to the IAEA, replacing T. Keith Glennan.

---

---

PART III.  
TRUSTEESHIP AND DEPENDENT AREAS

---

---



UN consideration of conditions in non-self-governing territories is carried out in two different primary bodies—the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly's Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Committee of 24).

Chapter XII of the UN Charter established the international trusteeship system and Chapter XIII established the Trusteeship Council. Over the years most of the territories under the system have become independent; only Micronesia, known officially as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (administered by the United States), and New Guinea (administered by Australia) remain as trust territories. In 1973 the Trusteeship Council was composed of the two administering states and the four permanent members of the Security Council that do not administer trust territories—China, France, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. All were automatically members under Article 86 of the Charter.

Chapter XI of the Charter treats of the responsibilities of states for non-self-governing territories that are administered outside the trusteeship system. In 1960 the General Assembly adopted, in resolution 1514, a "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples" and in 1961 established a 17-member Special Committee to make suggestions and recommendations on the progress and extent of implementation of the 1960 Declaration. Enlarged to 24 members in 1962, the Committee in 1973 consisted of Afghanistan, Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, People's Republic of China, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Sierra Leone, Syria, Sweden, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The Committee of 24 annually considers conditions in those territories that, in the view of the General Assembly, have not achieved independence. In 1973 the Committee considered over 30 territories, mostly small ones, but devoted most of its attention to southern Africa. The Committee's work forms the basis for most of the General Assembly's action in this area.

The United States was a member of the Committee of 24 until 1971 and continues to discharge its obligations under Article 73(e) of the Charter by reporting to the General Assembly, through the Committee of 24, on conditions in three non-self-governing territories—Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Nevertheless, the United States takes basic exception to the view that has come to predominate in the Committee that independence is the only acceptable form of self-determination. The United States continues to support the General Assembly's resolution 1541, also adopted in 1960, which enumerates several ways in which non-self-governing territories can attain self-determination. The United States believes that the timing and manner of self-determination should be decided upon by the people of the territory concerned and the state that has the responsibility for administering it.

Although the number of non-self-governing territories has steadily declined over the years, concern for those that remain has increasingly preoccupied the United Nations and has begun more and more to engage the attention of the specialized agencies. Consideration of colonial questions now concentrates primarily on matters involving southern Africa. Some 20 resolutions adopted by the 28th General Assembly dealt in whole or in part with Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, and various non-self-governing territories in Africa. Despite its strong commitment to self-determination, the United States opposed most of these resolutions because it believed that they involved an inappropriate extension of the role of the United Nations and were often in contradiction to portions of the Charter.

The Security Council met to consider both Southern Rhodesia and Namibia during 1973, but for the first time in several years did not consider problems related to the Portuguese territories in Africa. The latter, however, drew increased attention in the General Assembly, partly because of the proclamation of independence issued on September 24 by the insurgent group in Portuguese Guinea.

#### TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM

The Trusteeship Council held its 40th session in New York, May 29–June 22, 1973, and elected Bertrand de Guillhem de Lataillade of France and Sir Laurence McIntyre of Australia President and Vice President, respectively. Although membership on the Council had passed from the Republic of China to the People's Republic of China in late 1971, the latter did not participate in the work of the Council in either 1972 or 1973.

In accordance with the UN Charter, the Council submitted its report on the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Security Council and its report on Papua New Guinea to the General Assembly.<sup>1</sup> The Security Council did not discuss the report on the Pacific Islands, but the 28th General Assembly adopted a resolution concerning Papua New Guinea on December 12.

#### TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is composed of more than 2,000 islands with a combined land area of approximately 700 square miles. The islands are located in the western Pacific Ocean just north of the Equator, ranging from about 1° to 22° north latitude and 130° to 172° east longitude, and are divided into three large groups: the Marianas (with the exception of Guam) in the northwest, the Carolines to the south running from west to center, and the Marshalls in the east. The total population is estimated at 114,645.

Prior to World War II, Japan administered the islands under a League of Nations mandate. As a result of the war they passed under U.S. administration. On July 18, 1947, the United States and the Security Council concluded an agreement making the islands a strate-

<sup>1</sup> Article 82 of the Charter provides that in any trusteeship agreement part or all of the trust territory may be designated a strategic area, and under Article 83 of the Security Council exercises all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas. Article 85 provides that the General Assembly shall exercise the UN functions for all other trust areas.



gic trust territory; it is the only strategic trust territory. It has been administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior since July 1, 1951.

During the Trusteeship Council's consideration of the Pacific Islands from June 8 to June 15, 1973, Ambassador William E. Schaufele, Jr., served as U.S. Representative and Edward E. Johnston, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, served as Special Representative. Senator Andon Amaraich and Congressman Joab Sigrah—both members of the Congress of Micronesia—served as special advisers to the U.S. delegation. All addressed the Council on June 8.

#### *Visiting Mission*

A visiting mission composed of representatives of Australia, France, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. had visited the trust territory from February 2 to March 7, 1973. In presenting the mission's report, the Australian Representative noted that although the mission saw much of which it was critical, its criticisms were put forth in a constructive sense and it did not doubt the good faith and intentions of the administering power. He stated that the mission had attempted in its report to point to those areas in which changes would facilitate the achievement of the objectives set forth in the Trusteeship Agreement.

The mission's report *inter alia* expressed disappointment at the interruption since October 1972 of the U.S. talks with the Joint Committee on Future Status established by the Congress of Micronesia, criticized the U.S. separate negotiations with the Marianas District, and recommended relaxation of restrictions on foreign investment in the trust territory.

The U.S. Representative noted that the U.S. Government, while taking exception to some portions of the mission's report, would certainly gain new ideas and perspective from it.

#### *U.S. Report*

In reporting on the future political status of the territory, the U.S. Representative reviewed the developments in the negotiations with the Micronesians since the previous Council session. In July 1972 agreement had been reached on draft language for a preamble and those titles of a compact of free association covering foreign affairs, defense, and internal affairs. However, in August the Congress of Micronesia, without taking any action on the partial draft compact, instructed its Joint Committee to negotiate an independence option in addition to the free association compact.

The U.S. Representative noted that there appeared to be some confusion on the question of independence, but the U.S. Government had never refused to discuss independence as a status alternative. He added, however, that the Micronesians had earlier expressed their preference for free association, that previous discussion had centered on an effort to negotiate a free association option to place before the Micronesian people, and that serious consideration of an independence option required information on the character of that option as perceived by the Micronesians.

The U.S. Representative also stated that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Future Status had informed the chairman of the U.S. delegation<sup>2</sup> in February 1973 that the formal talks could not be re-

<sup>2</sup> Ambassador F. Haydn Williams, the President's Personal Representative for Micronesian Status Negotiations.

sumed until public lands in the Palau District were returned to the traditional chiefs of that district. Noting that the United States had already expressed its willingness to return these lands, Ambassador Schaufele called attention to a joint statement by the negotiators in early May. The statement said that in preparation for the next round of talks, the question of early return of public lands to the districts would be studied by the United States in consultation with appropriate Micronesian authorities and individuals, and that the two chairmen would meanwhile continue to hold regular, informal meetings in preparation for the formal resumption of negotiations.

The U.S. Representative observed that the United States had spoken at length at the Council's session in 1972 on the reasons that separate negotiations were desired by the Marianas and would not repeat those reasons this year. The first two series of meetings with the Marianas Political Status Commission, he reported, had led to agreement on the form of the future political relationship with the United States, which would be closer than that being negotiated with the other five districts of Micronesia. At the first meeting, in December 1972, general agreement had been reached on procedures for future negotiating sessions. The second meeting, in May 1973, resulted in a broad preliminary understanding on most aspects of a Marianas-United States commonwealth relationship which would vest sovereignty over the islands in the U.S. Government but permit maximum Marianas control over local affairs, including the drafting and adoption of a constitution.

The U.S. Representative reaffirmed U.S. hopes that the other districts of Micronesia would remain united. In any case, he stated, the United States planned to end the trusteeship simultaneously for all of Micronesia as was the case previously when portions of other trust territories chose separate political destinies.

The Special Representative, Mr. Johnston, noted that the Trusteeship Council had over the years expressed great interest in Micronesian political education. In this connection he noted that the Council's proceedings in 1972 had been broadcast in their entirety throughout the six districts of the territory, generating much discussion and comment among the citizens, and that they would be again in 1973.

Discussing the progress on the return of the former residents of Bikini to their island, Mr. Johnston noted that the coconut plantings were growing well, many residences had been completed while others were under construction, and planning for resettlement was moving apace. He further assured the Council that offers of resettlement were being made to part of the population of Ebeye, an overcrowded island in the Kwajalein lagoon of the Marshall Islands District. He also called attention to recent legislation by the Congress of Micronesia providing the framework for a low-cost housing program for all six districts of Micronesia.

The Special Representative noted that the 1973 visiting mission had suggested more emphasis on basic occupations such as fishing and agriculture. He reported that the need for vocational training was recognized in Micronesia and that such programs had been implemented in agriculture, fishing, industrial arts, and home economics.

He also drew the Council's attention to the increasing participation

of Micronesian citizens in their government. All six district administrators were now of Micronesian birth and of eight major government departments, three were headed by Micronesians.

The special advisers, in statements critical of the U.S. administration of the territory, stressed the steps they believed should be taken to solve the social and economic problems of Micronesia and to insure that the people of Micronesia would exercise true political self-determination. Senator Amaraich recognized that some progress had been made with the granting to the Congress of Micronesia of the power of advice and consent over some major administrative appointments. In addition, the Congress of Micronesia had during the year enacted the Trust Territory Single Pay Plan, providing a single base salary plan applicable to all government employees regardless of citizenship. He asserted, however, that the administration had resisted broadening the applicability of the advice and consent authority, eliminating the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's final authority over Congress of Micronesia legislation, and appointing Micronesians to the High Court. He lamented that the U.S. position on law of the sea matters in preparation for the upcoming international conference did not appear to protect Micronesia's interests. He also expressed the belief that the United States was fostering disunity in the territory by holding separate talks with the Marianas and cited a portion of the visiting mission's report which recommended that the talks be discontinued for the time being in order to permit the Congress of Micronesia to reach an agreement acceptable to all six districts.

Congressman Sigrah criticized the lack of economic development in Micronesia and called for improved agriculture, fisheries, and air and sea transportation, as well as more control by the Congress of Micronesia over budgetary funds and developmental priorities. He concluded that a more aggressive political education program was necessary for Micronesia and asserted that Micronesians should seize the initiative in developmental and other matters rather than passively await action by the administering authority.

#### *Council report*

In its report to the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council indicated that it was generally satisfied with U.S. efforts in meeting its obligations under the trusteeship agreement. At the same time, the report contained a number of conclusions and recommendations on how the administration of the territory might be improved.

In the area of political advancement, the Council recalled the hope expressed at earlier sessions that the financial authority of the Congress of Micronesia would be gradually extended to include Micronesian appropriation of U.S. financial subsidies and noted that a study was being made of this possibility. It commended the Congress of Micronesia and the trust territory administration for having jointly prepared and adopted the legislation leading to the single basic salary schedule.

In the area of economic advancement, the Council endorsed the view of the visiting mission that there was a need to rethink the ways in which the Micronesian economy should be developed, while bearing in mind options for Micronesia's future political status. It endorsed the idea of a full review of the economy of the territory with develop-

ment priorities formulated by Micronesians themselves. The Council approved the increased involvement of the Congress of Micronesia and the district legislatures in determining economic policies. It noted with regret that Micronesian products had not yet been exempted from U.S. tariffs, although acknowledging that the subject was still under consideration. The Council noted that the visiting mission had found overwhelming support in the territory for permitting investment there from non-United States sources, and it endorsed the mission's view that such investment should be permitted.

In the areas of social and educational development, the Council recommended that more attention be given to bringing the high standard of medical care available in district centers within reach of all inhabitants of the territory. It also expressed satisfaction with the appointment of a Micronesian as Director of the Department of Education and noted that all members of the Board of Education were Micronesians.

With respect to future political status, the Council hoped that negotiations would soon resume between the Joint Committee on Future Status, with the participation of representatives of the Mariana Islands, and the United States, and that they would be conducted in a climate of "understanding, realism, and clarity which will make mutual concessions possible." The Council expressed its disappointment that no substantial progress had been made since the previous year toward convening a constitutional conference. It noted that all the possible forms of political status—commonwealth, free association, and independence—commanded some support in the territory and that any choice through a plebiscite should not be limited to one solution.

The Council acknowledged the existence of strong separatist trends in the Mariana Islands District and said it was aware that the Congress of Micronesia and its Joint Committee on Future Status had said they would not object to a separate future political status for the Marianas if that was the freely expressed preference of the majority of the inhabitants. On the other hand, the Congress of Micronesia had adopted a resolution in early 1973 expressing the view that the Joint Committee was "the sole organ competent to conduct negotiations" with the United States for all the districts of the territory. The Council hoped that if a separate plebiscite is held in the Marianas, it will not take place before the conclusion of the future status talks for all of Micronesia. It further hoped that a future political status acceptable to all six districts might still be found.

#### *Political Status Negotiations*

A seventh round of political status negotiations was held in Washington during mid-November 1973. The discussions centered on levels of financial assistance for Micronesia in the post-trusteeship period under a free association arrangement. The Micronesians requested a level substantially in excess of the total current grants, while U.S. proposals were essentially based on an extension of current levels. The United States also tabled proposals on the remaining titles of the draft compact, including those which would cover nationality, trade and immigration, applicability of laws, dispute settlement, future changes in political status, and other facets of a future free as-

sociation relationship. Although informal understandings were reached on many elements, no agreement was reached on levels of assistance.

As the U.S. Representative had promised at the Trusteeship Council in June, the United States reviewed its public lands policy and immediately prior to the seventh round of talks announced a new policy which provides for an early transfer of trust territory public lands to the districts of Micronesia. Previously it had been contemplated that trust territory public lands would be transferred to a Micronesian central government at termination of the trusteeship agreement. The Micronesian delegation indicated its acceptance of that policy.

The third round of Marianas talks was held in December 1973 on Saipan. It covered a wide range of topics and resulted in specific agreements in some areas. While there was no attempt to develop language for a final agreement, it became clear that the Marianas delegation was firmly committed to political union with the United States on the basis of a commonwealth relationship. Both sides reaffirmed that the negotiated agreement would have to be approved by the Marianas District Legislature, the people of the Marianas in a plebiscite, and by the Congress of the United States.

#### *Committee of 24*

The General Assembly's Committee of 24 again considered the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands during 1973. The United States holds that the Committee lacks competence to consider the territory since Article 83 of the UN Charter clearly provides that all UN functions relating to this strategic trust territory shall be exercised by the Security Council which, in turn, has delegated the responsibility to the Trusteeship Council. The United States did not, therefore, take part in the Committee's discussion.

On the recommendation of its subcommittee concerned with Atlantic and Pacific territories, the Committee on August 23 adopted a report whose conclusions and recommendations *inter alia* (1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination in conformity with the 1960 Declaration on Colonialism, (2) urged that a U.S. Government representative be present during the Committee's consideration of the territory, (3) expressed the importance it attached to the need for political education programs to engender an awareness among the people of their rights as set forth in the Declaration on Colonialism, and (4) regretted the negative U.S. position toward a visiting mission from the Committee to the trust territory and urged that the United States reconsider this position.

#### TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA

The Trust Territory of New Guinea comprises the northeastern part of New Guinea, north of the Papuan and east of the West Irian borders, and the arc of islands stretching from the Admiralties to the northern Solomons (Buka and Bougainville). The total land area is some 92,160 square miles. As of June 30, 1972, its indigenous population was 1,845,264. Australia administers the trust territory in union with the neighboring Australian territory of Papua.

The Trusteeship Council considered New Guinea from May 30 to June 6. David Hay, Secretary of the Australian Department of Ex-

ternal Territories, served as Special Representative, while Julius Chan and Thomas Kavali, Papua New Guinea Minister for Finance and Minister for Works, respectively, were special advisers.

In opening the debate Australia stated that Papua New Guinea was to a large degree already self-governing, with most authority residing in the Government and Parliament of Papua New Guinea. Full internal self-government was expected by December 1973. The Special Representative subsequently noted the importance that the new government in Australia attached to Papua New Guinea and said that the new Prime Minister had stated that Papua New Guinea would have "first call on our foreign aid program." He outlined the timetable for implementing self-government. After formal self-government was officially introduced in December 1973, a draft constitution recommended by the Constitutional Planning Committee would be tabled in the Papua New Guinea House of Assembly in February 1974. In April the House would meet in special session to consider and adopt the constitution and in May the Australian Parliament would remove from the Papua New Guinea Act those parts included in the new constitution. He stated it was the policy of the Australian Government to create a fully independent and united Papua New Guinea before the end of 1975.

#### *Council Report*

The Council's report approved of the accelerating pace at which Papua New Guinea was moving toward self-government and independence. The report also contained a number of conclusions and recommendations on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the territory as it moved toward internal self-government. With regard to the future political status of the territory, the Council noted with satisfaction the significant transfer of authority from Australia to the Government of Papua New Guinea.

On the timing of independence, the Council noted that the views of both Australia and Papua New Guinea were relevant. Australia expected independence to come by 1975 and be achieved in the closest consultation with the Government and House of Assembly of Papua New Guinea, but it did not disagree with the view of the Papua New Guinea House of Assembly that there should be a period of self-government before a specific date for independence was set.

#### *Committee of 24*

The General Assembly's Committee of 24 considered New Guinea together with Papua. On August 21 it adopted a report that *inter alia* (1) noted with satisfaction that Papua New Guinea was making steady progress toward self-government and independence, (2) welcomed indications that the Papua New Guinea Government would have a wide degree of responsibility in foreign affairs and defense matters once self-government had been attained, and (3) noted with satisfaction the assurance by the Australian Prime Minister that Papua New Guinea would continue to have first call on assistance from the Australian foreign aid program.

#### *General Assembly*

The Assembly's Fourth Committee considered both the Trusteeship Council and the Committee of 24 reports at three meetings on Novem-

ber 30 and December 3. On the latter day it approved without objection a draft resolution sponsored by 23 African, Asian, Latin American, and Western European states which *inter alia* welcomed the attainment of self-government "as an important step in the progress of Papua New Guinea towards independence," emphasized the imperative need to preserve national unity, stressed the right of the people of Papua New Guinea to control their own natural resources, and welcomed Papua New Guinea's growing involvement in matters of defense and foreign affairs.

The General Assembly in plenary session adopted the resolution without objection on December 12.

## U.S. TERRITORIES

### GUAM AND AMERICAN SAMOA

These territories were considered together by the Committee of 24's subcommittee concerned with Atlantic and Pacific territories. The Committee had available working papers prepared by the UN Secretariat on the basis of information submitted by the United States and an oral presentation on July 3 on recent developments in the territories by the U.S. Representative, Robert M. Immerman.

The U.S. Representative noted that Guam now had a nonvoting delegate in the U.S. Congress. He observed that the economic growth in Guam was striking, as evidenced by the substantial increases in tax collections and the dramatic rise in tourism. With respect to American Samoa, he noted that the territory was working toward the popular election of its governor and that its constitution was undergoing revision toward this end.

Guam's delegate in the U.S. Congress, Antonio B. Won Pat, had asked to appear before the subcommittee as a petitioner and did so on July 11. He emphasized the preference of all the parties concerned, including the indigenous population, for Guam's association with the United States and outlined for the members of the subcommittee the important role a nonvoting delegate can play in introducing bills, voting in committees, and in the party caucus which chooses the Speaker of the House.

On August 23 the Committee adopted without objection a report recommended by its subcommittee in which it *inter alia* (1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of American Samoa and Guam to self-determination and independence in conformity with the Declaration on Colonialism; (2) reiterated its view that the question of size, geographical location, population, or limited natural resources should in no way delay the speedy implementation of the Declaration in the territories; (3) reiterated that the people of American Samoa should elect their own governor; and (4) urged the United States to continue its efforts to develop and diversify Guam's economy and to safeguard the right of the indigenous population to own and dispose of their own natural resources and to establish and maintain control over their future development.

### U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

In considering the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Committee of 24 and its subcommittee concerned with Atlantic and Pacific territories again

had available a working paper prepared by the UN Secretariat on the basis of information submitted by the United States and an oral presentation on July 20 by the U.S. Representative on recent developments. The U.S. Representative emphasized that the new nonvoting delegate of the Virgin Islands in the U.S. Congress plays an important role in influencing federal legislation since the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where the delegate does have a vote, handles most important legislation affecting the Virgin Islands.

The U.S. Representative also reported that in a referendum held concurrently with the November 7, 1972, elections the people of the Virgin Islands had approved a proposed Constitution and Federal Relations Act, but that there were some misgivings about the small margin by which the people approved it and about the large number of voters who had bypassed the issue on the ballot. No implementing legislation had as yet been introduced in the U.S. Congress.

On August 23 the Committee adopted without objection a report recommended by its subcommittee which *inter alia* (1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the territory to self-determination and independence in conformity with the Declaration on Colonialism; (2) reiterated its view that the factors of size, geographical location, population, and limited natural resources should "in no way delay the speedy implementation of the Declaration" with respect to the territory; (3) considered that the November 1972 election of the legislature, referendum on the constitution, and election of a nonvoting delegate to the U.S. Congress did not constitute significant progress toward the implementation of the Declaration and reiterated that the developments only tended to "perpetuate the territory's association with the United States"; (4) urged the United States to encourage the people to discuss fully the various alternatives for their political future; (5) expressed its concern that a decline in tourism was aggravating a general downturn in the economy which had begun in 1970 and suggested that the assistance of the UN specialized agencies might prove helpful; and (6) urged the United States to review its previous negative position on receiving a UN visiting mission to its territories.

In expressing reservations on the subcommittee's report, the U.S. Representative recalled that since the Committee had welcomed the presence of the nonvoting delegate from Guam as enhancing the Committee's discussion of the future status of that territory, he found somewhat inconsistent the Committee's statement in the case of the Virgin Islands that the existence of a nonvoting delegate in the U.S. Congress tended to perpetuate the Virgin Islands association with the United States. With regard to assistance from UN specialized agencies, he reiterated the position of the U.S. Government that those nations able to supply assistance to their own territories should not seek assistance from the United Nations.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

The General Assembly's Fourth Committee on December 5 approved two very similar omnibus resolutions on groups of small territories. The first, sponsored by five African and Latin American states, dealt with American Samoa, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Guam, New Hebrides,



Pitcairn, St. Helena, Seychelles, and Solomon Islands. The second, sponsored by 12 African and Latin American states, dealt with Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Both were approved by rollcall votes and subsequently adopted by the Assembly on December 14 by recorded votes.

In their operative paragraphs the resolutions, *inter alia*, (1) reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the territories to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on Colonialism; (2) reaffirmed that questions of territorial size, geographical location, and limited resources should in no way delay the implementation of the Declaration; (3) called upon the administering powers concerned to reconsider their attitude toward receiving visiting missions and to permit access by such missions to territories under their administration; and (4) called upon administering powers concerned to take all possible steps to diversify the economies of their territories.

The committee vote on the draft resolution including Guam and American Samoa was 99 to 4, with 16 abstentions (U.S.), and the plenary vote was 106 to 4, with 18 abstentions (U.S.). The committee vote on the resolution including the U.S. Virgin Islands was 101 to 0, with 16 abstentions (U.S.) and the plenary vote was 110 to 0, with 19 abstentions (U.S.).

The United States abstained because, as with similar resolutions in previous years, it found a number of the provisions unacceptable, including the failure to take into account the special problems which small size creates for some territories.

## NAMIBIA

### UN CONTACTS WITH SOUTH AFRICA

At a meeting in Addis Ababa on February 4, 1972, the Security Council had adopted a resolution inviting the Secretary General to initiate contacts with all parties concerned with a view to establishing the conditions necessary for the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The Secretary General reported to the Security Council twice during 1972 on his contacts with the South African Government. Each time after considering the report the Council invited him to continue his discussions with South African representatives.

On April 30, 1973, the Secretary General submitted a report on his contacts with South Africa during the first third of 1973. In this report he said that on December 20, 1972, he had transmitted to the Government of South Africa a series of questions designed to elicit further information on (1) South Africa's policy regarding self-determination and independence for Namibia; (2) the composition and functions of the proposed advisory council<sup>3</sup> in Namibia; (3) the removal of restrictions on movement and measures to ensure freedom of political activity, including freedom of speech and the holding of

<sup>3</sup> In 1972 the South African Prime Minister had told the Secretary General he would be prepared to establish an advisory council for Namibia drawn from representatives of the various regions, regional governments or authorities.

meetings; and (4) the discontinuance of measures in furtherance of South Africa's "homelands" policy in Namibia. During the first 3 months of 1973 the Secretary General and his representatives held 12 meetings with South Africa's Permanent UN Representative to discuss his Government's preliminary replies to the above questions. During the talks, the Secretary General said that he and his representatives emphasized "the firm stand of the United Nations with regard to the international status of Namibia, its national unity and territorial integrity, and the right of the Namibian people, taken as a whole, to self-determination and independence."

On March 27 it had been concluded that further clarification of South Africa's position could best be achieved by direct contacts between the Secretary General and South Africa's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hilgard Muller. Accordingly, the two met in Geneva April 11-13. On April 30 the Secretary General received a written statement of South Africa's position. In that document South Africa declared that it would respect the wishes of Namibia's population with regard to the future constitutional organization of the territory, that it would allow all political parties free and full participation, and that it had no intention of delaying the act of self-determination. The Foreign Minister had previously told the Secretary General that his Government anticipated it might not take longer than 10 years for the territory's population to reach the stage where it would be ready to exercise self-determination.

In the conclusion of his report, the Secretary General observed that South Africa's statement did not provide a "complete and unequivocal clarification" of its policy toward Namibia, and that the position of the South African Government was "still far from coinciding with that established in the resolutions of the United Nations concerning Namibia." He also emphasized that time and protracted discussion would be required if progress were to be achieved.

Shortly before submission of the Secretary General's report, the UN Council for Namibia<sup>4</sup> reached a consensus that "To maintain contacts with the South African regime would mean an acceptance of its policy on the part of the United Nations; therefore the Council opposes continuation of the dialogue." In a declaration made June 14 during a special session at Lusaka, the Council for Namibia reaffirmed its earlier decision that the South African Government had not negotiated in good faith and that continued contacts were detrimental to the Namibian people and should be broken off. A Namibian liberation movement—the Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO)—concurred in the Council's decision, which was also endorsed by the OAU and the General Assembly's Committee of 24.

#### SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

On July 31 the Secretary General received a telegram from SWAPO complaining of mass arrests in Namibia and requesting that the Security Council discuss the Secretary General's April 30 report. It was not until December 4 that the African members of the Security

<sup>4</sup> The Council for Namibia was established by the General Assembly in 1967 to administer the territory until independence. Its 18 members in 1973 were Burundi, Chile, P.R.C., Colombia, Egypt, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Turkey, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, and Zambia.

Council—Guinea, Kenya, and Sudan—requested the Council to meet December 10 on this question.

At the first of three meetings the Secretary General reviewed his April 30 report and noted that it was the view of the OAU, the Council for Namibia, SWAPO, and many of the heads of state and government at the Conference of Non-Aligned States (held in Algiers in September) that no useful purpose would be served by continued contacts between him and the South African Government.

Following the Secretary General's statement, the Peruvian Representative noted that there had been no clear and unequivocal pronouncement by South Africa on self-determination for the peoples of Namibia or on their national unity and territorial integrity. On the contrary, early in 1973 South Africa had affirmed the division of the territory into "bantustans" or tribal homelands. He then introduced a resolution in which the Council would note with appreciation the Secretary General's report, decide in light of the report to discontinue further efforts on the basis of its 1972 resolution, and request the Secretary General to keep the Council fully informed of any important developments concerning the question of Namibia. The majority of Council members spoke in favor of the resolution.

In a statement on December 11 the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Bennett, expressed U.S. concern over recent arrests and floggings of dissidents in Namibia and South Africa's continuing implementation of its homelands policy in the territory. At the same time he expressed U.S. reluctance to eliminate the possibility of future talks which the United States continued to believe were "the most realistic way of gaining self-determination for the people of Namibia." He concluded that:

"No matter what one might think of the sincerity of the South African Government, responses already given to the Secretary General by Foreign Minister Muller represented important departures from previous policy. They signal openings which are admittedly narrow but which we believe to be worth further exploration."

Nevertheless, the United States joined in the unanimous adoption of the Peruvian draft resolution on December 11.

The Council members next began to consider a draft resolution unofficially circulated by Kenya which would have declared South Africa's continued illegal presence in Namibia "an act of aggression" and "a threat to international peace and security." The draft would have further provided that if South Africa did not withdraw from Namibia immediately the Security Council would meet to determine the effective, mandatory measures to be taken under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The United States, the United Kingdom, and France informed the Kenyan delegation privately of their reservations on mandatory action against South Africa. Unable to agree on changes in language, however, the Council then suspended further discussion of the draft resolution *sine die*.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly on October 3 approved by a vote of 80 to 9 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions, a recommendation by its Fourth Committee

to "invite the leaders of those national liberation movements of the colonial territories in Africa which are recognized by the OAU to continue to participate as observers in its proceedings relating to their respective countries." The United States voted against the proposal, as it had when first raised in 1972, because it does not believe that observer status should be given nongovernmental entities nor that the United Nations or any other international institution is competent to determine or alter the status under international law of political movements.

The General Assembly's Fourth Committee considered the question of Namibia during 14 meetings between October 26 and December 4, and over 70 states took part in the debate. The Committee also heard a number of petitioners including the acting Vice President of SWAPO, Mishake Muyongo, on October 26 and Chief Clemens Kapuuo of the National Convention of Namibia on November 6. Both men complained of political repression in Namibia and expressed opposition to the "homelands" policy of the South Africa administration.

The Committee approved two resolutions on December 4, both by recorded votes.

The first, a lengthy omnibus resolution introduced by Morocco and sponsored by 36 states, most of them African, was approved by a vote of 99 to 1 (Portugal), with 19 abstentions (U.S.). In its most important paragraphs the resolution recognized SWAPO as "the authentic representative of the Namibian people"; condemned South Africa's refusal to withdraw from Namibia and its "homelands" policy; demanded the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia; considered that the contacts between the Secretary General and the Government of South Africa should be terminated; invited the Security Council "to consider taking effective measures" to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia; urged all states "to take all possible economic and other measures with a view to compelling South Africa to withdraw immediately from Namibia"; and requested all specialized agencies and other organizations within the UN system and the member states thereof "to take such necessary steps as will enable the UN Council for Namibia, as the legal authority for Namibia, to participate fully on behalf of Namibia in the work of those agencies and organizations."

The United States abstained because it could not endorse a number of the provisions of the resolution. Specifically, it disapproved of the nomination of SWAPO as the "authentic representative of the Namibian people" because the Namibian people as a whole have not expressed their views on this subject. It also disagreed with the veiled invitation to the Security Council to invoke sanctions, which the United States believes would be ineffective, against South Africa. In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Barbara White, said that the United States deplored recent South African actions in Namibia, but believed that negotiations were a more realistic way than sanctions of obtaining the withdrawal of South Africa.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a recorded vote of 107 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with 17 abstentions (U.S.).

The second resolution, introduced by Senegal, Pakistan, and Argentina and sponsored by 40 states, most of them African, concerned the UN Fund for Namibia. It was approved by a vote of 117 (U.S.) to 1 (Portugal), with no abstentions. The resolution decided to allocate to the Fund \$100,000 from the regular UN budget; authorized the Secretary General and the Council for Namibia to continue to appeal to governments for voluntary contributions to the Fund; urged the Secretary General, in cooperation with the Council for Namibia, to begin the implementation of the long-term measures and studies outlined in his report to the General Assembly at its 26th session in 1971;<sup>5</sup> and decided that, pending the entry into full operation of the comprehensive program, the Namibians should continue to be eligible for assistance through the UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa and the UN Trust Fund for South Africa.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a recorded vote of 124 (U.S.) to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with no abstentions.

On December 18 the General Assembly approved without a vote the appointment by the Secretary General of Sean MacBride, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland, as UN Commissioner for Namibia for an initial period of 1 year. He replaced Agha Abdul Hamid of Pakistan whose term expired December 31, 1973. The post had been created by the General Assembly in a resolution adopted May 19, 1967.

#### PORTUGUESE TERRITORIES

The Security Council did not consider in 1973 the question of territories under Portuguese administration, but, as in previous years, the General Assembly's agenda for its 28th session contained an item on this subject. In conformity with past practice, the item was referred to the Fourth Committee which discussed it at 15 meetings between September 27 and November 15 and approved two draft resolutions. The first was an omnibus resolution on the situation in the Portuguese territories, which was similar to resolutions adopted in previous years. The second called for an investigation of an alleged massacre in Mozambique. Both were approved by rollcall votes and subsequently adopted by the General Assembly by recorded votes. The United States voted against both.

In accordance with the General Assembly's decision of October 3 (see p. 205), the Fourth Committee allowed representatives of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) and the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) to participate in an observer capacity in its proceedings.

On November 7 Kenya, Iraq, and the Malagasy Republic introduced a draft resolution ultimately sponsored by 64 African, Asian, Latin American, and Eastern European states. The Fourth Committee approved the draft on November 9 by a vote of 102 to 6 (Brazil, France, Portugal, Spain, U.K., U.S.), with 16 abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 12 by a vote of 105 to 8 (Bolivia, Brazil,

<sup>5</sup> In 1971 the Secretary General proposed a detailed investigation of the human and natural resources of Namibia with a view to preparing a coordinated plan of international economic and technical assistance, including manpower training, to be implemented in Namibia after South Africa's withdrawal.

France, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, U.K., U.S.), with 16 abstentions. Among other things, the resolution reaffirmed that the liberation movements in the Portuguese African territories were the "authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the peoples of those territories"; condemned Portugal's retention of its African territories; demanded that Portugal treat the "freedom fighters of Angola and Mozambique" as prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949; appealed to Governments, specialized agencies, and other organizations in the UN system for aid to the people in those territories, particularly in the "liberated areas"; and urged all states, particularly those members of NATO, to withdraw assistance from Portugal and to prevent the supply to Portugal of material which could be used for military purposes.

The United States disagreed with a number of the resolution's provisions and voted against it, primarily because of the request for special assistance to the populations in the "liberated areas." The United States believes such aid constitutes interference in the internal affairs of a UN member.

Also on November 7, Sweden, Mexico, and Sudan introduced a draft resolution on the "Establishment of a Commission of Inquiry" to investigate massacres alleged to have been committed by a Portuguese military unit at Wiriyamu in Mozambique. The resolution, ultimately sponsored by 16 states, most of them Western European, decided to establish a 5-member commission of inquiry to be appointed by the President of the Assembly; instructed the commission to carry out a thorough investigation of the reported atrocities and to report its findings; and requested Portugal to cooperate with the commission. The Committee approved the resolution on November 9 by a vote of 103 to 3 (Portugal, Spain, U.S.), with 16 abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 12 by a vote of 109 to 4 (Portugal, South Africa, Spain, U.S.), with 12 abstentions.

While the United States shared the humanitarian concerns of those voting for the resolution, it voted against it because it believed the dispatch of an inquiry commission against Portugal's will would constitute interference in the internal affairs of a member state, contrary to Article 2(7) of the UN Charter. In addition, the establishment of the commission would set a precedent that later could be used to justify interference in the affairs of other states as well.

After adoption of the resolution the President announced the appointment of the German Democratic Republic, Honduras, Ireland, Malagasy Republic, and Nepal to the commission.<sup>6</sup>

## SOUTHERN RHODESIA

### SECURITY COUNCIL

During 1973 the Security Council held three sets of meetings on Southern Rhodesia. From January 29 to February 2 it considered a Zambian complaint of Rhodesian aggression; from March 8 to 10 it discussed the report of a special mission which visited Africa in connection with Zambia's complaint; finally, between May 14 and 22 it

<sup>6</sup> Ireland later indicated it was not in a position to participate, and in March 1974 Norway was appointed in its place.

discussed the second special report of the Rhodesian Sanctions Committee.

### *Zambian Complaint of Rhodesian Aggression*

In a January 24, 1973, letter to the President of the Security Council, the Zambian Representative requested that the Council meet to consider "serious acts of aggression" against Zambia by the regime in Southern Rhodesia. Zambia charged that Rhodesia had closed their common border and had imposed an economic blockade in an effort to make Zambia the scapegoat for the success of the "freedom fighters" within Rhodesia. Zambia further charged that Rhodesian and 4,000 South African troops were deployed along the border and had committed "a series of violations against the sovereignty and territorial integrity" of Zambia. Following the border closure the Zambian Government announced that it had decided once and for all to cease to use the rail and road routes through Rhodesia and to establish permanent alternative routes for its imports and exports.

In a January 26 letter to the Council South Africa categorically denied the allegation that South African troops were stationed in Rhodesia.

Twenty-eight states, including all the members of the Security Council, took part in the debate during five meetings between January 29 and February 2; all supported the Zambian position to a greater or lesser extent.

The U.S. Representative, Christopher H. Phillips, spoke on January 31 and recalled that the economic relationships between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia before the latter's unilateral declaration of independence imposed a heavy burden on Zambia when it tried to comply with the sanctions instituted in 1965. He noted that many states had helped Zambia in this effort, and pointed out that U.S. aid had included a comprehensive air lift valued at \$4.5 million to transport petroleum products to Zambia and \$38 million toward construction of a Great North Road to enable Zambia to transport its copper and other materials through Tanzania. This assistance had helped Zambia weather the adverse effects on its economy of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. He reiterated the U.S. view that sanctions should be maintained and tightened and that further attempts should be made to achieve a peaceful settlement.

On February 2 the Security Council adopted two resolutions sponsored by Guinea, Kenya, Sudan, and Yugoslavia and introduced by Sudan on February 1.

The first resolution, primarily political, *inter alia* (1) condemned all acts of military and economic provocation and harassment against Zambia by Rhodesia in collusion with South Africa; (2) called on the United Kingdom, as the legal administering power, to take all effective measures to put an end to such actions; (3) regretted that measures so far taken had failed to bring the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia to an end; (4) demanded the "immediate and total withdrawal" of South African military forces from Rhodesia and called on the United Kingdom to ensure that this was done; and (5) decided to dispatch a special mission of four Council members to assess the situation in the area and report back by March 1.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 13 to 0, with 2 abstentions (U.K., U.S.). The United States abstained because the resolution, like

many previous ones, called on the United Kingdom to take clearly unrealistic actions, not only against Rhodesia but also against South Africa; and because it made sweeping findings of fact, particularly with respect to South African collusion, in the absence of prior investigation.

The second resolution, primarily economic, (1) commended Zambia for its decision to sever all remaining economic and trade relations with Southern Rhodesia; (2) took note of the special hardships confronting Zambia as a result of this decision; and (3) decided that the special mission already established would, with the assistance of a team of six UN experts, assess the needs of Zambia in maintaining alternate systems of road, rail, air, and sea communications for the normal flow of traffic. The mission was requested to submit this second report also by March 1.

This resolution was adopted by a vote of 14 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.S.R.). The United States voted for the resolution, despite certain reservations, because it sympathized with Zambia's economic plight. It was concerned over the political overtones of the special mission and believed it would have been better to have requested the Secretary General to send the team of experts to the scene to make an objective evaluation of needs than to have representatives of governments oversee the work of a group of experts.

In consultations after the meetings the Council members decided that the special mission would be composed of Austria, Indonesia (chairman), Peru, and Sudan and would be accompanied by six economic and transportation specialists.

The special mission left New York February 8 and on February 9 met in London with officials of the British Government and the Commonwealth Secretariat. It visited Zambia from February 11 to 15. During that period the members consulted with Zambian officials and were briefed on landmine incidents along Zambia's borders and on the economic dislocation that resulted from the border closing. On February 16 and 17 the special mission visited Tanzania to investigate port facilities that might be used to handle Zambian exports and imports. The next two days were spent in Kenya looking into the use of Kenyan ports for Zambian goods.

The special mission submitted its report to the Security Council on March 6. It concluded that "a considerable measure of tension continues to exist" along Zambia's borders. It asserted that important factors in increasing the tension were the military preparations confronting Zambia's frontier and incidents along its borders. The mission approved Zambia's closure of its borders with Rhodesia.

In the economic section of its report the special mission observed that Zambia's economy would be significantly affected by shortages of imports and higher costs. It stated that only adequate and timely assistance would make it possible for the economy of Zambia to continue to develop in a normal fashion, and it assessed Zambia's needs at \$200 million.

#### *Second Meeting on Zambian Complaint*

Again at Zambia's request, the Security Council held three meetings between March 8 and 10 to consider and adopt the special mission's report. During the debate several members of the Council, in-



cluding the United States, expressed misgivings about discussing the report without adequate time to study it.

Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, and Yugoslavia sponsored two resolutions—one political and the other economic—which were introduced by Kenya on March 9.

The economic resolution, adopted unanimously on March 10, *inter alia* (1) commended Zambia for abandoning the Rhodesian route for its imports and exports; (2) appealed to all states to aid Zambia in maintaining its normal flow of traffic; (3) requested the United Nations and the specialized agencies to assist Zambia; and (4) requested the Secretary General "in collaboration with appropriate organizations of the United Nations system" to organize all forms of financial, technical, and material assistance to Zambia to enable it to "carry out its policy of economic independence from the racist regime of Southern Rhodesia."

Speaking in explanation of the U.S. vote, Ambassador Phillips noted that the United States had supported sending UN experts to Zambia to assess the economic situation, but said it was unrealistic to expect most governments to be able to determine their views about such a complex report on such short notice. The United States was therefore not in a position to undertake any commitments regarding the extension of assistance. Turning to specific provisions in the resolution, he drew attention to the possible implications of the language in points (3) and (4) above and said that the United States did not interpret this as implying a demand by the Security Council that the specialized agencies undertake any commitment without regard to their ongoing commitments or the resources available to them.

The resolution on the political situation was also adopted by the Council on March 10, by a vote of 13 to 0, with 2 abstentions (U.K., U.S.). It largely contained points covered in previous resolutions by calling for wider and stronger sanctions, the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from Rhodesia, and a constitutional conference for Southern Rhodesia to be convened by the United Kingdom.

Explaining the U.S. abstention, Ambassador Phillips said that the United States agreed with the special mission's view that the situation in southern Africa in large part resulted from the denial of self-determination to the majority of the African people, but did not think the resolution was likely to have the desired result of advancing that right. Further, the United States could not accept the idea that the scope of the sanctions might be extended, as distinct from strengthening the existing sanctions.

#### *Sanctions Committee Report*

At the request of Guinea and Kenya, the Security Council met five times between May 14 and 22 to discuss the second special report, submitted April 15, of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 of May 29, 1968 (which had imposed comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions on Southern Rhodesia). This Committee, known as the Sanctions Committee, had been charged by the Security Council in a September 29, 1972, resolution, on which the United States abstained, to consider "the type of action which could be taken in view of the open and persistent refusal of South Africa

and Portugal to implement sanctions against the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia," and to report on a variety of proposals to extend the scope and effectiveness of sanctions.

The Committee, on which all Council members are represented, began its work in early February basing its consideration on a 24-point working paper submitted by Guinea, Kenya, and Sudan. Some alternate proposals were submitted by other states during the course of the debate. Two months of extensive debate produced agreement on about half of the proposals and they, along with the proposals on which agreement was not reached, were forwarded to the Security Council.

The agreed proposals generally recommended ways of improving the existing sanctions. For example, states were urged to be more vigilant in checking imports from South Africa and the Portuguese territories to be sure that they were not of Rhodesian origin, and the Committee would produce a manual elaborating on documentation and clearing procedures to assist states in this checking. In addition, governments were to be asked to submit the names of persons qualified to investigate suspicious cargoes at the request of an importing country.

One of the most controversial among the non-agreed proposals was an African recommendation that the Security Council decide that all states should limit their purchases of chrome ores, asbestos, tobacco, pig iron, copper, sugar, maize, and meat products from South Africa, Mozambique, and Angola to 1965 levels. Another was that Lourenço Marques be blockaded to prevent the export of commodities and products originating in Southern Rhodesia. Other non-agreed proposals ranged from recommendations on contracts and insurance to calling on the United States to revoke legislation permitting the importation of Rhodesian minerals.

The first draft resolution, sponsored by Australia, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, and Yugoslavia, endorsed the proposals on which the Committee had reached agreement. However, it also contained some committee proposals with which the United States and others had not been able to agree and requested states to repeal immediately any legislation permitting the importation of Rhodesian products. The resolution was adopted on May 22 by a vote of 12 to 0, with 3 abstentions (France, U.K., U.S.).

The United States abstained because the repeal provision and others were incompatible with Section 503 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971. The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Scali, explained, however, that the United States was in sympathy with the general goal of strengthening sanctions, and he hoped that recommendations of the Sanctions Committee's report would contribute significantly to making sanctions more effective.

The second draft resolution, which would have *inter alia* imposed a blockade on Lourenço Marques and limited all purchases from South Africa, Mozambique, and Angola to 1965 levels, was clearly unacceptable and even went beyond what had been considered in the Sanctions Committee. On May 22 the United States and the United Kingdom vetoed the draft resolution; France and Austria abstained.

In an explanation of the negative U.S. vote Ambassador Scali said that "We consider it unrealistic to call for broader sanctions until the

full membership of the United Nations has demonstrated its willingness to take more seriously the sanctions already in force." He added, "In our view, to pass a resolution which is clearly unenforceable would seriously damage the reputation and credibility of the United Nations and further erode public confidence in the United Nations ability to act in a meaningful way."

#### *Sanctions Committee's Subsequent Work*

During the last half of 1973 the Sanctions Committee was active in preparing a manual for customs agents and in putting into effect the agreed recommendations in its report. In the course of its work it sent several notes to all UN members requesting information on their compliance with the sanctions programs.

In reply to specific questions in the notes, the United States told the Committee of precautions taken to prevent the entry of illegal Rhodesian goods. The United States also stated its willingness to make available the facilities at the U.S. Customs Service laboratory at Baltimore, Maryland, to perform tests to determine whether certain commodities originated in Rhodesia. In addition the United States informed the Committee that it alerts individuals and nongovernmental organizations in this country to the importance of the UN sanctions program and to the desirability of providing to the appropriate bodies information on violations of sanctions contrary to U.S. law. The United States also indicated it was prepared to make available to the Sanctions Committee such information on sanctions violations as its representatives abroad, within the confines of their status and the bounds delineated by the host governments, obtain in the course of their normal diplomatic and consular duties.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Fourth Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the question of Rhodesia at 12 meetings between October 12 and November 20. In accordance with the Assembly's decision of October 3 to allow leaders of national liberation movements to continue to participate as observers in its proceedings relating to their respective countries (see p. 205), representatives of two Rhodesian liberation movements—the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU)—took part in the Committee's proceedings.

On November 19 Tanzania introduced a draft resolution ultimately sponsored by 58 African, Asian, Latin American, and Eastern European states. In its operative paragraphs the resolution *inter alia* (1) reaffirmed that there should be no independence before majority rule; (2) called on the United Kingdom to take "all effective measures" to terminate the illegal Rhodesian regime; and (3) called on the United Kingdom to bring about the conditions to enable the people of Southern Rhodesia to exercise their right to self-determination. The Committee approved the resolution on November 20 by a rollcall vote of 100 to 3 (Portugal, U.K., U.S.), with 13 abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 12 by a rollcall vote of 108 to 4 (Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S.), with 15 abstentions. The United States

voted against the resolution, which is nearly identical to one adopted in 1972 at the 27th General Assembly, because of its unrealistic, violent demands on the United Kingdom.

Also on November 19 Zambia introduced a second draft resolution sponsored by 50 of the same states. This resolution *inter alia* (1) condemned the U.K. failure to take effective measures to end the regime in Rhodesia; (2) condemned the continued U.S. importation of chrome and nickel from Southern Rhodesia and called on the United States to terminate forthwith all such importation; (3) called on the United States to terminate the activities in the United States of Air Rhodesia, the Rhodesian National Tourist Board, and the Rhodesian Information Office; and (4) drew the attention of the Security Council to the need "to consider imposing sanctions against Portugal and South Africa." The Fourth Committee approved the draft resolution on November 20 by a rollcall vote of 93 to 4 (France, Portugal, U.K., U.S.), with 20 abstentions, and the Assembly adopted it on December 12 by a recorded vote of 101 to 5 (France, Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S.), with 22 abstentions.

The United States voted against the resolution primarily because it could not accept language that condemned actions it had taken in compliance with its own laws and that focused attention on the United States while largely ignoring the violations of others.

## OTHER QUESTIONS

### OTHER TERRITORIES

In addition to the resolutions described in previous sections of this report, the 28th General Assembly adopted by recorded votes resolutions on six other specific territories—Niue, Seychelles Islands, Brunei, Falkland Islands, Comoro Islands, and Spanish Sahara.

The Fourth Committee considered the territories together at 14 meetings between November 19 and December 6 under the agenda item on "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples." The Committee based its discussion on the report of the Committee of 24 and each resolution approved the pertinent chapter of that report.

On November 28 the Fourth Committee approved by a vote of 110 to none a draft resolution on Niue, an island in the Pacific west of the Cook Islands, that had been introduced by Ethiopia, Venezuela, and Japan and was sponsored by 38 states, including the United States. The resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Niue to self-determination; noted that a specific timetable had been agreed between New Zealand (the administering power) and the Government and people of Niue for achieving self-government in 1974; welcomed New Zealand's invitation to observe the act of self-determination; and requested the Committee of 24 to appoint a special mission to Niue to observe the act of self-determination and to report to the 29th General Assembly. The resolution was adopted by the Assembly on December 14 by a vote of 128 to none.

On December 3 the Fourth Committee approved, by a vote of 103 to 5 (France, Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S.), with 13 abstentions,

a resolution on the Seychelles which was sponsored by 15 African and 1 Asian states. The resolution affirmed the right of the Seychelles people to independence and requested the United Kingdom to make the necessary arrangements, in consultation with a special mission to be dispatched by the Committee of 24, for a referendum on the future status of the territory. The United States disagreed with the inference in the resolution that the UN General Assembly was the definitive judge of whether a territory has attained self-determination. Inasmuch as the Seychelles people had decided in a free election in 1970 not to request independence, the United States considered the resolution interference in the internal affairs of the Seychelles as well as of the United Kingdom. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 14 by a vote of 113 to 5 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

In September 1972 the United Kingdom had reported to the Secretary General that as a consequence of an agreement with Brunei signed November 23, 1971, the latter had full internal self-government. Therefore the two governments did not consider it appropriate that information continue to be submitted by the United Kingdom under Article 73(e). Nevertheless, on December 4, the Fourth Committee approved by a vote of 101 to 0, with 15 abstentions (U.S.) and the United Kingdom not participating, a resolution on Brunei sponsored by 7 African and 1 Asian states. In a preambular paragraph the resolution recalled an earlier resolution adopted by the Assembly in 1972 which reaffirmed "that in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly itself that a Non-Self-Governing Territory has attained a full measure of self-government . . . the administering power concerned should continue to transmit information under Article 73(e)," and in its operative paragraphs it reaffirmed Brunei's right to self-determination and requested the administering power to furnish such information as might be required by the Committee of 24 and to take part in that Committee's proceedings with respect to the territory. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 14 by a vote of 115 (U.S.) to 0, with 15 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

On December 5, by a vote of 99 (Argentina) to 0, with 15 abstentions (U.K., U.S.), the Fourth Committee approved a resolution on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) which was sponsored by 16 Latin American states. The resolution declared the need to accelerate the negotiations between the governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom that were called for in a 1965 Assembly resolution in order to arrive at a peaceful solution of the conflict of sovereignty between them concerning the islands, urged the two governments to proceed without delay with the negotiations in order to put an end to the colonial situation, and requested both governments to report to the Secretary General and the Assembly as soon as possible on the results of their negotiations. The Assembly adopted the resolution on December 14 by a vote of 116 to 0, with 14 abstentions (U.S.).

On December 6, by a vote of 93 to 0, with 16 abstentions (U.S.) and France not participating, the Fourth Committee approved a resolution on the Comoros Islands which was sponsored by 12 African states. The resolution *inter alia* noted that the French Government had affirmed the readiness of the Comoro Archipelago for independence; re-

<sup>7</sup> The U.S. voted affirmatively by mistake; it had intended to abstain.

quested France to ensure that the unity and territorial integrity of the Comoro Archipelago are preserved; called on France to take all necessary measures to ensure the full and speedy attainment of freedom and independence by the people of the territory; requested France to cooperate with the Committee of 24; and invited all states to render all help to the people of the territory in their efforts to achieve the objectives of the Declaration on Colonialism. The United States abstained because the report of the Committee of 24, which the resolution approved, called for aid to the Comorian "liberation movement." The United States believes such aid constitutes interference in the internal affairs of a UN member. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 14 by a vote of 110 to 0, with 18 abstentions (U.S.).

On December 6, by a vote of 91 to 0, with 24 abstentions (Spain, U.S.), the Fourth Committee approved a resolution on Spanish Sahara that was sponsored by 9 African states. The resolution *inter alia* declared that the continued existence of the colonial situation in the territory endangered stability and harmony in northwest Africa; repeated an earlier invitation to Spain to determine, in consultation with Mauritania, Morocco, and any other interested party, the procedures for holding a referendum under UN auspices to enable the indigenous population of the territory to exercise its right to self-determination and independence; invited all states to refrain from helping perpetuate the colonial situation in the territory by means of investments; and reaffirmed the UN responsibility in all consultations intended to lead to the free expression of the wishes of the people. The United States abstained because it disagreed with the inference in the resolution that foreign investments in non-governing territories were incompatible with the welfare of indigenous populations. The Assembly adopted the resolution on December 14 by a vote of 108 to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.).

#### GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

Under several different agenda items the 28th General Assembly also adopted 10 general resolutions on different aspects of colonialism and racial discrimination. Almost all were adopted by recorded votes, and for the most part they followed closely the texts of similar resolutions adopted in previous years. One of the resolutions was recommended by the Third Committee, five by the Fourth Committee, and four were considered directly in plenary without prior reference to a main committee.

##### *Third Committee Resolution*

The Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural), following its practice since 1969, considered at five meetings between November 2 and 7 an agenda item entitled "Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights." On November 7, after a long series of votes on separate paragraphs, the Committee approved by a vote of 91 to 6 (France, Israel, Nicaragua, Portugal, U.K., U.S.), with 24 abstentions, a resolution sponsored by 41 states, mostly African.

The resolution *inter alia* reaffirmed the legitimacy of the peoples' struggle for liberation from colonial and foreign domination "by all available means, including armed struggle"; called upon states to offer moral and material assistance to peoples struggling for self-determination and independence; condemned the policies of members of NATO and other countries that assist "Portugal and other racist regimes in Africa and elsewhere in their suppression of peoples' aspirations for, and enjoyment of, human rights"; condemned "all governments which do not recognize the right to self-determination and independence of peoples, notably the peoples of Africa still under colonial domination and the Palestinian people"; and requested the Secretary General to continue to assist the specialized agencies and other UN organizations in the provision of increased international assistance to the peoples of colonial territories.

The United States voted against the resolution because it found most of the provisions extreme and unacceptable, particularly the condemnation of NATO members, based on the assumption, contrary to fact, that NATO countries are assisting Portugal in its conflicts in Africa, and the call for international assistance to those fighting against colonial administrations. The United States considers such assistance interference in the internal affairs of UN members and inappropriate for international organizations.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 97 to 5 (U.S.), with 28 abstentions.

#### *Fourth Committee Resolutions*

Under an agenda item on "Information from non-self-governing territories transmitted under Article 73(e) of the Charter of the United Nations," the Fourth Committee on November 30 by a vote of 107 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with 7 abstentions (Brazil, France, Guatemala, Spain, U.K., U.S., Uruguay), approved a resolution sponsored by 10 African states, India, Iran, and Yugoslavia. The resolution *inter alia* strongly deplored that some member states had ceased or failed to transmit information under Article 73(e); reaffirmed that in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly that a territory has attained self-government the administering power should continue to transmit information under Article 73(e); and requested the administering powers concerned to transmit such information "as well as the fullest possible information on political and constitutional developments in the territories concerned." The United States abstained because it objected to the affirmation that the General Assembly was the sole judge of whether territories had achieved self-government. The Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a vote of 114 to 2, with 10 abstentions (U.S.).

On November 30 the Fourth Committee adopted a lengthy resolution under a recurring agenda item entitled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, and territories under Portuguese domination and in all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa." Sponsored by 32 states, mostly

African, the resolution was approved by a vote of 99 to 3 (Portugal, South Africa, U.S.), with 21 abstentions. *Inter alia* it reaffirmed that the activities of foreign economic, financial, and other interests operating in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, and Portuguese territories were "a major obstacle to independence" and condemned the policies of the colonial powers and other states that continue to support such foreign economic and other interests. The United States voted against the resolution because it disagrees with the basic premise that foreign economic interests are an impediment to self-determination. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a vote of 103 to 3 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions.

Under an agenda item on "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations," the Fourth Committee on December 4 approved by a vote of 99 to 4 (Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S.), with 16 abstentions, a lengthy resolution sponsored by 47 African, Asian, and Eastern European states. The United States voted against the resolution because it, *inter alia*, urged the UN system of organizations to give moral and material assistance to liberation movements and people in the "liberated areas"; urged specialized agencies to withhold any assistance from Portugal and South Africa; and requested the specialized agencies and other UN organizations to ensure that the people of the colonial territories in Africa were represented by their national liberation movements. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a vote of 108 to 4 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions.

The United States supported two resolutions concerning educational and training programs for indigenous inhabitants of non-self-governing territories. The first, proposed under an agenda item entitled "Offers by member states of study and training facilities for inhabitants of non-self-governing territories," was sponsored in the Fourth Committee by 18 states, most of them African, and approved by acclamation on November 30. It invited all states to make generous offers of study and training facilities to inhabitants of non-self-governing territories; requested states whenever possible to provide travel funds as well; and requested administering powers to publicize widely in their territories information relating to study offers. The General Assembly adopted the resolution without objection on December 12.

The second resolution, proposed under an agenda item entitled "United Nations Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa," was sponsored by 24 African, Asian, and European states, and approved by the Fourth Committee on December 4 by a vote of 115 (U.S.) to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with no abstentions. It appealed for contributions to the program, which was established in 1967, and decided that the program would receive \$100,000 from the UN regular budget for 1974 to ensure continuity pending the receipt of adequate voluntary contributions. Although the United States voted for the resolution, it pointed out that it did not approve the allocation of funds from the regular budget to a voluntary fund. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a vote of 126 (U.S.) to 2, with no abstentions.



### *Plenary Resolutions*

As in previous years, some portions of the Committee of 24 report, including the chapter reviewing the Committee's work as a whole and containing recommendations for its activities in the coming year, were considered by the General Assembly directly in plenary session.

On December 14, by a recorded vote of 104 to 5 (France, Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S.), with 19 abstentions, the Assembly adopted under the agenda item "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence on Colonial Countries and Peoples" an omnibus resolution similar to others adopted in earlier years.

Sponsored by 56 states (37 African, 14 Asian, 2 Eastern European, and 3 Latin American), the lengthy resolution *inter alia* (1) reaffirmed the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples "and all other resolutions on decolonization"; (2) approved the report of the Committee of 24; (3) affirmed that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms, "including racism, apartheid and activities of foreign economic and other interests which exploit colonial peoples, as well as the waging of colonial wars to suppress the national liberation movements of the colonial territories in Africa," is incompatible with the UN Charter "and poses a serious threat to international peace and security"; (4) urged all states and specialized agencies to provide moral and material assistance to peoples struggling for their freedom and independence in the colonial territories, "in particular to the national liberation movements of the territories in Africa"; (5) requested states to withhold assistance from the governments of Portugal and South Africa and the regime in Southern Rhodesia; and (6) requested the specialized agencies and other UN organizations to ensure the representation of the colonial territories in Africa by the national liberation movements concerned.

The United States voted against the resolution, as it has its predecessors, because of the assertion that colonialism is a threat to international peace and security, the urging that specialized agencies provide assistance to representatives of the liberation movements, and the call to grant representation in international organizations to the liberation movements.

Also on December 14 and under the same agenda item, the Assembly adopted by a vote of 121 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with 5 abstentions (Brazil, France, Nicaragua, U.K., U.S.), a resolution on "Dissemination of information on decolonization" which was sponsored by 59 states, mostly African and Asian. The resolution requested the Secretary General to continue giving widespread publicity to the work of the United Nations in decolonization, to the situation in colonial territories, and to the struggle for liberation being waged by colonial peoples; further requested the Secretary General to establish a Unit on Decolonization within the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship, and Decolonization of the UN Secretariat; and invited states, specialized agencies, and other governmental and nongovernmental organizations to undertake large-scale dissemination of information on decolonization. The United States abstained on the resolution primarily for budgetary reasons.

A third resolution adopted under this agenda item on December 14, by a vote of 121 to 2 (Portugal, South Africa), with 6 abstentions (Brazil, France, Greece, Spain, U.K., U.S.), concerned the "Interna-

tional Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and Apartheid in Southern Africa" which had been held in Oslo, Norway, in April 1973. Sponsored by 11 states (5 African, 5 Western European, and Australia), the resolution *inter alia* reiterated the intention of the United Nations to intensify its efforts to find a solution to the "grave situation in southern Africa" and commended the Conference's proposals for a program of action to the attention of UN organizations, the OAU governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the public. The United States abstained because it disagreed with a number of the conference proposals, such as the call for mandatory sanctions against South Africa, withdrawal of foreign investment from southern Africa, and specialized agency aid to liberation movements.

Under an agenda item on "Cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU" the General Assembly on November 15 adopted by a vote of 92 to 2, with 3 abstentions (U.S.), a resolution sponsored by 37 African states. In a preambular paragraph the resolution recalled the urgent need to give assistance to the "victims of colonialism, racial discrimination, and apartheid resulting from political and criminal acts of repression" by Portugal, South Africa, and Southern Rhodesia. In its operative paragraphs it reiterated the intention of the United Nations, in cooperation with the OAU, to intensify its efforts to find a solution to the situation in southern Africa; requested the Secretary General to take any necessary action to strengthen cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU; drew the attention of the Security Council to the need to associate the OAU with "all its work concerning Africa, including the activities of its Committee on Sanctions"; and invited the specialized agencies and other UN organizations to continue and intensify their cooperation with the OAU. The United States abstained on the resolution principally because it considered the allegation of "criminal acts of repression" in the preambular paragraph unfounded in law.

#### PUERTO RICO

In a resolution adopted August 28, 1972, the Committee of 24 had instructed its Working Group to submit a report relating specifically to the procedure to be followed with respect to Puerto Rico. At the initiative of Cuba (not a member of the Committee), the Committee has been confronted by this issue for the past few years, in spite of the fact that the General Assembly in 1953 recognized Puerto Rico's self-governing status and in 1971 declined to resurrect the issue by refusing to place on its agenda an item requested by Cuba on "the colonial case of Puerto Rico."

Although the Working Group had been instructed to submit its report early in 1973, it did not meet on this question until August 14 when it promptly agreed by consensus to refer the matter back to the full Committee.

The Committee took up Puerto Rico in plenary session on August 16 when it heard the Cuban Permanent Representative to the United Nations urge the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Puerto Rico and ask that Puerto Rico be added to the Committee's list of non-self-governing territories. Further complicating the subject in 1973 was the appearance before the Committee of the President of

the Puerto Rican Independence Party and the Secretary General of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. (In the 1972 Puerto Rican elections the various independence parties together gathered approximately 5 percent of the vote.) Although some Committee members suggested that the independence advocates should submit written statements rather than appear in person, the Committee agreed on August 22, by a vote of 12 to 0, with 12 abstentions, to hear the two. The proponents of the hearings claimed it would not prejudice the Committee's eventual decision on the action to be taken with respect to Puerto Rico. The United States reacted strongly against the Committee's decision, Ambassador Scali declaring in a statement to the press that the proper place for the two to express their views was in Puerto Rico, not in New York.

On August 30 the Committee adopted a resolution sponsored by Congo, Iraq, Mali, and Syria that (1) reaffirmed Puerto Rico's right to self-determination and independence; (2) requested the United States "to refrain from taking any measures which might obstruct the full and free exercise by the people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, as well as of their economic, social and other rights, and in particular to prevent any violation of these rights by bodies corporate under its jurisdiction"; (3) requested the Committee's rapporteur, with the assistance of the UN Secretariat, to compile information on Puerto Rico for submission to the Committee at a later date; and (4) decided to keep the question under continuous review.

The resolution was adopted by a rollcall vote of 12 to 2, with 9 abstentions. Those in favor were Bulgaria, Chile, P.R.C., Congo, Czechoslovakia, India, Iraq, Mali, Syria, Tanzania, U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. Those opposed were Ethiopia and Iran. Those abstaining were Afghanistan, Australia, Fiji, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, and Venezuela; and Sierra Leone was absent.

Although it is significant that two delegations voted against the resolution—the Committee rarely departs from operation by consensus—the United States believes that the resolution constituted blatant interference in the internal affairs of the United States and Puerto Rico. In a statement to the press after the vote, Ambassador Scali assailed the decision as "not only irrelevant but ludicrous," and noted that the Committee vote had come only a few days after the UN Secretary General in his annual report counseled that member states could develop a far more effective international organization by consistently respecting the decisions and findings of the main UN organs.

The United States has repeatedly emphasized during the past few years that it considers the issue to have been clearly and definitively settled by the 1953 General Assembly resolution which had recognized that "when choosing their constitutional and international status, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have effectively exercised their right to self-determination." The United States has also frequently pointed out that the 1971 General Assembly vote rejected by an overwhelming majority a proposal to include Puerto Rico on its agenda.

The status of Puerto Rico was not on the agenda of the 28th General Assembly, and the Assembly took no action to add it to the list of non-self-governing territories.



---

---

PART IV  
LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

---

---



Legal questions are relevant to a significant part of the work of the United Nations. Many of these questions are discussed in other parts of this report in connection with the underlying issues to which they relate. However, because of their specifically legal character, Part Four deals separately with the activities of the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission, the UN Commission on International Trade Law, the General Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee, and certain special committees constituted by the Assembly.

#### INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice is the principal UN judicial organ. It functions in accordance with its Statute, which forms an integral part of the UN Charter. The Court's main function is to decide, in accordance with international law, such cases as are submitted to it by states. It also gives advisory opinions on legal questions at the request of bodies authorized pursuant to the Charter to make such requests.

All members of the United Nations are automatically parties to the Statute of the Court. In addition, Liechtenstein, San Marino, and Switzerland are parties to the Statute although not UN members. At the end of 1973, 46 of those states also accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under Article 36 of the Court's Statute; Costa Rica accepted the compulsory jurisdiction during the year. However, a number of countries, including the United States, continued to maintain significant reservations to their acceptance.

#### CASES

*Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v. Iceland; Federal Republic of Germany v. Iceland)*

In 1972 the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany filed separate applications instituting proceedings against Iceland because of the latter's decision to extend, as of September 1, 1972, the limits of its exclusive fisheries zone from a distance of 12 to one of 50 nautical miles from the baselines around its coast. In July 1972 the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany filed requests for interim measures of protection to prevent this unilateral extension of exclusive fishing area limits, but on July 28 Iceland asserted by telegram that the Court had no jurisdiction in the matter. Iceland did not appoint an agent to represent it in the proceedings. On August 17 the Court, by votes of 14 to 1, issued orders restraining Iceland from extending its fisheries limits as planned and stipulating restrictions on the catch of the British and German trawler fleets until final judgment. Iceland strongly protested the orders and announced it would not consider itself bound.

On August 18, 1972, the Court fixed time limits for the filing of pleadings to be addressed to the question of the Court's jurisdiction. Pleadings were filed by the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany in their respective cases, but Iceland filed no pleadings in either case, notifying the Court by telegram that its position was unchanged.

On February 2, 1973, the Court delivered judgments finding, by votes of 14 to 1, that it had jurisdiction to entertain the applications and deal with the merits of the disputes. On February 15 the Court set time limits of August 1, 1973, for the applicants and January 15, 1974, for Iceland to submit pleadings on the merits. After petitions by the applicants, and a dissenting view presented by Iceland by telegram, the Court on July 12, 1973, decided, by a vote of 11 to 3, that the interim measures of protection that it had previously issued would continue until it had given final judgment in the cases. The Court mentioned, *inter alia*, that it was cognizant that negotiations had taken place between the parties with a view to resolving their dispute and that the interim measures did not exclude other interim arrangements that might be agreed upon by the governments concerned, but that pending final decision and in the absence of other arrangements between the parties it would maintain its interim measures in order to preserve the rights of the parties. The cases continue.

*Application for Review of Judgment No. 158 of the UN Administrative Tribunal*

An official of the UNDP, Mohammed Fasla, whose fixed-term appointment expired December 31, 1969, appealed to the UN Administrative Tribunal<sup>1</sup> a decision not to renew his appointment. The Tribunal in 1972 decided that he was entitled to receive 6 months' salary and certain reimbursements. Mr. Fasla considered that the Administrative Tribunal had not fully examined and passed upon all his claims and applied for a review of the judgment. On June 20, 1972, the Committee on Applications for Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgments<sup>2</sup> decided to request an advisory opinion of the International Court, specifically on whether the Tribunal had failed to exercise the jurisdiction vested in it and had committed a fundamental error in procedures which occasioned a failure of justice.

Both the United Nations and Mr. Fasla presented written statements, and each presented written comments on the statement of the other. On July 23, 1973, the Court delivered its advisory opinion. In examining the issues in question, the Court was of the opinion, by a vote of 9 to 4, that the Administrative Tribunal had not failed to exercise the jurisdiction vested in it and, by a vote of 10 to 3, that the Tribunal had not committed a fundamental error in procedure which had occasioned a failure in justice.

<sup>1</sup> The UN Administrative Tribunal was established by the General Assembly in 1949 to hear and pass judgment upon applications alleging nonobservance of contracts of employment of staff members of the UN Secretariat or of their terms of appointment.

<sup>2</sup> The Committee is composed of those states serving on the General Committee of the current or most recent session of the General Assembly. Established by a 1955 General Assembly resolution, the Committee is authorized to request advisory opinions of the International Court on disputed judgments of the Administrative Tribunal.



*Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France; New Zealand v. France)*

On May 9, 1973, Australia and New Zealand instituted separate proceedings against France asking the Court to declare that the carrying out of further atmospheric nuclear weapon tests in the South Pacific Ocean was not consistent with applicable rules of international law and to order that the French Government should not carry out any further such tests. Australia and New Zealand also requested the Court to indicate interim measures of protection. In response by letter, France stated that the Court was not competent to hear the matter and the question of interim measures thus did not arise. It requested the Court to remove the case from its list.

At four public hearings, May 21–25, representatives of Australia and New Zealand presented their observations on the question of interim measures of protection; France was not represented at the hearings.

On June 22 the Court ordered, by a vote of 8 to 6, interim measures of protection that directed the parties, pending the Court's final decision, to take no action which might aggravate or extend the disputes. The Court set time limits of September 21 for Australia and New Zealand and December 21 for France for the submission of pleadings addressed to the question of the Court's jurisdiction.

On May 16 Fiji had filed an application for permission to intervene in the suits. On July 12 the Court decided, by a vote of 8 to 5, to defer its consideration of the application until it had pronounced upon the question of its jurisdiction. The cases continue.

*Trial of Pakistani Prisoners of War (Pakistan v. India)*

On May 11, 1973, Pakistan instituted proceedings against India contending that, contrary to applicable international law, India was proposing to hand over 195 Pakistani prisoners of war to Bangladesh, which intended to try them for acts of genocide and crimes against humanity. Pakistan claimed, *inter alia*, that it had exclusive right to exercise jurisdiction over the persons in question. Pakistan also requested that the Court indicate interim measures of protection enjoining the transfer of the Pakistani detainees by India to Bangladesh pending the judgment of the Court.

In letters of May 23, 28, and June 4 India stated that the Court lacked jurisdiction, that India would not consent to jurisdiction, and that therefore any request for interim measures of protection was without legal effect.

On June 4, 5, and 26 the Court held hearings on the question of indication of interim measures of protection. Observations were presented by representatives of Pakistan; India was not represented. By a letter of July 11 Pakistan informed the Court that it would be discussing the issues involved in these proceedings with India, and it requested the Court to postpone its consideration of the question of interim measures of protection. On July 13 the Court, by a vote of 8 to 4, stated that in light of the Pakistani request it would first examine the question of its jurisdiction over the dispute. Time limits for submission of pleadings were set at October 1 and December 15 for Pakistan and India, respectively.

By order of December 15 the President of the Court directed that the case be removed from the Court's list. This decision was based on

a letter received from Pakistan informing the Court of negotiations with India and requesting discontinuance of the proceedings.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Upon motion of its Chairman, the Sixth Committee agreed by consensus on December 7 that the agenda item entitled, "Review of the role of the International Court of Justice," consideration of which the United States had proposed with 11 cosponsors in 1970, be deferred until the next General Assembly. The Committee had devoted almost half of its meetings to preparing the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, Including Diplomatic Agents (see p. 230), and concluded that insufficient time remained in the session to consider adequately the item on the Court. The Assembly approved the Committee's recommendation without objection on December 12.

#### INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION

The International Law Commission, established by the General Assembly in 1948 to promote the codification and progressive development of international law, is composed of 25 experts, elected by the Assembly for 5-year terms, who serve in their individual capacities. Richard D. Kearney of the United States is a member of the Commission.

In discharging its functions the Commission studies topics it has determined are suitable for codification or which other UN bodies, usually the General Assembly, refer to it. Its usual procedure is to select one of its members to prepare a report and, following a preliminary discussion, to request the rapporteur to prepare draft articles on the subject. After discussing the draft articles the Commission adopts tentative texts which are sent to governments for review. Following reconsideration in light of the government comments, the Commission adopts final texts and forwards them to the General Assembly.

When the General Assembly receives a set of draft articles, generally in the form of a proposed convention, it may convene a diplomatic conference to consider adoption of a convention, review the articles itself, note them, or remand them to the Commission for further study.

At its 25th session, held in Geneva May 7–July 13, the Commission adopted on first reading a number of draft articles on three of the principal topics on its agenda: state responsibility, succession of states in matters other than treaties, and the most-favored-nation clause.

#### STATE RESPONSIBILITY

The Commission considered two reports on this topic and adopted six draft articles on first reading.

Four of the articles comprise Chapter I, "General Principles." Article 3, which is the foundation for the Commission's work on responsibility, deals with the elements of an internationally wrongful act of a state by providing that there is such an act when "(a) conduct consisting of an action or omission is attributable to the state under international law; and (b) that conduct constitutes a breach of an international obligation of the state."

The purpose of Chapter II is to determine what conduct is regarded by international law as an act of the state for the purpose of establishing the possible existence of an international wrongful act. Two of the nine articles proposed by the special rapporteur for this Chapter were considered and adopted by the Commission.

#### SUCCESSION OF STATES IN MATTERS OTHER THAN TREATIES

The special rapporteur on this subject submitted 40 articles for the consideration of the Commission. During the session the Commission provisionally adopted eight articles. The first three deal with the scope of the articles and with definitions of terms to be used throughout the draft.

Articles 4 through 8 are part of the general provisions applicable to Part I, "Succession to State Property." For the purpose of that Part, the Commission defined state property as property, rights, and interests which, on the date of the succession of states, were, according to the international law of the predecessor state, owned by that state. Articles 6, 7, and 8 deal, respectively, with rights of the successor state to state property passing to it, the date of the passing of state property, and passing of state property without compensation.

#### MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

The Commission provisionally adopted six articles designed to apply to most-favored-nation clauses contained in treaties between states. Among those articles are definitions of the most-favored-nation clause and most-favored-nation treatment. The former is a treaty provision whereby a state undertakes to accord most-favored-nation treatment to another state in an agreed sphere of relations. The latter means treatment by the granting state of the beneficiary state or of persons or things in a determined relationship with that state, not less favorable than treatment by the granting state of a third state or of persons or things in the same relationship with a third state.

#### PROGRAM OF WORK

The Commission will be occupied for a number of years in completing the topics on which it is actively engaged—succession of states in respect of treaties, state responsibility, succession of states in matters other than treaties, the most-favored-nation clause, and the question of treaties concluded between states and international organizations. In addition, most members supported the view that the Commission should promptly take up the law of the nonnavigational uses of international water courses, with priority being given to the legal aspects of the problem of the pollution of such waterways.

The Commission decided that in 1974 it would concentrate on the topics of succession of states in respect of treaties and state responsibility. Its intention was to complete at that session the second reading of the whole of the draft articles on the former topic and to make substantial progress in its study on state responsibility.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

The Sixth Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the report of the International Law Commission at 15 meetings between September 25 and October 16. Some 50 states took part in the debate.

On October 11 Argentina introduced a resolution ultimately sponsored by 15 states from all regions. After a number of separate votes the Committee approved the resolution, as amended, on October 15 by a recorded vote of 92 (U.S.) to 0, with 12 abstentions. The Assembly adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 96 (U.S.) to 0, with 12 abstentions. *Inter alia* the resolution recommended that the Commission (1) complete at its next session the second reading of the draft articles on the succession of states in respect of treaties; (2) continue its work on state responsibility, succession of states in respect of matter other than treaties, the most-favored-nation clause, and the question of treaties concluded between states and international organizations or between two or more international organizations; (3) begin work on the law of nonnavigational uses of international water courses at its 1974 session; and (4) undertake at an appropriate time a separate study on international liability for injurious consequences arising out of the performance of activities other than internationally wrongful acts.

In a separate resolution, the Assembly on November 30 unanimously adopted a resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee that, *inter alia*, (1) decided to hold the UN Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations early in 1975 in Vienna; (2) referred to the Conference as the basic proposal for its consideration the draft articles adopted by the International Law Commission in 1971; and (3) decided to determine at its 29th session in 1974 the question of participation in the Conference.

## PROTECTION OF DIPLOMATS

In 1971 the International Law Commission offered to draft on an expedited basis a convention on the protection of diplomats, if the UN General Assembly requested it to. The Assembly at its 26th session made such a request, and the Commission transmitted draft articles to the 27th Assembly. That Assembly asked states to submit their comments on the draft articles.

On July 2, 1973, the United States submitted its comments, noting *inter alia* that the cases of murder, kidnapping, and assault of diplomats and the attacks upon diplomatic premises that had taken place just since the Commission had submitted the draft articles emphasized again the imperative necessity for the world community to adopt measures to provide protection for the channels of communication among states and to preserve the normal methods of conducting international activities. The United States considered that the Commission's draft articles provided a sound basis for such a cooperative effort.

The Sixth Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the draft convention at 30 meetings between October 4 and December 6, devoting almost half its time to this topic. The Committee decided to proceed immediately to an article by article consideration of the Commission's draft, without any general debate. It established a 15-member

drafting committee (including the United States) which operated in parallel to the full committee. After a first reading in the Sixth Committee, an article would be considered and revised by the drafting committee. The Sixth Committee reviewed the work of the drafting committee, taking final positions where necessary. The drafting committee then put the draft into final form for adoption by the full Committee. During the entire process, there were extensive consultations among and between the various regional groups in order to achieve a negotiated settlement to important issues of substance relating to the convention. The Committee spent about half its time working out the substance of the convention itself, with the rest of its time devoted to negotiating a compromise on certain political issues involving the applicability of the convention to "national liberation movements." The successful conclusion of these negotiations allowed the adoption of the convention by consensus both in the Sixth Committee on December 6 and in the General Assembly as a whole on December 14. The convention that resulted was substantially in accord with the positions taken by the United States, which became the first state to sign on December 28. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, Including Diplomatic Agents, will enter into force 30 days after the deposit of the 22nd instrument of ratification or accession.

The convention lists a number of serious crimes which it covers when they are committed against diplomats, and each state party is under an obligation to make these crimes punishable under its internal law. When a person who has committed such a crime escapes from the territory of one state party to the convention to the territory of another state party, a legal mechanism is established to ensure that the alleged offender is brought to justice. The state party in which the alleged offender is present is obligated, without exception, either to extradite him or to submit the case for prosecution. In this respect the convention employs the same legal mechanism that was used in earlier conventions relating to civil aviation, specifically the 1970 Hague Convention and the 1971 Montreal Convention.

On December 14 the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Bennett, declared that the Assembly could be proud of having successfully completed its work on this important convention. Stating that the Assembly had acted in response to an urgent need, he said:

"... The long-established principle of the inviolability of diplomatic agents was being threatened by random acts of violence in various parts of the world. The continued effectiveness of diplomatic channels, the means by which states communicate with one another, has been jeopardized. Although the legal obligation to protect these persons was never questioned, the mechanism for international cooperation to ensure that perpetrators of serious attacks against such persons are brought to justice, no matter to where they may flee, was lacking.

"The Assembly here and now declares to the world that under no circumstances may a diplomat be attacked with impunity."

Ambassador Bennett also noted that the Sixth Committee had worked out an acceptable compromise with regard to the final clauses of the convention, which would permit the widest possible adherence

without placing the Secretary General in an impossible position. This compromise provided that the convention would be open to participation by "all states" and that in discharging his functions as depositary the Secretary General would, whenever advisable, request the opinion of the Assembly before receiving a signature or instrument of ratification or accession.

The resolution adopting the convention was a compromise proposed by the Sixth Committee Chairman after consultations. The compromise embodied in the resolution replaced a previous proposal made by Mali and cosponsored by most of the African group which had sought to exempt the struggle against colonialism, alien domination, foreign occupation, racial discrimination, and apartheid from the coverage of the convention. This would have been unacceptable to a significant number of states, including the United States. Instead, a paragraph in the resolution provided that the Assembly recognized "that the provisions of the annexed convention could not in any way prejudice the exercise of the legitimate right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations by peoples struggling against colonialism, alien domination, foreign occupation, racial discrimination, and apartheid." By stating that the convention did not relate to the right of people to self-determination, the paragraph allayed the fears of some that the convention could in some way be abused to that end.

#### INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

The Sixth Committee spent so much of its time preparing the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, Including Diplomatic Agents, that there was insufficient time remaining to take up several other important agenda items. The item on international terrorism was among these. Since the United States considered that in adopting a convention on the protection of diplomats the Assembly had made significant progress in the general field of combatting international terrorism, it did not press for renewed consideration of the topic, which continued to be highly controversial politically, at the 28th session of the Assembly.

The Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism, established by the Assembly at its 27th session, met at UN Headquarters from July 16 to August 11, 1973, but was not able to bridge the gaps between positions on significant aspects of the problem. The lack of agreement on whether to study causes before measures, on the importance of state conduct as opposed to individual acts, and on whether the degree of support for the cause on whose behalf the terrorist was acting had any relevance were all factors inhibiting progress. Thus, in light of the progress made on related problems, the lack of time remaining, and the failure of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to make progress, the Sixth Committee by consensus recommended to the plenary Assembly that consideration of the item be postponed until the 29th session in 1974. The Assembly accepted this recommendation.

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

The UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL)<sup>3</sup> was established by the General Assembly in 1966 to promote "the progressive harmonization and unification of the law of international trade." UNCITRAL's sixth session, which took place in Geneva April 2-13, 1973, considered the following topics: international sale of goods, international payments, international legislation on shipping, international commercial arbitration, and multinational enterprises. The U.S. Representative was E. Allan Farnsworth, Professor of Law at Columbia University.

## SALE OF GOODS

The Commission considered a report of its working group on sales, which is engaged in revising the 1964 Hague conventions on sales. The Commission is concentrating its work on the first of these conventions, that relating to a uniform law on the international sale of goods.

After receiving a comprehensive paper from the UN Secretariat on general conditions of sale and standard contracts, UNCITRAL decided that the Secretariat should proceed with further work on the subject and submit a draft of general (or global) conditions to a small group of experts for comment. It further requested the Secretariat to draw up revised global general conditions and to submit them to it at a subsequent session.

Recalling that at its fifth session it had approved a draft convention on time limits (or prescription) in the international sale of goods, UNCITRAL called upon the General Assembly to convene a diplomatic conference on the subject in 1974.

## PAYMENTS

UNCITRAL also had before it a report of its working group on international negotiable instruments, which had considered 28 articles of the draft uniform law on international bills of exchange. Those articles related to the transfer and negotiation of an international bill of exchange or an international promissory note, the rights and liabilities of the signatories of such instruments, and the definition and the rights of a "holder" and a "protected holder." The Commission expressed its appreciation to the members of the working group for the progress achieved on the complex and technical subject.

In accordance with the working group's recommendation, UNCITRAL decided to ask the Secretary General to prepare and circulate a questionnaire regarding the use of checks in international payment transactions and the problems presented, under current commercial practice, by divergencies in the rules of the principal legal systems. The information elicited by the questionnaire should permit the Commission to decide at a future session whether or not to include checks in the draft uniform law being prepared by its working group.

<sup>3</sup> The members of UNCITRAL in 1973 were Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, France, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Syria, Tanzania, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Zaire.

## LEGISLATION ON SHIPPING

At its fourth session, in 1971, UNCITRAL had decided to examine the rules governing the responsibility of ocean carriers for cargo. The Commission considered that the rules and practices concerning bills of lading, including those in the International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law Relating to Bills of Lading (the Brussels Convention, 1924) and in the 1968 Brussels Protocol to amend that Convention, should be examined with a view to their possible revision and amplification and that a new international convention might, if appropriate, be prepared for adoption under UN auspices.

The working group on this subject held its fifth session in 1973 and took a number of decisions with respect to rules of limitation of the carrier's liability. The working group recommended that the revised convention should follow the approach of the 1968 Brussels Protocol, which prescribes alternative upper limits based on (1) the number of packages or units and (2) the weight of goods lost or damaged. However, the working group also proposed revising certain language in the Protocol to remove ambiguities and to take account of problems presented by containerized transport.

The working group also submitted to UNCITRAL draft provisions on the effect of transshipment of goods on the responsibility of the contracting carrier and the actual carrier, the effect of measures to save life or property at sea, and the period of limitation within which legal or arbitral proceedings may be brought against the carrier.

The Commission noted with appreciation the progress made by the working group and asked it to complete its work of revising the Hague Rules as expeditiously as possible.

## ARBITRATION

UNCITRAL had before it a report on problems concerning the application and interpretation of existing conventions on international commercial arbitration and proposals for future work in this field. The Commission decided to repeat its recommendation that the General Assembly should invite states which have not ratified the 1958 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards to consider the possibility of adhering to it. The United States, which is a party to that convention, supported the recommendation.

The Commission also decided to request the Secretary General, in consultation with the UN regional economic commissions, to prepare a draft set of rules for optional use in *ad hoc* arbitration relating to international trade. The Secretary General will submit his report on this topic to the eighth session of UNCITRAL in 1975.

## MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES

The 27th General Assembly in 1972 had adopted a resolution asking UNCITRAL to seek from governments and interested international organizations information on legal problems presented by the different kinds of multinational enterprises, and the implications thereof for the unification and harmonization of international trade law,



and to consider, in the light of this information and the results of available studies, including those by the ILO, UNCTAD, and ECO-SOC, what further steps would be appropriate.

In considering this topic, UNCITRAL had before it a paper prepared by the Secretary General suggesting possible courses of action. The course of action on which discussion focused was the sending out of a questionnaire. Some Western European representatives argued that before preparing a questionnaire it would be necessary to define "multinational enterprises," but most members expressed the view that such an exercise would unduly delay UNCITRAL's work. They favored sending out the questionnaire to governments and interested international organizations without waiting for the results of the pending studies under way in other organizations.

The Commission decided to request the Secretary General to (1) draw up a questionnaire designed to obtain information on legal problems presented by multinational enterprises and their implications for the unification and harmonization of international trade law and to seek suggestions concerning the areas in which measures might appropriately be taken by the Commission; and (2) prepare a report setting forth an analysis of the replies to the questionnaire, a survey of relevant available studies prepared by other organizations to the extent that they disclose problems susceptible of solution by means of uniform legal rules, and suggestions as to the Commission's future course of action on multinational enterprises.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

The General Assembly's Sixth Committee considered UNCITRAL's report at 12 meetings between October 29 and November 27.

On November 23 the Committee approved, by a vote of 95 (U.S.) to 0, with 6 abstentions, a resolution which was introduced by Ghana and sponsored by nine states from all areas. The resolution was similar to those adopted in earlier years in that it recommended that UNCITRAL (1) continue work on its priority topics; (2) continue to consider the legal problems presented by different kinds of multinational enterprises; (3) accelerate its work on training and assistance in the field of international trade law; (4) continue its collaboration with international organizations active in this field; (5) continue to give special consideration to the interests of developing countries, bearing in mind the special problems of landlocked countries; and (6) keep its program of work and working methods under constant review.

In other paragraphs the resolution (1) invited UNCITRAL to consider the advisability of preparing uniform rules on the civil liability of producers for damages caused by their products intended for or involved in international sale or distribution, taking into account the feasibility and most appropriate time therefor in view of the other items on its program of work; and (2) decided to increase the membership of the Commission from 29 to 36 countries.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a vote of 121 (U.S.) to none.

In a separate resolution on December 12, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of its Sixth Committee and by a vote of 108

(U.S.) to 0, with 11 abstentions, decided to convene at UN Headquarters from May 20 to June 14, 1974, the UN Conference on Prescription (Limitation) in the International Sale of Goods.

#### DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION

The 35-member Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression,<sup>4</sup> established by the 22nd General Assembly in 1967, met in Geneva from April 25 to May 30, 1973. Marked by a new spirit of accommodation, the work of the Special Committee, operating within the framework of its working group (open to all members), resulted in sufficient progress to permit optimism about completion of a definition at its next session.

The Committee resumed its consideration of the three main proposals submitted in 1969 by (1) the Soviet Union; (2) Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Iran, Malagasy Republic, Mexico, Spain, Uganda, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia; and (3) Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and United States. The working group established four contact groups: the first considered the text of the general definition of aggression, in particular the terms "sovereignty" and "territorial integrity"; the second examined acts proposed for inclusion, indirect use of force, clause on minor incidents, and the rights of peoples to self-determination; the third discussed the questions of priority and aggressive intent; and the fourth considered the legal uses of force and the legal consequences of aggression. The working group also decided to establish a drafting group to prepare a draft preamble and consider other drafting questions.

Although a draft preamble and articles emerged from the respective contact groups in the form of a consolidated text of the reports of these groups, no consensus was achieved on the draft as a whole and the working group only took note of the consolidated text.

A substantial narrowing of differences was, however, reflected in the consolidated text. In particular, the element of indirect uses of force for the first time found acceptance as an element in the concept of aggression and was added to the list of possible acts of aggression, although the proposed formulation was not accepted by all delegations. The United States viewed the formulation as too narrow, omitting acts that should be included.

The third contact group developed language for which there was wide support on the two-pronged question of priority (i.e., the first use of armed force) and aggressive intent. The compromise text tried to strike a balance between the simplistic view that a first use of force automatically constituted aggression, and the view of the United States and its cosponsors that intent to achieve an end for which the use of force is prohibited must also be present. The negotiated language provided that the first use of armed force shall contribute *prima facie* evidence of aggression, but stated that the Security Council might conclude that a determination to that effect would not be justifi-

<sup>4</sup> Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Malagasy Republic, Mexico, Norway, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Turkey, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaïre.

fied in the light of other relevant circumstances, including, as evidence, the purposes of the states involved.

One change in the list of possible acts of aggression was the addition of the words "marine and air fleets" in the subparagraph concerning attack on the land, sea, or air forces of another state. This change was intended to make clear that an attack on commercial vessels or aircraft could also constitute aggression. Another addition was a new subparagraph concerning the placing of a state's territory at the disposal of another state for aggressive purposes. This made it explicit that making available territory which was then used for aggressive purposes, with the acquiescence and agreement of the host state, constituted aggression.

On May 30 the Special Committee took note of the report of its working group, but emphasized that in the absence of agreement on a draft definition each proposed article must be read together with the comments thereon. The Special Committee then unanimously adopted a resolution recommending that the General Assembly invite it to resume its work in 1974.

The 28th General Assembly's Sixth Committee considered the report of the Special Committee at seven meetings between November 15 and 23.

On November 19 the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, noted that the 1973 session of the Special Committee had been its most productive and encouraging. Commenting on portions of the consolidated text, which he agreed had commanded wide support, he expressed the U.S. view that although significant progress had been made on the difficult questions of priority and intent there was still room for improvement in striking a correct balance between the first use of armed force and the many other circumstances, including intent, which must be taken into account. With reference to the list of acts that might constitute aggression, particularly those involving indirect uses of force, he stated that the United States considered that the accuracy of the list would be improved by fuller inclusion of the wording of the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States with regard to covert uses of force by one state against another.

On November 23 the Sixth Committee approved, by a vote of 102 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions, a draft resolution deciding that the Special Committee should resume its work at New York early in 1974 with a view to completing its task. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a vote of 119 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN ARMED CONFLICTS

As a followup to the two conferences of government experts it held in 1971 and 1972, the International Committee of the Red Cross convened in January and March of 1973 small consultative groups of government experts to continue considering draft protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions on the protection of victims of war. As a result of these and other consultations, as well as of the previous conferences, the ICRC in June 1973 submitted to the Swiss Government two draft protocols, one concerning international armed conflicts and the other concerning noninternational armed conflicts. The Swiss Government

circulated these drafts to the states parties to the 1949 Geneva Conventions and to UN members and decided to convene a diplomatic conference in Geneva from February 20 to March 29, 1974, to consider the draft protocols. In answering the Swiss note, the United States welcomed the convening of the diplomatic conference and stated its intention to participate.

In November 1973 the protocols were submitted to the 22nd International Conference of the Red Cross, held at Tehran, Iran. The International Humanitarian Law Commission of the Conference considered them and adopted two resolutions. The first welcomed the convening of the diplomatic conference and urged all governments to make all efforts so that substantial humanitarian progress would be made. However, a paragraph calling for participation in the conference by "national liberation movements" caused the United States to abstain on the otherwise acceptable resolution. The second resolution concerned specific conventional weapons deemed to cause unnecessary suffering or to be indiscriminate in their effects. The Red Cross conference asked the diplomatic conference to begin consideration of the topic and asked the ICRC to convene a meeting of government experts in 1974 to do an in-depth study of the topic. This resolution was adopted unanimously.

The Sixth Committee of the 28th UN General Assembly considered the item on human rights in armed conflicts at nine meetings between November 26 and December 5. On November 29 George H. Aldrich, Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, affirmed the importance attached to the topic by the U.S. Government and stated its intention to participate constructively in the conference. Recognizing that many difficult issues would be before the conference, he expressed confidence that substantial progress could be made. However, he regretted the attempt by some states to inject political issues, such as the participation of national liberation movements, into the consideration of these basically humanitarian topics and noted that a liberation movement as such could not negotiate or conclude international agreements. Participation in conferences concerned with the concluding of treaties relating to the development of international law had always been limited to governments and international organizations that might become parties to those treaties.

Two draft resolutions were submitted to the Committee. The first, introduced by Canada and ultimately sponsored by 16 states, was essentially procedural. *Inter alia*, it (1) expressed appreciation to the Swiss Federal Council for convoking the diplomatic conference in 1974 and to the ICRC for the extensive work it had performed in preparing the draft additional protocols to the Geneva Conventions of 1949; and (2) urged participants in the diplomatic conference to do their utmost to reach agreement on additional rules that might help alleviate the suffering brought by armed conflict and to protect non-combatants and civilian objects in such conflicts. The United States found this resolution laudable. However, an amendment submitted by Kenya and Indonesia urged that national liberation movements recognized by the various regional intergovernmental organizations concerned be invited to participate in the conference as observers in accordance with the practice of the United Nations. The United States considered this amendment inappropriate and voted against it. When

it was adopted in the Sixth Committee on December 4 the United States abstained on the entire resolution, which was approved by a vote of 97 to 0, with 4 abstentions. The resolution was adopted by the Assembly on December 12 by a vote of 107 to 0, with 6 abstentions (U.S.).

The second draft resolution, introduced on December 2 and sponsored by 19 African, Asian, and Eastern European states, was entitled "Basic Principles of the Legal Status of the Combatants Struggling Against Colonial and Alien Domination and Racist Regimes." In its operative section the resolution "solemnly proclaimed" that the struggle of peoples under colonial, alien domination and racist regimes for the implementation of their rights to self-determination and independence was legitimate and in full accordance with the principles of international law and that any attempt to suppress this struggle was incompatible with the law and constituted a threat to international peace and security. The draft resolution further asserted that such armed conflicts were international armed conflicts in the sense of the 1949 Geneva Conventions and that the legal status envisaged as applying to the combatants in the 1949 Conventions was applicable to persons engaged in such struggle. Specifically, it asserted that prisoners captured struggling against colonial and alien domination were to be accorded the status of prisoners of war. Moreover, the resolutions asserted that the use of mercenaries by colonial and racist regimes was a criminal act and the mercenaries should be punished as criminals. Finally, the resolution said that the violation of the legal status of the combatants struggling against colonial and alien domination and racist regimes entailed full responsibility in accordance with the norms of international law.

In explaining the U.S. vote on December 4, Ronald Bettauer suggested that the resolution was wrong on the law in virtually every paragraph. The attempt to accord special treatment to combatants based on the cause for which they fought was the antithesis of humanitarian law, which regarded all the victims of conflicts as equal before it and sought to accord them equal protection. In view of the brief time given the Sixth Committee to study such an important resolution setting forth "basic principles," the United States wondered whether the resolution should be taken seriously. The United States was joined in this view by several other countries, but the resolution was approved in the Committee by a rollcall vote of 68 to 12 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 12 by a recorded vote of 83 to 13 (Austria, Belgium, Brazil, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, South Africa, U.K., U.S., Uruguay), with 19 abstentions.

#### HOST COUNTRY RELATIONS

The 15-member Committee on Relations with the Host Country<sup>5</sup> was established in 1971 by the 26th General Assembly. Among other things, the Committee is authorized to deal with the question of the security of missions accredited to the United Nations and the safety of their personnel, and to advise the United States on issues arising in

<sup>5</sup> Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Cyprus, France, Guyana, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Spain, Tanzania, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

connection with the implementation of the Headquarters Agreement.

The Committee met nine times in 1973 and considered cases brought to its attention by member states that involved problems with respect to their status. On November 21 the Committee adopted a report to the General Assembly that included a number of conclusions and recommendations. The Committee, *inter alia*, (1) expressed its concern at the acts of violence, threats, harassment, and other offenses committed against diplomatic missions and the fact that few persons or groups responsible for the offenses had been prosecuted and convicted by the host country authorities; (2) urged the host country to implement effectively the new federal legislation known as the Act for Protection of Foreign Officials and Official Guests of the United States (Public Law 92-539); (3) requested prior consultation between the host country and the Committee before the adoption of stricter parking enforcement regulations; (4) appealed to the host country to consider suggestions by the Committee regarding parking problems, including stopping the issuance of summonses to diplomats and the towing away of diplomatic cars; (5) requested all members of the diplomatic community to make a special effort to avoid parking improperly and to respect the laws and regulations of the host country; and (6) expressed the view that future meetings should be held more frequently and on a regular basis.

The U.S. Representative on the Committee (Ambassador Schaefele at first and later Ambassador White) reaffirmed U.S. acceptance of its responsibility under international law as host country to ensure adequate protection for missions and their personnel. Ambassador Schaefele pointed out, however, that the rights of freedom of speech and assembly were constitutionally protected in the United States. He pointed out that the legislation of both New York State and New York City had to be amended to make the Federal Protection Act more effective and affirmed that the United States was seeking means to improve the implementation of the Act. The U.S. Representative also assured the Committee of the Government's awareness of the many parking problems. Ambassador White stated that the Traffic Commissioner of New York City had assured her that his forces intended to use both good judgment and tact with regard to the traffic problem. He had further offered to send a senior police officer to any mission to explain any police action in this regard. The United States also furnished the Committee with a partial list of arrests made in connection with criminal acts committed against diplomats and diplomatic missions in New York and pointed out that frequently cases were lost in the courts because diplomats refused to appear and the prosecuting authorities were thus unable to introduce the evidence required to prove the guilt of the accused.

The Sixth Committee of the 28th General Assembly considered the Committee's report at two meetings on December 1 and 6. On the latter day it approved without objection a draft resolution sponsored by Cyprus, Guyana, and the Ukrainian S.S.R. that incorporated the recommendations and conclusions of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. The General Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote on December 12.

On December 14 the President of the Assembly announced that he was appointing Costa Rica and Honduras as members of the Committee to replace Argentina and Guyana who wished to withdraw.

---

---

PART V.  
BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

---

---





## UN FINANCIAL SITUATION

Little progress was made during 1973 toward resolving the continuing financial problem confronting the United Nations. The organization, as in past years, had to operate on a dangerously thin cash margin.

This situation is the result primarily of deliberate withholdings by the U.S.S.R. and certain other members of portions of their assessed contributions related to peacekeeping activities which they have opposed for reasons of principle. The members deliberately in default have been joined by the People's Republic of China. In addition, some states, the Soviet Union in particular, have attempted to pay for their share of the technical assistance program financed in the UN regular budget in inconvertible currencies which cannot be used and therefore are not accepted by the United Nations. The shortfall in the 1973 UN regular budget due to these withholdings is estimated at \$4 million. Although the amount is small in comparison to the total UN budget, its cumulative effect over the years has created a serious financial problem for the organization. By the end of 1973 the total of such deliberate annual withholdings was about \$40 million.

In addition to the arrears on the UN regular budget, the long-term arrearages on the special peacekeeping accounts for the Middle East (1956-67) and the Congo (1960-64) amount to almost \$132 million. This sum, too, is likely to rise. The Soviet Union has agreed to contribute to the current UN peacekeeping operation in the Middle East, but the P.R.C. has announced its refusal to do so.

The accumulated withholdings have exhausted the \$40 million Working Capital Fund (a reserve to compensate for fluctuations in the receipt of payments) and contributed to a growing short-term deficit (i.e., what the organization owes) which amounts to some \$90 million.

The 28th General Assembly was able to remove from the UN regular budget two small contentious items which had been the object of withholdings: UNCURK was dissolved (see p. 22), and arrangements were made for financing the maintenance of the UN Memorial Cemetery in Korea outside of the United Nations. The remaining items in contention are primarily repayments on UN bonds sold in the early 1960's and the technical assistance program financed from the regular budget. Since the reductions from the removal of the Korean items were offset by a \$500,000 increase in the appropriation for technical assistance, which had been recommended by UNIDO's Industrial Development Board (see p. 91) and approved by the Fifth Committee on November 29 over the opposition of the United States and 15 others, the net result of the changes is minimal.

The 26th General Assembly in 1971 had established a 15-member Special Committee on the Financial Situation of the United Nations to

seek a solution that would eliminate future withholdings and liquidate the deficit. The Committee was unsuccessful because its proposals were not acceptable to some members who were withholding part of their assessed contributions. The 27th General Assembly allowed the committee to lapse, but requested the Secretary General to explore all possibilities for an overall solution to the financial problem and report to the 28th Assembly.

On December 11, 1973, the Secretary General submitted a report to the Assembly outlining the steps he had taken during the year to encourage members both to pay their assessments more promptly and to make one-time voluntary contributions to help eliminate the deficit. On January 5 he had appealed to each member to pay its 1973 assessment as well as any amounts due for previous years at the earliest possible date. He noted in his report, however, that the early payments received in 1973 were not much higher than in 1972. In this connection the United States, while meeting its financial obligations to the United Nations, is reviewing its pattern of payments in an effort to eliminate the difficulties produced by the differing fiscal years of the United States (July 1-June 30) and the United Nations (January 1-December 31).

On July 20 the Secretary General had solicited suggestions from member states for amendments to the financial regulations which might help to achieve a more timely cash flow in the payment of assessed contributions, stating that some members had expressed the belief "that there should be financial incentives for exceptionally prompt payment and that there should be deterrents for late payments as well." He noted in his report that there seemed to be no substantial support among members for changing the existing regulations. In its response to the Secretary General, the United States expressed interest in such suggestions, but cautioned that there were inherent problems in procedures which would make the actual amounts required from members either larger or smaller than the amounts derived from their annual assessment rates.

With a deficit of \$90 million to be liquidated, substantial voluntary contributions will be a key element in restoring the financial health of the organization. In reporting on the response to his request for such contributions the Secretary General noted that the United Arab Emirates had contributed \$1 million and that Japan had pledged \$10 million. He pointed out that the new scale of assessments for 1974-76 would result in a general reduction in the percentage contribution of most member states. Further, the revaluation of some national currencies meant that some members would pay less, in terms of their own national currencies, for the dollars in which their contributions were made. He suggested that members who derived windfall benefits from these factors might consider making voluntary contributions equal to the amount of such "savings." It appears unlikely that members will respond favorably to this suggestion.

The Secretary General concluded his report by reiterating his belief that the spirit of cooperation and the sense of collective responsibility will eventually bring about conditions which will make it possible to eliminate the accumulated deficit. At the same time, however, he admitted that no way had yet been found to eliminate completely the

withholding of contributions assessed upon member states by the General Assembly.

The United States continues to play a constructive role in the search for a comprehensive and final solution to the UN financial problem. It expects, however, that such a solution will include substantial voluntary contributions from those members who have withheld their payments. Only if Article 17(2) of the UN Charter<sup>1</sup> is fully honored can the current situation be remedied and not recur.

The United States has suggested to the Secretary General that, until an overall solution is reached, his most prudent course would be to continue the austerity measures he initiated in 1972 as well as the policy of keeping expenditures within the level of anticipated income. The Secretary General did not underspend his budget in 1973, as he had in 1972, primarily because of the extra costs caused by currency fluctuations and inflation.

## UN BUDGET

### PROGRAM BUDGETING

In 1972 the 27th General Assembly decided to change, on an experimental basis, from an annual to a biennial budget cycle and from an object-of-expenditure budget format to a program budget. This change is the result of effort over a number of years by the Secretary General, various intergovernmental and expert bodies, and member states. The United States played a major role in the effort.

The new format represents an important first step toward achieving an integrated system of planning, programming, budgeting, and evaluating and is intended to show more clearly the purposes for which the funds appropriated are being spent. The program budget presents expenditures in terms of organizational unit and program (outputs) and is in sharp contrast to the traditional approach to budgeting which emphasizes goods and services (inputs) such as travel, equipment, and the like. In addition, the new format presents data on the total funds and staff resources available for each unit and program, including for the first time those from sources other than the regular budget. An important feature of the new program budgeting system is the "medium-term plan" covering a 4-year period. In the initial plan, for the years 1974-77, attention concentrated on activities in the economic, social, and human rights fields. It was, therefore, of particular interest to ECOSOC.

At its 14th session, held in New York June 11-15, the Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC)<sup>2</sup> reviewed both the proposed budget for 1974-75 and the medium-term plan. The Committee made a number of technical recommendations on format and presentation designed to improve both the quantity and quality of the data provided. On August 7, during its 55th session, ECOSOC adopted by consensus a resolution recommending to the General Assembly that

<sup>1</sup> Article 17(2) states: "The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly."

<sup>2</sup> A 21-state standing committee of ECOSOC. Its members in 1973 were Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian S.S.R., Colombia, Denmark, France, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sudan, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

the program-reviewing bodies and the Secretary General be requested, in preparing future budgets and medium-term plans, to take into account the recommendations of the CPC.

The ACABQ<sup>3</sup> also studied the budget and plan carefully. In addition to supporting the CPC's recommendations it suggested further specific measures to improve budget preparation in the future.

When the 28th General Assembly considered the budget, the United States was one of 29 sponsors of a draft resolution introduced by Guyana in the Fifth Committee and subsequently adopted by the Assembly on December 18 by a recorded vote of 117 (U.S.) to 0, with 9 abstentions. Taking into account and drawing on the recommendations of the CPC, ECOSOC, and ACABQ, the resolution *inter alia* (1) approved the work program contained in the 1974-75 program budget; (2) requested the Secretary General in preparing the medium-term plan and program budgets for 1976-79 "to continue to evaluate the effectiveness of programs, redeploying resources where necessary, and to ensure that there is a meaningful element of real growth in important programs"; (3) requested ECOSOC to indicate the priorities the Secretary General should reflect in drawing up the program budgets; (4) requested the Secretary General in preparing the next program budget to ensure program coordination among major organizational units, provide information on the allocation of indirect costs of programs, provide information on extra-budgetary resources by source of funds, and give relative weight of programs in terms of percentages; and (5) decided to place on the provisional agenda of the 29th Assembly a new item on "Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review, and approval of programs and budgets."

The United States believes that use of a program budget by the United Nations will improve resource management within the organization and provide member states with a better tool for a more analytical evaluation of budgetary requirements. Although the initial formulation and presentation of a program budget fell short, in some respects, of the goals of the program budgeting approach, it was generally recognized that it had to be considered within the context of a transition from one basic budget technique to another, and the Secretary General is expected to make a number of improvements in the next presentation.

#### BUDGET LEVEL FOR 1974

The initial budget estimates for the 1974-75 biennium called for an expenditure of \$513.4 million. These estimates were reviewed by the ACABQ, which recommended reductions amounting to \$12.1 million. The Fifth Committee of the General Assembly did not accept all the recommended reductions and, moreover, various substantive proposals were approved by the Assembly's other main committees in the course of the session which added to the projected expenditures so that the final budget presented to the General Assembly for approval was \$540.5 million. This was \$104.6 million, or 24%, higher than the combined budgets approved by the General Assemblies in 1971 and 1972

<sup>3</sup> Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, an expert body of 13 members appointed by the General Assembly for 3-year terms. David L. Stottlemeyer of the United States was a member during 1973.

which totaled, on a comparable basis, \$435.9 million for the 1972-73 biennium. The increase constituted a compound annual rate of increase of 11.4%, of which inflation and related factors accounted for 6.3% and currency realignments for 1.9%, leaving 3.2% for real program growth.

The 1974-75 budget was adopted on December 18, 1973, by a recorded vote of 106 to 8 (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R.), with 7 abstentions (Cuba, France, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, U.K., U.S.). The 106 members voting for the budget represented only 37.93% of the assessed contributions. The United States abstained because it considered the magnitude of the increase unacceptable. It believed that the need for austerity should be obvious at a time when the UN deficit was increasing every year, when the cash liquidity problem was unresolved, and when members were being called upon to meet large peacekeeping assessments in addition to their regular assessed contributions.

On December 11, by a vote of 94 (U.S.) to 9, with 4 abstentions, the General Assembly also approved a supplemental appropriation of \$7.9 million for the 1973 regular budget, primarily to cover the costs of currency realignments for that year. This amount was included in the assessments on members for 1974.

After deducting the credits due to the United States for repayment of and interest on UN bonds purchased in the early 1960's and for a partial refund on its contribution to the Working Capital Fund (resulting from the admission of new members and a reduction in the U.S. assessment rate), the U.S. share of the assessment against members for 1974 was \$59,555,153. The 1974 U.S. contribution is lower than that for 1973 (\$63,957,228) because of the reduction in the U.S. assessment rate to 25%. Had the rate remained at 31.52%, the U.S. contribution for 1974 would have been \$79,396,929.

In addition to the regular budget, the Assembly adopted a special assessed budget of \$30 million for the costs of UNEF for 6 months (see p. 9). The U.S. share of this budget was \$8,668,100.

#### CURRENCY INSTABILITY

The combination of the realignment of exchange rates and global inflation has posed an increasingly difficult financial problem for UN agencies since 1971. In particular the problem results from the significant depreciation during the first half of 1973 of the U.S. dollar. The dollar is the currency in which the budgets of most organizations are presented and in which most of the contributions by member states are assessed and paid. On the other hand, considerable expenditures are made in other currencies, such as the Swiss franc, Austrian schilling, Italian lira, British pound, and French franc. When these currencies appreciate, too few dollars will have been appropriated to permit the organizations to purchase required other currencies at the new rate of exchange.

This problem was considered by the Fifth Committee at five meetings in December on the basis of reports submitted by the ACABQ and the ACC. In view of the complexity of the subject and the strengthening of the U.S. dollar in November and December no conclusions were reached. Instead, the Fifth Committee decided, without

objection, to approve a proposal by Argentina to establish a working group of 13 states to "consider alternative solutions to the difficulties resulting from the effect of continuing currency instability and inflation on the budgets of organizations in the United Nations system" and report to the 29th Assembly.

On December 18 the Assembly adopted without objection the decision recommended by the Fifth Committee, and the President designated Bulgaria, P.R.C., Cuba, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, India, Japan, Kenya, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States and Venezuela as the members of the working group.

#### CHINESE AND ARABIC LANGUAGES

Although Chinese has always been one of the five official languages of the United Nations, it has not been a working language, a distinction that has limited the interpretation and translation services to important documents and major meetings. In a letter of July 19, 1973, the P.R.C. requested that the question of including Chinese among the working languages be considered by the 28th General Assembly. On the recommendation of the General Committee the Assembly included the item in the agenda and allocated it to the Fifth Committee for consideration. On the recommendation of the Fifth Committee the Assembly on December 18 adopted without objection a resolution deciding to include Chinese as a working language of the Assembly and expressing the desirability of its inclusion among the working languages of the Security Council. The expanded use of Chinese is expected to cost an additional \$1,050,000 during the 1974-75 biennium.

At the request of the 19 Arabic-speaking members, the General Assembly also considered the question of including Arabic as both an official and a working language. On the recommendation of the Fifth Committee the Assembly on December 18 adopted without objection a resolution which, after noting the assurances of the Arab States members of the United Nations "to meet collectively the costs of implementing the present resolution during the first three years," decided to include Arabic as an official and working language of the General Assembly and its main committees. The cost of implementing the resolution is estimated at \$8.3 million for the 3 years beginning in 1974.

The United States supported both the Chinese and Arabic language proposals.

#### SCALES OF ASSESSMENT

The U.S. shares of the assessed budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the IAEA are as follows:

[In percent]

	1973	1974
UN.....	31.52	25.00
FAO.....	31.52	25.00
ICAO.....	28.75	28.75
ILO.....	25.00	25.00
IMCO.....	5.82	5.79
ITU.....	11.45	11.65
UNESCO.....	29.41	29.41
UPU.....	4.20	4.20
WHO.....	30.82	29.18
WMO.....	23.80	23.47
IAEA.....	31.80	31.908

On the basis of a resolution adopted by the 27th General Assembly in 1972, which approved new ceiling and floor assessment rates as a matter of principle, the Committee on Contributions<sup>4</sup> developed a UN scale of assessments for the triennium 1974-76 in which the maximum rate to be paid by any member was reduced from 31.52% to 25%, and the minimum rate was reduced from .04% to .02%. On the recommendation of the Fifth Committee this scale was approved by the 28th General Assembly on November 9, 1973, by a vote of 90 (U.S.) to 1, with 1 abstention. The organization was able to reduce both the ceiling and floor rates without increasing the assessment rate of any member as a consequence because of the percentage points provided by the admission of the two German states and the economic growth of certain other members.

The 27th General Assembly had also reaffirmed that additional recognition should be given to members with a low per capita income and requested the Committee on Contributions to change the elements of the low per capita income allowance formula to adjust it to "the changing world economic conditions." The Committee therefore changed the formula from \$1,000/50% to \$1,500/60%. That is, the difference between \$1,500 and a state's per capita income less than that is expressed as a percentage of \$1,500. The state's total national income is then reduced by 60% of that percentage as a step in computing its assessment.

On December 11 the General Assembly adopted a special scale of assessments to apportion the costs of UNEF (see p. 9). As in past UN peacekeeping operations, the shares of the five permanent members of the Security Council exceed their rates of assessment under the regular UN budget. The rates of other designated developed members are the same as for the regular budget, and special reductions are given to less developed members. However, the U.S. share for UNEF—28.894%—represents an increase over its regular budget assessment in the same proportion (15.6%) as the share of the other permanent members of the Security Council, and it is lower than it has been in previous UN peacekeeping operations. The United States voted for the apportionment of UNEF expenses on this basis because it considered it a reasonable method of implementing the decisions of the Security Council which the United States strongly supported.

Efforts were made in 1973 to achieve a reduction in the U.S. assessment rates for the four specialized agencies having assessment scales with a maximum above 25%: FAO, ICAO, WHO, and UNESCO. At its biennial Conference in November, FAO set a 25% ceiling for its assessment scale for 1974. At an Extraordinary Assembly in February-March 1973, ICAO decided to set a ceiling of 25% as a matter of principle in determining its scale of assessment for the triennium 1975-77. The 1974 ICAO assessment rates had been set in 1971 when the scale for the triennium 1972-74 was adopted. Although WHO in May 1973 voted as a matter of principle to establish a 25% ceiling, this was before the UN scale for 1974-76 (on which the WHO scale is based) had been adopted, so the decision was not implemented during the year. Implementing action was expected at the 1974 meeting of the

<sup>4</sup> An expert body of 13 members appointed by the General Assembly for 3-year terms. Richard V. Hennes of the United States was a member during 1973.

World Health Assembly. The 1974 assessment scale for UNESCO was set in 1972 when the biennial scale for 1973-74 was adopted. The 1975-76 scale is expected to be acted upon at the General Conference to be held in November 1974.

#### INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

In 1972 the General Assembly had established in principle an International Civil Service Commission as of January 1, 1974. The Secretary General, as requested, submitted to the 28th Assembly in 1973 detailed proposals and a draft statute for the Commission. The Fifth Committee considered this and related questions at five meetings between December 4 and 10.

The draft statute had been agreed upon by the ACC which had drawn on the advice of the International Civil Service Advisory Board<sup>5</sup> to help resolve some of the more complex issues that had arisen in the course of extended interagency discussions and consultations with staff representatives. The 28th Assembly also had before it an interim report of the ACABQ which raised the question whether the full-time members of the Commission should, as proposed in the draft statute, be accorded powers different from their part-time colleagues. The ACABQ pointed out that before it could take a position on other questions, such as the number of full-time commissioners or the frequency of meetings, this crucial question would have to be decided by the member states. Another question presented for decision was a proposal by Ghana that the General Assembly should designate a member from a developing country as chairman of the Commission.

The Fifth Committee was unable to reach any consensus on the issues before it, and on December 6, by a rollcall vote of 42 to 16, with 32 abstentions (U.S.), adopted an Algerian proposal recommending that the Assembly defer consideration of the establishment of the Commission until the 29th session and that in the meantime the Secretary General submit the draft statute to member states for comment. The Assembly approved the recommendation in plenary session on December 18 by a vote of 101 to 1, with 30 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained because it had consistently supported improving personnel management in the UN system, considered that the establishment of a fully effective and operational International Civil Service Commission composed of recognized experts was the major way to bring about such improvement, and would have preferred that the General Assembly take a decision at its session in 1973.

In 1972 the 27th General Assembly had decided that the International Civil Service Commission, when established, should take up the question of salaries "at the earliest possible date." Since the establishment of the Commission had now been deferred, the Fifth Committee decided on December 10 by a vote of 71 (U.S.) to 9, with 3 abstentions, to recommend that the International Civil Service Advisory Board be requested to submit to the 29th General Assembly a

<sup>5</sup> Composed of 11 experts appointed by the Secretary General on the recommendation of the ACC for 3-year terms. Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, is a member.



report with recommendations concerning salaries and allowances of professional staff. The Assembly approved the recommendation in plenary session on December 18 by a vote of 120 (U.S.) to 10, with 1 abstention.

## PERSONNEL

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The Fifth Committee considered personnel questions at four meetings between November 29 and December 13, adopting without objection several decisions which were subsequently approved by the 28th General Assembly on December 18 without a vote.

At the request of the 27th Assembly, the Secretary General had prepared a report on differential treatment based upon sex under the Staff Regulations and Staff Rules. He had concluded that there were a number of distinctions, arising primarily from "the traditional concept of the husband as normally the 'bread-winner' in the family." Noting that in the light of contemporary thinking there appeared to be "a compelling reason for eliminating present distinctions" he said that specific proposals for action would be submitted to the next session. The Assembly took note of the Secretary General's report, on the understanding that such action proposals would be made in 1974.

The Secretary General reports annually on the composition of the Secretariat; that is, the application of the various recruitment guidelines laid down by the Assembly to assure an equitable distribution of the staff by nationality. Determination of equity is based generally on three factors—UN membership, assessed contribution to the regular budget, and population. The 28th Assembly decided to defer its consideration of the Secretary General's report on the understanding that he would update it in light of the new scale of assessments going into effect in 1974 and any other relevant Assembly decisions.

The personnel policies and practices of the United Nations, as well as the structure of the Office of Personnel Services, have been under review by the Joint Inspection Unit and the Administrative Management Service. These bodies have proposed, *inter alia*, establishing an effective job classification system to cover all posts in the Secretariat, establishing a comprehensive training program which is part of a career development system, modernizing recruitment methods through a long-term recruitment plan, and reorganizing the Office of Personnel Services. In view of the late distribution in all working languages of the Secretary General's comments on the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit and the Administrative Management Service, together with the general realization of the complicated nature of the questions involved, the Assembly decided to defer consideration until its 29th session in order to allow the fullest possible discussion at that time. It was understood that the Secretary General would update his report in light of the results of an intra-Secretariat task force that he had said he was establishing to assist him in improving the operation of the Office of Personnel Services.

## EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICANS

The total number of professional employees in the United Nations and specialized agencies rose from 6,208 in 1972 to 6,370 in 1973. The number of U.S. nationals increased from 916 (14.76%) to 951 (14.93%).

In the UN Secretariat the upward trend continued in American professional employment. At the end of 1973, Americans held 463 (19.82%) of the professional positions, compared to 445 (19.68%) at the end of 1972. With respect to the other agencies in the UN system, the percentage of American professionals increased in the IAEA, ILO, ITU, and WHO while it declined in FAO, ICAO, IMCO, UNESCO, UPU, and WMO. For the most part, the changes were minimal representing the gain or loss of one or two positions. However, significant increases occurred in the IAEA and ILO. In the former, the number of American professionals rose from 48 (17.39%) to 53 (19%) and in the latter from 60 (10.93%) to 74 (12.35%).

The total number of experts employed by the UNDP declined from 5,475 in 1972 to 4,747 in 1973. The number of American experts also declined, from 426 to 395, but the percentage rose from 7.78% to 8.32%.

The situation with respect to senior posts remained unchanged except for the appointment of an American, Robert A. Frosch, as Assistant Executive Director of UNEP. This position is at the level of an Assistant Secretary General.

During 1973 the United States gave increased attention to the qualitative factor in the selection and placement of Americans in the secretariats of the various UN agencies. This aspect of UN personnel management will continue to be of particular concern in the future.

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE U.N. SYSTEM<sup>1</sup>

[Thousands of dollars]

	1972			1973		
	Total contributions from all States	Contribution	Percent	Total contributions from all States	Contribution	Percent
<b>A. Regular budgets (assessed):<sup>2</sup></b>						
UN.....	203,041	63,999	31.52	215,279	67,856	31.52
FAO.....	46,810	12,651	31.52	46,810	12,651	31.52
IMCO.....	2,113	142	6.85	2,007	117	5.82
IAEA.....	15,392	4,883	31.72	16,750	5,422	31.81
ICAO.....	8,855	2,495	28.75	10,029	2,806	28.75
Joint financing program.....	5,609	2,164	38.58	5,654	2,110	37.32
ILO.....	34,837	8,709	25.00	32,550	6,422	(9)
ITU.....	7,230	829	11.47	8,616	986	11.45
UNESCO.....	40,650	12,013	29.80	52,720	15,896	29.41
UPU.....	2,315	97	4.20	2,996	126	4.20
WHO.....	93,914	26,342	30.84	105,141	28,834	30.82
International Agency for Research on Cancer <sup>4</sup> .....				2,483	335	13.49
WMO.....	3,960	911	23.82	5,183	1,234	23.80
Subtotal.....	464,726	135,240	30.16	506,218	144,795	29.96
<b>B. U.N. peacekeeping operations:</b>						
UNEF (assessed).....				10,000	2,889	28.89
UNEF (voluntary).....				5,048	1,333	26.41
UNFICYP (voluntary).....	15,659	4,800	30.65	15,860	4,800	30.26
Subtotal.....	15,659	4,800	30.65	30,908	9,022	29.19

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE U.N. SYSTEM<sup>1</sup>—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

	1972			1973		
	Total contributions from all States	Contribution	Percent	Total contributions from all States	Contribution	Percent
<b>C. Voluntary programs (continuing):</b>						
IAEA operational program-----	4,226	1,689	39.97	5,283	1,831	34.66
UNICEF-----	53,810	17,060	31.70	52,700	17,380	32.98
UNDP-----	283,600	86,000	30.32	319,400	90,000	28.18
UNEP-----				10,984	4,300	39.15
U.N./FAO World Food Program-----	124,700	62,500	50.12	177,600	8,000	38.29
U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control-----	1,717	1,000	58.24	5,513	5,000	90.69
U.N. Fund for Population Activities-----	30,592	14,097	46.08	42,414	17,878	42.15
UNHCR-----	5,934	1,000	16.85	6,185	1,000	16.17
U.N. Fund for Development Planning and Projections-----				2,865	1,250	43.63
UNRWA-----	46,978	24,376	51.89	56,100	23,200	41.35
UNITAR-----	1,240	400	32.26	1,350	400	29.63
U.N. Volunteers-----	298	200	67.11	276	260	72.46
<b>UNESCO special programs:</b>						
Trust Fund for Nubian Monuments-----				11,067	7,000	9.04
Other-----	50	0		125	50	40.00
WHO International Agency for Research on Cancer <sup>6</sup> -----	2,363	337	14.26			
WHO special programs-----	5,737	1,127	19.64	10,819	1,933	17.87
WMO Voluntary Assistance Program-----	4,826	1,500	31.08	4,450	1,500	33.71
Subtotal-----	566,071	211,286	37.32	707,131	234,922	33.22
<b>D. Special humanitarian programs:<sup>8</sup></b>						
U.N. Relief Operation in Bangladesh-----	188,740	112,980	59.86	15,673	3,500	22.33
UNICEF Relief in South Asia-----	22,845	11,075	48.48	23,432	13,562	57.88
<b>UNHCR:</b>						
South Asian Exchange of Persons-----				8,500	2,150	25.29
Southern Sudan Relief Program-----	9,795	5,452	55.66	3,205	867	27.05
Relief Program for Asians Expelled from Uganda-----	2,819	500	17.74			
UN/FAO Sahelian Trust Fund-----				7,741	300	3.88
Subtotal-----	224,199	130,007	57.99	58,551	20,379	34.81
Grand total-----	1,270,655	481,333	37.88	1,302,808	409,118	31.40

<sup>1</sup> Data for calendar year 1973 is preliminary as of May 1974. Data on contributions to the regular budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and UNEF represents amounts assessed by the appropriate bodies. Data on voluntary contributions to UNFICYP, UNEF, other voluntary programs, and special humanitarian programs represents commitments by governments which may include the value of commodities and services as well as cash.

<sup>2</sup> Total contributions represent gross assessments, but U.S. assessments are net after adjustments. U.S. percentages are computed on gross assessments.

<sup>3</sup> Includes cash payment of \$60,119,000 and an offset of \$3,879,000, representing interest and principal due the United States on U.N. bonds.

<sup>4</sup> Includes cash payment of \$63,957,000 and an offset of \$3,899,000, representing interest and principal due the United States on U.N. bonds.

<sup>5</sup> Amount actually appropriated. The total U.S. assessment is \$8,709,000 (25 percent of total assessments amounting to \$34,837,000).

<sup>6</sup> U.S. contribution was funded through 1972 as voluntary and thereafter as assessed.

<sup>7</sup> In United States owned Egyptian currency.

<sup>8</sup> Data represents commitments by governments to U.N. agencies for emergency programs. Some of the resources committed to the U.N./FAO World Food Program have also been utilized to meet emergency needs.

## APPENDIX I: ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE THE 28TH SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1973

I come before you today—confirmed in office but two days ago—as probably the world's most junior Foreign Minister. That President Nixon should ask me as my first official act to speak here for the United States reaffirms the importance that my country attaches to the values and ideals of the United Nations.

It would be idle to deny that the American people, like many others, have sometimes been disappointed because this organization has not been more successful in translating the hopes for universal peace of its architects into concrete accomplishments.

But despite our disappointments, my country remains committed to the goal of a world community. We will continue to work in this Parliament of Man to make it a reality.

Two centuries ago, the philosopher Kant predicted that perpetual peace would come eventually—either as the creation of man's moral aspirations or as the consequence of physical necessity. What seemed utopian then looms as tomorrow's reality; soon there will be no alternative. Our only choice is whether the world envisaged in the Charter will come about as the result of our vision or of a catastrophe invited by our shortsightedness.

The United States has made its choice. My country seeks true peace, not simply an armistice. We strive for a world in which the rule of law governs and fundamental human rights are the birthright of all. Beyond the bilateral diplomacy, the pragmatic agreements, and dramatic steps of recent years, we envisage a comprehensive, institutionalized peace—a peace which this organization is uniquely situated to foster and to anchor in the hearts of men.

This will be the spirit of American foreign policy.

This attitude will guide our work in this organization.

We start from a bedrock of solid progress. Many of the crises that haunted past General Assemblies have been put behind us. Agreement has been reached on Berlin; there is a cease-fire in the Middle East; the Viet-Nam war has been ended. The rigid confrontation that has dominated international life and weakened this organization of a quarter of a century has been softened.

The United States and the Soviet Union have perceived a commonality of interest in avoiding nuclear holocaust and in establishing a broad web of constructive relationships. Talks on strategic arms limitation have already produced historic accords aimed at slowing the arms race and insuring strategic stability; we have, today, resumed negotiations on this subject. The positive results we hope for will enhance the security of all mankind.

Two decades of estrangement between the United States and the People's Republic of China have given way to constructive dialogue and productive exchanges. President Nixon has met with the leaders of that nation; we have agreed to a historic communique that honestly sets forth both our differences and our common principles; and we have each opened a Liaison Office in the capital of the other.

Many other countries have seized the initiative and contributed—in substance and spirit—to the relaxation of tensions. The nations of Europe and North America are engaged in a conference to further security and cooperation. The two German states have taken their place in this Assembly. India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh have begun to move toward a welcome reconciliation. North and South Korea are at last engaged in a dialogue which we hope will lead to a new era of peace and security.

Yet these achievements, solid as they are, have only made less precarious the dangers and divisions inherited from the postwar era. We have ended many of the confrontations of the cold war; yet, even in this room, the vocabulary of suspicion persists. Relaxation of tensions

is justified by some as merely a tactical interlude before renewed struggle. Others suspect the emergence of a two-power condominium. And as tension between the two original blocs has eased, a third grouping increasingly assumes the characteristics of a bloc of its own—the alignment of the nonaligned.

So the world is uneasily suspended between old slogans and new realities, between a view of peace as but a pause in an unending struggle and a vision of peace as a promise of global cooperation.

In 1946 James Byrnes, the first Secretary of State to address this Assembly, spoke of how the United Nations could help break down habits of thinking in national isolation and move toward universal understanding and tolerance among all peoples.

The United States will never be satisfied with a world of uneasy truces, of offsetting blocs, of accommodations of convenience. We know that power can enforce a resigned passivity, but only a sense of justice can enlist consensus. We strive for a peace whose stability rests not merely on a balance of forces, but on shared aspirations. We are convinced that a structure which ignores humane values will prove cold and empty and unfulfilling to most of mankind.

The United States deeply believes:

That justice cannot be confined by national frontiers.

That truth is universal and not the peculiar possession of a single people or group or ideology.

That compassion and humanity must ennoble all our endeavors.

In this spirit we ask the Assembly to move with us from détente to cooperation, from coexistence to community.

Our journey must begin with the world as it is and with the issues now before us. The United States will spare no effort to ease tensions further and to move toward greater stability:

We shall continue, in the spirit of the Shanghai communique, our search for a new relationship with the People's Republic of China.

We shall work to promote positive trends elsewhere in Asia. The uncertain peace in Indochina must be strengthened; the world community cannot afford, or permit, a relapse into war in that region.

We shall continue to pursue vigorously the building of constructive relations with the Soviet Union.

We shall strive to promote conciliation in Europe. In the negotiations beginning next month we shall seek a reduction of the military forces that have faced each other for so long across that divided continent.

We shall give new vigor to our policy of partnership in the Western Hemisphere.

We shall honor our pledge to promote self-determination, economic development, and human dignity across the continent of Africa.

We shall press on with strategic arms limitation talks. We consider them crucial for security and stability in this period.

We shall search for solutions to the worldwide problem of conventional weapons, which drain our resources and fuel the fires of local conflict.

In these efforts, the United States will be guided by fundamental principles:

We have no desire for domination. We will oppose—as we have consistently opposed throughout this century—any nation that chooses

this path. We have not been asked to participate in a condominium; we would reject such an appeal if it were made.

We will never abandon our allies or our friends. The strengthening of our traditional ties is the essential foundation for the development of new relationships with old adversaries.

We will work for peace through the United Nations as well as through bilateral relationships.

We recognize our special obligation, as a permanent member of the Security Council, to assist in the search for just solutions in those parts of the world now torn by strife, such as the Middle East. While we cannot substitute for the efforts of those most directly involved, we are prepared to use our influence to generate a spirit of accommodation and to encourage the parties toward practical progress.

But progress on the traditional agenda is not enough. The more we succeed in solving political problems, the more other and perhaps deeper challenges emerge. As the world grows more stable, we must confront the question of the ends of détente. As the threat of war recedes, the problem of the quality of life takes on more urgent significance.

We are, in fact, members of a community drawn by modern science, technology, and new forms of communication into a proximity for which we are still politically unprepared. Technology daily outstrips the ability of our institutions to cope with its fruits. Our political imagination must catch up with our scientific vision. This is at the same time the greatest challenge and the greatest opportunity of this organization:

The pollution of the skies, the seas, and the land is a global problem.

The increased consumption of cereals and protein has reduced world food reserves to dangerously low levels.

The demand for energy is outrunning supply, and the need for technological innovation is urgent.

The growth of the world's economy is inhibited by restrictive trading blocs and an insufficiently flexible international monetary system.

The exploitation of the resources of the ocean beds, which is essential for the needs of burgeoning populations, requires global cooperation lest it degenerate into global contention.

Challenges of this magnitude cannot be solved by a world fragmented into self-contained nation-states or rigid blocs.

I do not intend today to cover the whole agenda of international cooperation. Rather, I shall speak briefly of some illustrative areas of common action. I pledge the readiness of the United States to solve these problems cooperatively and to submit proposals aimed at their resolution.

### *1. A world community requires the curbing of conflict.*

The United Nations, in its 28-year history, has not always been idle in this sphere. In Indonesia, the Indian Subcontinent, the Middle East, the Congo, and in Cyprus, it has shown its ability for effective factfinding, mediation, and peacekeeping missions. This central aspect of the U.N.'s work must be strengthened. On a small planet, so bound together by technology and so interdependent economically, we can no longer afford the constant eruption of conflict and the danger of its spread.

Yet, in recent years we have found ourselves locked in fruitless debates about the inauguration of peacekeeping operations and over the degree of control the Security Council would exercise over peacekeeping machinery—an impasse which insured only that permanent peacekeeping machinery would not come into being. Each peacekeeping unit we have formed to cope with an emergency has been an improvisation growing out of argument and controversy.

We should delay no longer. The time has come to agree on peacekeeping guidelines so that this organization can act swiftly, confidently, and effectively in future crises. To break the deadlock, the United States is prepared to consider how the Security Council can play a more central role in the conduct of peacekeeping operations. If all countries concerned approach this problem with a desire to achieve a cooperative solution, the United Nations can achieve a major step forward during this session.

*2. A world community must have the widest possible membership.*

The exclusion of any qualified state denies representation not only to governments but to peoples. Membership in this body should be a step toward reconciliation, not a source of conflict. The time has come for North and South Korea to be offered their rightful places here, without prejudice to a future evolution toward unification.

In this spirit also, we support the permanent membership of Japan in the Security Council.

*3. A world community must assure that all its peoples are fed.*

The growing threat to the world's food supply deserves the urgent attention of this assembly. Since 1969, global consumption of cereals has risen more rapidly than production; stocks are at the lowest levels in years. We now face the prospect that—even with bumper crops—the world may not rebuild its seriously depleted reserves in this decade.

No one country can cope with this problem. The United States therefore proposes:

That a World Food Conference be organized under United Nations auspices in 1974 to discuss ways to maintain adequate food supplies, and to harness the efforts of all nations to meet the hunger and malnutrition resulting from natural disasters.

That nations in a position to do so offer technical assistance in the conservation of food. The United States is ready to join with others in providing such assistance.

*4. A world community cannot remain divided between the permanently rich and permanently poor.*

Let us therefore resolve that this Assembly, this year, initiate a search—drawing on the world's best minds—for new and imaginative solutions to the problems of development. Our search must be candid and realistic, but it must also be free of peremptory demands, antagonistic propositions, ideological confrontation, or propagandistic rhetoric—or we will surely fail.

The United States is prepared to join in this new search, providing freely of the experience gained over two decades. We have learned not to exaggerate our capacity to transform nations—but we have also learned much about what progress is possible.

We will participate without preconditions, with a conciliatory attitude and a cooperative commitment. We ask only that others adopt the same approach.

In this spirit the United States is willing to examine seriously the proposal by the distinguished President of Mexico for a Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States. Such a document will make a significant and historic contribution if it reflects the true aspirations of all nations; if it is turned into an indictment of one group of countries by another, it will accomplish nothing. To command general support—and to be implemented—the proposed rights and duties must be defined equitably and take into account the concerns of industrialized as well as of developing countries. The United States stands ready to define its responsibilities in a humane and cooperative spirit.

*5. Finally, a world community must harness science and technology for the benefit of all.*

We must begin to match our remarkable technological skills with our equally remarkable technological needs. We must find the means for the cooperative and judicious development of our energy resources. We must responsibly confront the problems of population growth, which are fast pushing humanity toward the limits of what our earth can sustain. We must embark on a new scientific revolution to increase agricultural productivity in all lands. No field of human endeavor is so dependent upon an open world for its advancement; no field is so in need of international cooperation to cope with its potential dangers.

Mr. President, fellow delegates: Are we prepared to accept the imperatives of a global society and infuse our labors with a new vision? Or shall we content ourselves with a temporary pause in the turmoil that has wracked our century? Shall we proceed with one-sided demands and sterile confrontations? Or shall we proceed in a spirit of compromise produced by a sense of common destiny? We must move from hesitant cooperation born of necessity to genuine collective effort based on common purpose.

It is a choice no country can make alone. We can repeat old slogans or strive for new hope. We can fill the record of our proceedings with acrimony, or we can dedicate ourselves to dealing with man's deepest needs. The ideal of a world community may be decried as unrealistic—but great constructions have always been ideals before they can become realities. Let us dedicate ourselves to this noblest of all possible goals and achieve at last what has so long eluded us: true understanding and tolerance among mankind.

## APPENDIX II: PRINCIPAL ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The General Assembly is the only principal organ of the United Nations on which all 135 members are represented. They are:

Afghanistan  
Albania  
Algeria  
Argentina  
Australia

Austria  
Bahamas  
Bahrain  
Barbados  
Belgium



Bhutan  
 Bolivia  
 Botswana  
 Brazil  
 Bulgaria  
 Burma  
 Burundi  
 Byelorussian S.S.R.  
 Cameroon  
 Canada  
 Central African Republic  
 Chad  
 Chile  
 China  
 Colombia  
 Congo  
 Costa Rica  
 Cuba  
 Cyprus  
 Czechoslovakia  
 Dahomey  
 Denmark  
 Dominican Republic  
 Ecuador  
 Egypt  
 El Salvador  
 Equatorial Guinea  
 Ethiopia  
 Fiji  
 Finland  
 France  
 Gabon  
 Gambia  
 German Democratic Republic  
 Germany, Federal Republic of  
 Ghana  
 Greece  
 Guatemala  
 Guinea  
 Guyana  
 Haiti  
 Honduras  
 Hungary  
 Iceland  
 India  
 Indonesia  
 Iran  
 Iraq  
 Ireland  
 Israel  
 Italy  
 Ivory Coast  
 Jamaica  
 Japan

Jordan  
 Kenya  
 Khmer Republic  
 Kuwait  
 Laos  
 Lebanon  
 Lesotho  
 Liberia  
 Libya  
 Luxembourg  
 Malagasy Republic  
 Malawi  
 Malaysia  
 Maldives  
 Mali  
 Malta  
 Mauritania  
 Mauritius  
 Mexico  
 Mongolia  
 Morocco  
 Nepal  
 Netherlands  
 New Zealand  
 Nicaragua  
 Niger  
 Nigeria  
 Norway  
 Oman  
 Pakistan  
 Panama  
 Paraguay  
 Peru  
 Philippines  
 Poland  
 Portugal  
 Qatar  
 Romania  
 Rwanda  
 Saudi Arabia  
 Senegal  
 Sierra Leone  
 Singapore  
 Somalia  
 South Africa  
 Spain  
 Sri Lanka  
 Sudan  
 Swaziland  
 Sweden  
 Syria  
 Tanzania  
 Thailand  
 Togo

Trinidad and Tobago	Upper Volta
Tunisia	Uruguay
Turkey	Venezuela
Uganda	Yemen (Aden)
Ukrainian S.S.R.	Yemen (San'a)
U.S.S.R.	Yugoslavia
United Arab Emirates	Zaire
United Kingdom	Zambia
United States	

The 28th regular session of the General Assembly convened Sept. 18 and was suspended on Dec. 18, to be resumed if circumstances warranted consideration by the Assembly of the situation in the Middle East. The Assembly elected Leopoldo Benites (Ecuador) as President and the chairmen of the delegations of Cameroon, People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia, Fiji, France, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Netherlands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and United States as the 17 Vice Presidents.

The chairmen of the seven main committees, on which each member may be represented, were:

First (Political and Security)—Otto R. Borch (Denmark)  
Special Political—Károly Szarka (Hungary)

Second (Economic and Financial)—Zewde Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia)

Third (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural)—Yahya Mahmasani (Lebanon)

Fourth (Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories)—Leonardo Díaz González (Venezuela)

Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary)—C.S.M. Mselle (Tanzania)

Sixth (Legal)—Sergio González Gálvez (Mexico)

The General Committee (steering committee) is composed of the President, the 17 Vice Presidents, and the chairmen of the seven main committees.

#### SECURITY COUNCIL

Five members designated in the Charter as permanent; 10 elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms ending Dec. 31 of the year given in the heading.

*Permanent Members:* China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

1973: Guinea, India, Panama, Sudan, and Yugoslavia.

1974: Australia, Austria, Indonesia, Kenya, and Peru.

On Oct. 15 the Assembly elected Byelorussian S.S.R., Cameroon, Costa Rica, Iraq, and Mauritania for terms beginning Jan. 1, 1974.

#### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

During most of 1973 ECOSOC was composed of the following 27 members elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms ending Dec. 31 of the year given in the heading:

1973: Haiti, Hungary, Lebanon, Malagasy Republic, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, United States, and Zaire.

1973: Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, China, Finland, Japan, Poland, U.S.S.R., and United Kingdom.

1975: Algeria, Brazil, France, Mali, Mongolia, Netherlands, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uganda.

An amendment to Article 61 of the UN Charter enlarging ECOSOC from 27 to 54 members entered into force on Sept. 24. The Assembly decided without objection on Oct. 12 that the 27 states which were already members of ECOSOC's three sessional committees should serve on ECOSOC itself from Oct. 12 to Dec. 31. These states were Argentina, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., Venezuela, Yemen (San'a), and Yugoslavia.

On Nov. 23 the Assembly on a single ballot elected Australia, Congo, Liberia, Mexico, Romania, Thailand, United States, Yemen (Aden), and Zambia for 3-year terms beginning Jan. 1, 1974.

In two further ballots at the same meeting the Assembly elected Argentina,<sup>1</sup> Belgium,<sup>3</sup> Canada,<sup>1</sup> Colombia,<sup>3</sup> Czechoslovakia,<sup>1</sup> Egypt,<sup>3</sup> Ethiopia,<sup>1</sup> Fiji,<sup>2</sup> German Democratic Republic,<sup>3</sup> Germany<sup>2</sup> (Federal Republic of), Guatemala,<sup>2</sup> Guinea,<sup>2</sup> India,<sup>1</sup> Indonesia,<sup>2</sup> Iran,<sup>3</sup> Italy,<sup>3</sup> Ivory Coast,<sup>3</sup> Jamaica,<sup>3</sup> Jordan,<sup>3</sup> Kenya,<sup>1</sup> Pakistan,<sup>1</sup> Senegal,<sup>2</sup> Sweden,<sup>1</sup> Turkey,<sup>2</sup> Venezuela,<sup>2</sup> Yugoslavia,<sup>2</sup> and Zaire<sup>1</sup> as the 27 members added to ECOSOC from Jan. 1, 1974, in consequence of its enlargement to 54. On a proposal by the President, the Assembly decided without objection to determine by drawing lots which of the additional members within each regional group would serve for terms of 1, 2, or 3 years.

ECOSOC held its 54th session in New York, Jan. 8-10 and Apr. 17-May 18; the first part of its 55th session in Geneva, July 4-Aug. 10; a special session in New York on Sept. 17; and the resumed part of its 55th session in New York, Oct. 15, 16, and 18, and Dec. 11.

#### TRUSTESHIP COUNCIL

Two members\* that administer territories and the four nonadministering permanent members of the Security Council.

Australia*	U.S.S.R.
China	United Kingdom
France	United States*

The Trusteeship Council held its 40th session in New York, May 29-June 22.

#### INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Fifteen members elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council for 9-year terms ending Feb. 5 of the year given in parentheses. Members are listed in order of precedence.

Manfred Lachs (Poland) (1976), President  
Fouad Ammoun (Lebanon) (1976), Vice President

<sup>1</sup> To serve a 1-year term.

<sup>2</sup> To serve a 2-year term.

<sup>3</sup> To serve a 3-year term.

Isaac Forster (Senegal) (1982)  
 André Gros (France) (1982)  
 Cesar Bengzon (Philippines) (1976)  
 Sture Petré (Sweden) (1976)  
 Charles D. Onyeama (Nigeria) (1976)  
 Hardy C. Dillard (United States) (1979)  
 Louis Ignacio-Pinto (Dahomey) (1979)  
 Federico de Castro (Spain) (1979)  
 Platon D. Morozov (U.S.S.R.) (1979)  
 Eduardo Jiménez de Aréchaga (Uruguay) (1979)  
 Sir Humphrey Waldo (United Kingdom) (1982)  
 Nagendra Singh (India) (1982)  
 José María Ruda (Argentina) (1982)

#### SECRETARIAT

The Secretariat consists of a Secretary General who is the chief administrative officer of the organization and such staff as the organization may require. The Secretary General is appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council: the Staff is appointed by the Secretary General under regulations established by the General Assembly.

The current term of Kurt Waldheim (Austria) as Secretary General ends Dec. 31, 1976.

#### APPENDIX III: UNITED STATES MISSIONS

##### U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK

The United States is represented by a permanent mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. Under the direction of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, the mission carries out the instructions of the President, as transmitted by the Secretary of State. It serves as the channel of communication for the U.S. Government with the UN organs, agencies, and commissions at the Headquarters and the 132 other permanent missions accredited to the United Nations and 7 nonmember observer missions. It is also a base of operations for the U.S. delegations to the General Assembly and to other UN bodies when they meet in New York. In 1973 the United States participated in 34 conferences and meetings held under UN auspices in New York, in addition to the 3-month session of the General Assembly.

The chief of mission, who has the rank of ambassador, is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations: he also represents the United States in the Security Council. He is assisted by other persons of appropriate title, rank, and status, who are appointed by the President. These persons, at the direction of the U.S. Representative, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council.

The mission has a staff consisting of political economic, social, financial, legal, military, public affairs, and administrative advisers. In 1973 approximately 146 persons were assigned to the mission by the Department of State and other U.S. Departments and Agencies.

This staff assists the U.S. Representative in such activities as (1) planning the tactical pursuit of U.S. policy objectives in UN organs and bodies; (2) carrying out consultation, negotiation, and liaison with other delegations and the UN Secretariat; (3) preparing policy recommendations to the Department of State; (4) reporting to the Department of State on consultations and developments in the United Nations; (5) discharging U.S. responsibilities as "host government," in particular those arising from the 1947 Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations; the International Organizations Immunities Act of 1945, as amended; and the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations (entered into force with respect to the United States Apr. 29, 1970), which deal *inter alia* with relations of the United Nations, its officials, and delegation members with Federal, State, and local authorities; (6) carrying out public affairs activities; and (7) planning and administering conference operations.

#### U.S. MISSION TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GENEVA

The U.S. mission in Geneva is under the direction of the U.S. Representative, with the rank of ambassador, who is accredited to the European Office of the United Nations as well as to other international organizations with headquarters in Geneva. The mission is responsible for the representation of U.S. interests in UN bodies such as UNCTAD, UNHCR, ECE, WHO, ILO, ITU, Commission for Narcotic Drugs, and UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control, and in other international bodies such as GATT, CCD, and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. In 1973 the staff consisted of 88 Americans, including personnel detailed by U.S. Government Departments other than the Department of State, and 42 local employees.

The mission maintains liaison on a continuing basis with the executive heads and members of secretariats of international bodies, reports on developments relating to them, and makes policy and program recommendations to the Department of State. Officers of the mission serve on delegations to larger conferences and frequently represent the United States in smaller international meetings. In 1973 the United States participated in 114 conferences and meetings in Geneva held under the auspices of the UN and the specialized agencies. The mission is also responsible for liaison with the missions of other states located in Geneva.

#### OTHER U.S. MISSIONS

The United States also maintains missions at the headquarters of FAO (and WFP) in Rome, ICAO in Montreal, UNESCO in Paris, and IAEA and UNIDO in Vienna. The responsibilities and functions of these missions are similar to those of the Geneva mission.

#### APPENDIX IV: UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES

Permanent Representative and Chief of U.S. Mission to the United Nations:

George Bush, through Jan. 18.

John Scali, from Feb. 2.

Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations:

Christopher H. Phillips, through June 8.

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., from Oct 2.

Deputy Permanent Representative on the Security Council:

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

William E. Schautele, Jr., from Oct 2.

Representative on the Economic and Social Council:

Bernard Zagorin, through June 30.

Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., from Oct. 10.

Representative on the Trusteeship Council:

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

Alternate Permanent Representative for Special Political Affairs:

Barbara M. White, from Oct. 2.

U.S. Representative to the European Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations:

Idar Rimestad, through June 16.

Deputy U.S. Representative to the European Office of the United Nations and other International Organizations:

Jules Bassin.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY

28th regular session, New York, Sept. 18-Dec. 18, 1973.

#### REPRESENTATIVES

Henry A. Kissinger,<sup>1</sup> John A. Scali, W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., William F. Buckley, Jr., John H. Buchanan, Jr., and Robert N. C. Nix.

#### ALTERNATES

Margaret B. Young, Mark Evans, William E. Schaufele, Jr., Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., and Richard M. Scammon.

#### SPECIAL BODIES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

##### ADVISORY COMMISSION OF UNRWA

Representative: William B. Buffum.

##### WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF UNRWA

Representative: Charles O. Coudert.

##### UN SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON THE EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION

Representative: H. D. Brunner.

Alternate: John H. Harley.

<sup>1</sup> The Secretary served as chairman of the delegation, *ex officio*, during his presence at the session.

## COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

Representative: Herbert K. Reis.  
 Alternate: Arnold Frutkin.

## CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

Representative: Joseph Martin, Jr.  
 Alternates: Roger Kirk (Feb. 20-Apr. 26), and Alan F. Neidle  
 (June 12-Aug. 30).

## TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD OF UNCTAD

5th special session (Geneva, Apr. 24-May 4, May 9)

Representative: Martin M. Tank.

12th session (2d part) (Geneva, May 7-8, 10-11)

Representative: William K. Miller.

13th session (Geneva, Aug. 21-Sept. 11)

Representative: William K. Miller.  
 Alternates: William E. Culbert, and Anthony S. Kochanek.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

Representative: William E. Schaufele, Jr.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE UN PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE IN THE TEACHING, STUDY, DISSEMINATION, AND WIDER APPRECIATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Representative: Stephen M. Schwebel.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD OF UNIDO

7th session (Vienna, May 7-15)

Representative: William J. Stibravy.  
 Alternate: Daniel Arrill.  
 U.S. Permanent Representative to UNIDO: William J. Stibravy.

## UN COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

6th session (Geneva, Apr. 2-13)

Representative: E. Allan Farnsworth.  
 Alternate: Robert E. Dalton.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTION OF DEFINING AGGRESSION

6th session (Geneva, Apr. 25-May 30)

Representative: Steven C. Nelson.  
 Alternate: Robert B. Rosenstock.

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF THE SEABED AND THE OCEAN FLOOR  
BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL JURISDICTION

(New York, Mar. 5-Apr. 6)

Representative: John Norton Moore.

Alternates: Martin F. Herz, Donald L. McKernan, and Christopher H. Phillips.

(Geneva, July 2-Aug. 24)

Representatives: John R. Stevenson (Chairman), and John Norton Moore.

Alternates: Martin F. Herz, and Donald L. McKernan.

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY

Representative: William E. Schaufele, Jr. through Oct., Barbara M. White, from Nov. 1.

GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNEP

1st session (Geneva, June 12-22)

Representative: Christian A. Herter, Jr.

Alternates: Robert M. White, and John A. Busterud.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

(New York, July 16-Aug. 11)

Representative: W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

Alternate: Robert B. Rosenstock.

SECURITY COUNCIL

Representative: George Bush, through Jan. 18, John Scali, from Feb. 2.

Deputies: Christopher H. Phillips, through June 8, W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., and William E. Schaufele, Jr., from Oct. 2.

MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE

Representatives: Harry L. Harty, Jr., Vice Adm., USN, through Nov. 30, Joseph P. Moorer, Vice Adm., USN, from Dec. 1, Donald H. Cowles, Lt. Gen., USA, Austin J. Russell, Lt. Gen., USAF, through Oct. 14, and Duward L. Crow, Lt. Gen., USAF, from Oct. 15.

Deputies: Edward J. Melanson, Jr., Comdr., USN, Charles S. Johnson, Jr., Col., USA, and Robert E. Sheridan, Col., USAF.

TRUSTESHIP COUNCIL

Representative: W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

Alternates: Edward E. Johnston, and William E. Schaufele, Jr.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

54th session (New York, Jan. 8-10, Apr. 17-May 18)



Representative: Bernard Zagorin.

Alternate: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr.

55th session (Geneva, July 4–Aug. 10)

Representative: John Scali.

Alternates: Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., Robert W. Kitchen, Jr., and William J. Stibravy.

2d special session (New York, Sept. 17)

Representative: W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

Alternate: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr.

55th resumed session (New York, Oct. 15, 16, 18, and Dec. 11)

Representative: Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr.

Alternate: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr.

## FUNCTIONAL COMMISSIONS

### HUMAN RIGHTS

29th session (Geneva, Feb. 26–Apr. 6)

Representative: Philip E. Hoffman.

Alternates: Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., Warren E. Hewitt, and Arthur M. Stillman.

### NARCOTIC DRUGS

25th session (Geneva, Jan. 22–Feb. 9)

Representative: John E. Ingersoll.

Alternates: Roger O. Egeberg, M.D., and Harvey R. Wellman.

### POPULATION

2d special session (New York, Mar. 19–30) and 17th session (Geneva Oct. 29–Nov. 9)

Representative: William H. Draper, Jr.

Alternate: Philander P. Claxton, Jr.

### SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

23d session (New York, Feb. 12–Mar. 2)

Representative: Jean Picker.

Alternates: Gloria Gaston, and Arthur M. Stillman.

STATISTICAL (DID NOT MEET IN 1973)

Representative: Julius Shiskin.

## STATUS OF WOMEN (DID NOT MEET IN 1973)

Representative: Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, until Apr. 26.

## REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS

## AFRICA

2d meeting of the Conference of Ministers (Accra, Ghana, Feb. 19-23)

Principal U.S. Observer: Robert S. Smith.

## ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

29th session (Tokyo, Apr. 11-23)

Representative: Bernard Zagorin.

Alternates: Lester E. Edmond, and Joseph L. St. Lawrence.

## EUROPE

28th session (Geneva, May 8-18)

Representative: Christopher H. Phillips.

Alternates: Paxton T. Dunn, and William K. Miller.

## LATIN AMERICA

15th session (Quito, Ecuador, Mar. 23-30)

Representative: Bernard Zagorin.

Alternate: Douglas Henderson.

## SPECIAL BODIES OF ECOSOC

## EXECUTIVE BOARD OF UNICEF

(New York, Apr. 30-May 11)

Representative: Michael N. Scelsi.

Alternate: John J. Hutchings.

## COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, BUILDING, AND PLANNING

8th session (Geneva, Oct. 15-26)

Representative: William R. Miner.

## COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAM AND COORDINATION

13th session (New York, Jan. 11, Apr. 2-12)

Representative: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr.

Alternate: Irving Lee Sanders.

14th session (New York, June 11-15)

Representative: Robert B. Allen.

Alternate: Irving Lee Sanders.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE UN/FAO WORLD FOOD  
PROGRAM

23d and 24th sessions (Rome, Apr. 25-May 4 and Oct. 3-9)

Delegate: Andrew J. Mair.

Alternates: Paul J. Byrnes, Frank G. McKnight, and Daniel E. Shaughnessy.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PROGRAM  
(UNHCR)

3d special and 24th regular session (Geneva, May 28-30 and  
Oct. 8-16)

Representative: Francis L. Kellogg.

Alternate: James L. Carlin.

GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNDP

15th session (New York, Jan. 22-Feb. 13)

Representative: Bernard Zagorin.

Alternates: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr., and Stuart H. Van Dyke.

16th session (Geneva, June 6-29)

Representative: W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

Alternates: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr., Stuart H. Van Dyke, and M. Kathleen Bell.

COMMITTEE ON REVIEW AND APPRAISAL

2d session (New York, May 21-June 8)

Representative: Martin M. Tank.

Alternates: I. Austin Heyman and John W. Koehring.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

1st session (New York, Mar. 12-31, Apr. 9)

Representative: Frederick Seitz.

Alternates: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr., and Glenn F. Schweitzer.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

17th session FAO Conference (Rome, Nov. 10-29)

Delegates: Earl L. Butz (ex officio), and Thomas K. Cowden.

Alternates: Paul J. Byrnes, John L. Mills, and Ralph W. Phillips.

## 60th session FAO Council (Rome, June 11-22)

Delegate : Andrew J. Mair.

Alternates : Paul J. Byrnes and Ralph W. Phillips.

## 61st and 62d sessions FAO Council (Rome, Nov. 5-9 and 30)

Delegate : Thomas K. Cowden.

Alternates : Paul J. Byrnes and Ralph W. Phillips.

## INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

## 8th Assembly (London, Nov. 13-23)

Representative : Raymond J. Waldmann.

Alternates : Thomas R. Sargent, III, Vice Adm., USCG, Richard K. Bank, Roderick Y. Edwards, Rear Adm. USCG (ret.), Carl J. Grip, and William F. Rea, III, Rear Adm., USCG.

## 30th session of IMCO Council (London, June 4-8)

Representative : William Ford.

Alternate : Roderick Y. Edwards, Rear Adm. USCG (ret.).

## 7th extraordinary session of IMCO Council (London, Nov. 12)

Representative : William F. Rea, III, Rear Adm., USCG.

## 31st session of IMCO Council (London, Nov. 23)

Representative : Raymond J. Waldmann.

## INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

U.S. Governor, Board of Governors : George P. Shultz.

Alternate U.S. Governor : John N. Irwin, through Sept. 18, William J. Casey, from Sept. 19.

U.S. Executive Director : Robert E. Wiczorowski, through Mar. 9, Charles O. Sethness, from July 24.

Alternate U.S. Executive Director : Hal F. Reynolds, from July 24.

## INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

19th (extraordinary) session ICAO Assembly  
(New York, Feb. 27-Mar. 2)

Chief Delegate : Betty C. Dillon.

Delegate : Carl J. Grip.

20th (extraordinary) session ICAO Assembly  
(Rome, Aug. 28-Sept. 21)

Chief Delegate : William M. Rountree.

Alternate Chief Delegate : B. Keith Huffman.

Delegates : Elizabeth A. Brown, H. Rowan Gaither, Joan S. Gravatt, Paul B. Larsen, Peter B. Schwarzkopf, Bruce I. Selfon, M. Ann Vihel, and H. L. Dufour Woolfley.

U.S. Representative on ICAO Council and Permanent Representative to ICAO: Betty C. Dillon.

#### INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

The Governors, Executive Directors, and Alternates are the same as those of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

#### INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The U.S. Governor, Alternate Governor, Executive Director, and Alternate Executive Director of the IBRD also serve as the U.S. Governor, Alternate Governor, Director, and Alternate Director of the IFC.

#### INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

58th International Labor Conference (Geneva, June 6-27)

U.S. Government Delegates: Edward B. Persons, and Dale Good.  
Alternate: Allen R. DeLong.

U.S. Employer Delegate: Edwin P. Neilan.

U.S. Worker Delegate: Bert Seidman.

U.S. Government Substitute Representative on Governing Body: Edward B. Persons.

#### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

U.S. Governor, Board of Governors: George P. Shultz.

Alternate U.S. Governor: John N. Irwin, through Sept. 18, Arthur F. Burns, from Sept. 19.

U.S. Executive Director: William B. Dale.

Alternate U.S. Executive Director: Charles R. Harley.

#### INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

Plenipotentiary Conference (Torremolinos, Spain, Sept. 14-Oct. 26)

Chief Delegate: Jacob D. Beam.

Alternate Chief Delegates: Robert E. Lee, Thomas E. Nelson, and Bromley Smith.

Chief Delegate, U.S. Territories Delegation: Richard T. Black.

U.S. Representative, Administrative Council: Thomas E. Nelson.

#### UN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

3d extraordinary session of the General Conference  
(Paris, Oct. 23-27)

Delegates: Roy D. Morey (Chairman), William B. Jones, and Edward O. Sullivan.

U.S. Member, Executive Board: Louise Gore, through Sept. 10, Edward O. Sullivan, from Sept. 12.

U.S. Permanent Representative to UNESCO: Pierre Graham, through Aug. 31, William B. Jones, from Sept. 2.

## UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

1973 session of UPU Executive Council (Bern, May 1-24)

Head of U.S. Delegation: Benjamin F. Bailar.  
Alternate Head: H. Edgar S. Stock.

## WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

26th World Health Assembly (Geneva, May 7-23)

Delegates: Charles S. Edwards, M.D. (Chief Delegate), S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr., M.D. (Alternate Chief Delegate), and Max E. Johnson, M.D.

Alternates: Jules Bassin, Roy D. Morey, and David J. Sencer, M.D.  
U.S. Representative, Executive Board: S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr., M.D.

## WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

U.S. Member, Executive Committee: Robert M. White.

## INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

17th General Conference (Vienna, Sept. 18-24)

Representative: Dixy Lee Ray.

Alternates: William A. Anders, Clarence E. Larson, Dwight J. Porter, and Gerald F. Tape.

U.S. Representative on Board of Governors and Permanent Representative to the IAEA: T. Keith Glennan, through Mar. 16, Gerald F. Tape, from June 12.





