

U.S.
PARTICIPATION
IN THE UN



REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE
CONGRESS FOR THE YEAR 1969

Abbreviations and Short Forms

- 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
Committee of 33— Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations
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
ENDC — Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee
FAO — Food and Agriculture Organization
GATT — General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
IAEA — International Atomic Energy Agency
IBRD — International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICAO — International Civil Aviation Organization
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
NATO — North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OECD — Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
UNCITRAL— U.N. Commission on International Trade Law
UNCTAD — U.N. Conference on Trade and Development
UNCURK — U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea
UNDP — U.N. Development Program
UNESCO — U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
UNFICYP — U.N. Force in Cyprus
UNHCR — Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF — U.N. Children's Fund
UNIDO — U.N. Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR — U.N. Institute for Training and Research
UNRWA — U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UNSCEAR — U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
UNTSO — U.N. Truce Supervision Organization
UPU — Universal Postal Union
WHO — World Health Organization
WMO — World Meteorological Organization

**U.S.
PARTICIPATION
IN THE UN**

**REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE
CONGRESS FOR THE YEAR 1969**

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 8540
International Organization and Conference Series 92
Released October 1970

BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price \$1.00

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

The President of the United States


To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, I hereby transmit to the Congress the Annual Report on United States participation in the United Nations. This report covers the events of the calendar year 1969, the first year of my Administration.

In my address to the 24th General Assembly on September 18, 1969, and in my Foreign Policy Report to the Congress on February 18, 1970, I reaffirmed America's enduring commitment to the support and strengthening of the United Nations Organization. In addition, I took note of some of the steps taken by the United States in 1969 to demonstrate and carry out this commitment. This report covers these matters in greater detail.

The United States strove in 1969, and will strive in the future, to contribute to the success of the United Nations in the fields of diplomacy and peacekeeping and in the promotion of arms control, international law, economic progress, and human rights.

It is gratifying to me, as we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, to add this volume to the record of United States participation.



THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 1970.



The Secretary of State to the President

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, August 6, 1970

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 1969 has therefore been prepared.

As in previous years, the report is a comprehensive survey of the Government's participation in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

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

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William Rogers". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

CONTENTS

Letters of Transmittal

TO THE CONGRESS

III,

TO THE PRESIDENT

v

Part One. Maintenance of Peace and Security

DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL	1	<i>U.N. Peacemaking Efforts</i>	34
		<i>Security Council Activity</i>	36
OUTER SPACE	11	<i>U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East</i>	39
SEABED AND OCEAN FLOOR	16	Oman	43
PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT	20	West New Guinea (West Irian)	44
African Problems	20	GENERAL POLITICAL PROBLEMS	47
<i>Manifesto on Southern Africa</i>	20	Peacekeeping	47
<i>South Africa—Apartheid</i>	21	Membership	50
<i>Portuguese—African Disputes in Security Council</i>	24	25th Anniversary of the United Nations	53
Cyprus	26	<i>Special Commemoration Planned</i>	53
Korea	28	<i>Charter Review</i>	56
Middle East	34	<i>Strengthening International Security</i>	57
		Chinese Representation	59

Part Two. Cooperation in the Economic, Social, Scientific, and Human Rights Fields

SECOND DEVELOPMENT DECADE	63	SOCIAL COOPERATION	85
ECONOMIC COOPERATION	66	Social Development and Planning	85
Economic Commission for Europe	66	Social Defense Activities	91
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East	67	Advisory Social Welfare Services	92
Economic Commission for Latin America	67	Housing, Building, and Planning	94
Economic Commission for Africa	69	Narcotic Drugs	96
U.N. Development Program	70	U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees	98
U.N. Conference on Trade and Development	73	UNICEF	101
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade	75	SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION	103
Commodity Trade	76	Advisory Committee on the Appli- cation of Science and Technology to Development	104
U.N. Industrial Development Or- ganization	79	U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation	104
U.N. Population Program	80	Marine Resources	105
Statistical Activities	81	Problems of Human Environment	107
U.N. Institute for Training and Research	82	Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy	108

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS	109	Food and Agriculture Organization	131
PROGRAMING, COORDINATION, AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES	121	International Labor Organization	135
		U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization	138
SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE IAEA	127	World Health Organization	143
		International Civil Aviation Organization	147
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	127	Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization	149
International Finance Corporation	129	International Telecommunication Union	150
International Development Association	130	Universal Postal Union	151
International Monetary Fund	130	World Meteorological Organization	153
		International Atomic Energy Agency	155

Part Three. Trusteeship and Dependent Areas

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL	159	Activities of Specialized Agencies	177
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	159	General Colonialism Resolution	178
Trust Territory of New Guinea	165	TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLONIALISM DECLARATION	178
COMMITTEE OF 24	169	NAMIBIA	180
Visiting Missions	169	PORTUGUESE TERRITORIES	184
Territories Considered in 1969	170	SOUTHERN RHODESIA	186
Activities of Foreign Economic and Other Interests	174		
Military Activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories	176		

Part Four. Legal and Constitutional Developments

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE	189	DIPLOMATIC PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES	201
INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION	192	FRIENDLY RELATIONS	202
INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW	194	DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION	206
LAW OF TREATIES	196	ASSISTANCE IN INTERNATIONAL LAW	211
SPECIAL MISSIONS	198	AIRCRAFT HIJACKING	212

Part Five. Budgetary and Administrative Matters

UNITED NATIONS BUDGET	214	BUDGETS: SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA	221
EXPANSION OF U.N. FACILITIES	216	VOLUNTARY PROGRAMS	222
CONFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION	218	PERSONNEL	223
ASSESSMENTS	219		

Appendixes

I. PRINCIPAL ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS	225	International Court of Justice Secretariat	228
General Assembly	225	II. UNITED STATES REPRESENTATION	229
Security Council	226	United States Missions	229
Economic and Social Council	227	United States Representatives	231
Trusteeship Council	227		

Part I

Maintenance of Peace and Security

Disarmament and Arms Control

Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

In 1969 eight new members—Argentina, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia—were added to the ENDC and on August 26 the name of the organization was changed to Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.¹

There were two sessions of the CCD in 1969: March 18–May 23 and July 3–October 30.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S OPENING MESSAGE

When the Conference opened on March 18 President Nixon sent a message to the U.S. Representative, Gerard Smith, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, outlining the positions to be taken by the American delegation.

¹ Full membership of the CCD: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sweden, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia. Although a member France does not participate. The United States and the U.S.S.R. serve as cochairmen.

The United States would seek an international agreement to ban the emplacement or fixing of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed. The United States supported an “adequately verified” comprehensive test ban and would press for an agreement to cut off the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and to transfer such materials to peaceful purposes. It would also explore the problem of chemical and biological weapons.

SEABED

Considerable progress was made toward a seabed agreement. In a March 18 message to the ENDC, Premier Kosygin announced that the Soviet Union was submitting a draft treaty. This Soviet proposal, introduced the same date, would ban the use “for military purposes” of the seabed and the ocean floor beyond a 12-mile coastal zone. It would specifically prohibit placing on the seabed “objects with nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction” or setting up “military bases, structures, installations, fortifications and other objects of a military nature.” In a provision adapted from the outer space treaty, all installations on the seabed would be open for verification purposes to representa-

tives of treaty parties. The outer limit of the 12-mile zone would be measured from the baselines used in defining territorial waters.

The United States considered complete demilitarization "unworkable and probably harmful," as the U.S. Representative stated. He pointed out that defense against submarines involved placing warning systems on the seabed and that military personnel participated in scientific research in that environment. Moreover, the attempt to ban conventional weapons on the seabed would raise insuperable verification problems. The United States believed, however, that the deployment on the seabed of nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons should be banned.

On May 22 the United States submitted a draft treaty providing that parties would undertake "not to implant or emplace fixed nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction or associated fixed launching platforms" beyond a 3-mile narrow band measured from coastal baselines to be drawn in a manner to be specified. The treaty would not prejudice the rights or claims of states on matters relating to the law of the sea and the seabed. Parties would be free to observe the activities of others without interfering with them. If observation did not settle questions of compliance with treaty provisions, the parties would consult in specific cases. As in the nonproliferation treaty, there would be a review conference at Geneva 5 years after the treaty came into force, and parties could withdraw after giving notice to the U.N. Security Council. There was also an amendments provision modeled on the outer space treaty.

In presenting the draft treaty, the U.S. Representative pointed out that the 3-mile band would leave a larger area subject to prohibition than the 12-mile zone proposed by the Soviet Union. He doubted that the Soviet

verification provisions were practical for the seabed environment. On the other hand the observation and consultation procedures of the U.S. draft treaty would be workable and available to all parties.

In a message of July 3 to the ENDC, President Nixon said that it should not be impossible to find common ground between the U.S. and Soviet draft treaties in spite of the differences between them. He declared that the goal should be to present a sound proposal to the United Nations.

After a full discussion of the two drafts and consultation with their respective allies, the United States and the Soviet Union on October 7 submitted a joint draft treaty. The new draft was a compromise between the positions of the two countries. Article I provided:

1. The states parties to this treaty undertake not to implant or emplace on the seabed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof beyond the maximum contiguous zone provided for in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone any objects with nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction, as well as structures, launching installations or any other facilities specifically designed for storing, testing or using such weapons.

2. The states parties to this treaty undertake not to assist, encourage or induce any state to commit actions prohibited by this treaty and not to participate in any other way in such action.

As defined in the Geneva convention, the "maximum contiguous zone" was 12 miles. The second section was adapted from the limited test ban treaty.

National claims on matters related to the law of the sea would not be affected. Parties would have the right to verify the activity of others, either individually or with the assistance of third parties. Parties would undertake to consult and cooperate on verification. Amendments would come into

force for those that approved them after acceptance by a majority, including the nuclear parties (as in the limited test ban treaty). There was a withdrawal article, but no provision for a review conference.

The Swedish Representative regretted that it had not been possible to agree on complete demilitarization of the seabed and proposed an additional operative article pledging the parties to continue negotiations for a more comprehensive prohibition. The Indian Representative also felt that a provision of this kind should be included in the operative part of the treaty.

Although agreeing with the U.S. view that complete demilitarization was not practicable, the U.K. Representative believed that the joint draft should be clarified by spelling out "weapons of mass destruction" and by redrafting article I in order to eliminate the possibility that another state might implant prohibited weapons in the gap between the 12-mile limit and the territorial waters of a nation where the latter were narrower, e.g., the United States or the United Kingdom (3 miles). Other delegations were also concerned about this "gap."

The Canadian Representative did not think that the verification provisions were adequate and he was supported by the Indian Representative. A Canadian working paper of October 8 proposed specifying the right to request physical inspection if observation and consultation did not suffice and to have recourse to the Security Council if the right of inspection was refused. The Italian Representative also criticized the verification provisions and advocated international machinery. Many delegations favored a review conference and criticized the amendments provisions.

After full discussion in the CCD, the cochairmen introduced a revised joint draft treaty on October 30. The new draft dealt with the "gap" by

adding a provision that the undertakings in article I should "also apply within the contiguous zone . . . except that within that zone they shall not apply to the coastal state." The verification article was amended to permit recourse to the Security Council. A new article provided for a review conference after 5 years. The amendments article was revised to omit the veto power of the nuclear parties.

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

The United States has always taken the position that adequate verification of a test ban would require some on-site inspections. The Soviet Union, however, has maintained since 1963 that a comprehensive test ban could be verified by national means of detection.

Continuing its efforts to find a compromise, Sweden submitted a draft treaty based on the "verification by challenge" approach it had outlined in 1966. All parties would undertake to exchange seismic data, and states could request inspection in order to clarify underground events that were not identified as earthquakes. If inspection was refused, the complaining state could take its case to the Security Council and ultimately withdraw from the treaty if the matter was not clarified to its satisfaction. The U.S. Representative, however, still maintained that it was impossible to verify adequately a comprehensive test ban by seismic means alone, and that effective verification required some obligatory on-site inspections. In his view, the "challenge" approach was not satisfactory since it would place the onus of withdrawal on the complaining state rather than on the state that refused to invite inspection. The Soviet Representative, on the other hand, rejected the Swedish proposal because it envisaged inspection by invitation from the accused state in cer-

tain cases. He still took the position that on-site inspection was unnecessary.

There was a general consensus that international exchange of seismic data would improve capabilities of detecting and identifying underground tests. Sweden had previously initiated limited cooperation in a "nuclear detection club," and Canada proposed that all countries furnish a list of national seismic centers from which they would guarantee to make data available. A Canadian working paper summarized the kind of data that might be supplied.

The U.S. Representative at Geneva welcomed the Canadian proposal, said that the United States would be willing to provide a list of seismic stations that might participate, and made certain suggestions on the kind of data that might be supplied. The United States also furnished information on Project Rulison, an underground nuclear explosion carried out in connection with the seismic investigation proposal it had advanced at the General Assembly in 1968.

The Soviet Representative said that international exchange of seismic data would be useful if a comprehensive test ban agreement could be concluded but that there should be no assessment of the data by an international organ. He reaffirmed Soviet support of the 1965 U.A.R. proposals for an agreement banning underground tests above a threshold of 4.75 seismic magnitude, with a moratorium on tests below that level. The Japanese Representative proposed a threshold test ban without a moratorium, and this idea was welcomed by Pakistan.

FISSIONABLE MATERIALS PRODUCTION CUTOFF AND TRANSFER

On April 8 the U.S. Representative proposed that a cutoff and transfer agreement be verified by the IAEA which would apply its safeguards to the materials used for peaceful purposes and verify shutdown produc-

tion facilities. He also renewed the previous U.S. proposal for the United States and the Soviet Union to transfer fissionable materials to peaceful uses.

Although the U.S. proposal was welcomed by many delegations, the Soviet Union again rejected it. The Soviet Representative claimed that it would not reduce existing arsenals of nuclear weapons or prevent further production of such weapons. He asserted that the proposal resulted from the overproduction of fissionable materials in the United States. He also asked what would happen if a cutoff agreement was not signed by all the nuclear powers.

CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS

Both President Nixon and Premier Kosygin mentioned chemical and biological weapons in their opening messages. ENDC consideration of this question received added impetus from the report of the U.N. Secretary-General on the effects of chemical and biological weapons. This report, requested by the General Assembly in 1968, was prepared by a group of experts from 14 countries and released on July 1. The experts stated that the long-range effects of large-scale use of chemical and biological weapons could not be predicted but that there would be danger both to the country which initiated their use and to the nation that it attacked. They pointed out that any country could develop or acquire a capability to use them and that the danger of proliferation applied both to developing and to developed countries. The use of these weapons had been prohibited by the Geneva protocol of 1925¹ and other international agreements. In addition the General Assembly had adopted resolutions

¹ 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.

opposing the use of these weapons. The experts thought that the prospects for general and complete disarmament would be significantly improved if the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons were ended and they were eliminated from military arsenals.

The Secretary-General endorsed the experts' report and urged U.N. members to take the following steps: (1) appeal to all states to accede to the Geneva protocol; (2) affirm that the protocol banned the use in war of all chemical and biological weapons, including tear gas and other harassing agents; and (3) call on all countries to reach agreement on stopping the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical and biological agents and to eliminate them from military arsenals.

In his July 3 message to the ENDC, President Nixon welcomed the Secretary-General's report without endorsing his views on tear gas and harassing agents. Although the United States had not ratified the Geneva protocol, it had declared during the General Assembly debate of 1966 that it observed the principles of the protocol. At the same time, it stated that it did not interpret the protocol to mean that the use of nonlethal gases or herbicides was prohibited.

The British Representative believed that biological and chemical weapons should be treated separately because the former were "totally indiscriminate" and had never been used in war. On July 10 he submitted a draft convention prohibiting the use of biological methods of warfare and the production, possession, and acquisition of biological agents for hostile purposes. Complaints of violation could be made to the U.N. Secretary-General or the Security Council. Parties would declare their intention to provide assistance to any party that was a victim of biological weapons. A companion

draft Security Council resolution would establish machinery for dealing with complaints.

The U.S. Representative stated that the question of policy on chemical and biological weapons was under study within the U.S. Government and that he must reserve his position. The Soviet Representative questioned the desirability of separate treatment for chemical and biological weapons and said that the use and production of both should be prohibited.

The Swedish Representative endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendations *in toto*, including his interpretation of the Geneva protocol. In her view, the protocol was now part of customary international law. She urged the ENDC to submit to the United Nations a draft declaration confirming the ban on the use of all biological and chemical weapons and a proposal to continue study of their total elimination on the basis of the British draft convention. On August 26, Sweden and 11 other countries—Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, the U.A.R., and Yugoslavia—submitted a draft General Assembly declaration condemning the use in war of all chemical and biological agents as contrary to international law.

On the same day, Canada submitted a draft General Assembly resolution which (1) called for observance of the Geneva protocol, (2) invited all states to accede to it, (3) welcomed the Secretary-General's report and recommended wide publication of that document, (4) recommended the report to the ENDC as a basis for further consideration of the problem, and (5) commended the British draft convention.

General Assembly

In his address before the 24th General Assembly on September 18,

President Nixon emphasized the U.S. determination not only to limit the buildup of strategic arms but to reverse it. He also affirmed U.S. support for "arms control proposals which we hope the Geneva Conference will place before this Assembly with regard to the seabed and chemical and bacteriological weapons." He continued:

We should be under no illusion, however, that arms control will itself bring peace. Wars are fought by soldiers, but they are declared by politicians. Peace also requires progress on those stubbornly persistent political questions—questions that are considered in this room—questions that still divide the world. And it requires other exchanges, not only of words but of deeds, that can gradually weave a fabric of mutual trust among the nations and the peoples of the world.

The General Assembly's First Committee (Political and Security) had four agenda items relating to disarmament before it: (1) general and complete disarmament (under which the draft seabed treaty was considered); (2) urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests; (3) Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States; and (4) chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

U.S. STATEMENT

The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Charles W. Yost, opened the disarmament debate in the First Committee on November 17 by reviewing the extensive activity under way in the disarmament field and pointing to opportunities for further progress in arms control. Among the favorable developments he referred to were the opening of the U.S.-Soviet strategic arms limitation talks (SALT), the favorable prospects for early entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the development at the CCD of the draft seabed arms control treaty, and the continuing sig-

nificant work at the CCD on controlling chemical and biological weapons.

In discussing SALT, which had coincidentally opened the same day that the First Committee debate began, Ambassador Yost quoted from President Nixon's message to the U.S. delegation in Helsinki:

You are embarking upon one of the most momentous negotiations ever entrusted to an American delegation.

. . . you will begin what all of your fellow citizens in the United States and, I believe, all people throughout the world, profoundly hope will be a sustained effort not only to limit the buildup of strategic forces but to reverse it.

Ambassador Yost cited the development of a draft seabed arms control treaty as the year's principal achievement at the CCD. He urged international agreement on the treaty because "it would vastly extend the area of arms control" and bring under its prohibitions an area representing almost three-fourths of the earth's surface. He also noted the marked increase in proposals to limit chemical and biological weapons, characterizing the U.K. draft convention introduced in the CCD as "the most detailed and carefully thought out of these measures."

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Although much of the discussion under the general and complete disarmament item centered on the draft seabed treaty (see pp. 1 and 10), a number of other proposals were also debated and five were incorporated in resolutions.

Noting with satisfaction the beginning of SALT, Mexico and 14 other states, including all the nonaligned members of the CCD, on November 26 submitted a resolution appealing to the U.S.S.R. and the United States "to agree, as an urgent preliminary measure, on a moratorium on further testing and deployment of new offensive and defensive strategic nuclear-weapon systems." On December 8

amendments to the draft were submitted by Canada, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, and the United Kingdom which would have replaced the appeal for a moratorium with language expressing the hope that SALT would lead to agreement on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments and calling upon the U.S.S.R. and the United States "to refrain from any action which might be prejudicial to the achievement of this aim."

The resolution and amendments were put to a vote in the First Committee on December 9. The amendments were rejected by a vote of 40 (U.S. and U.S.S.R.) to 50, with 16 abstentions, and the resolution was then adopted by a vote of 67 to 0, with 40 abstentions (U.S. and U.S.S.R.). The resolution was adopted in plenary on December 16 by a vote of 82 to 0, with 37 abstentions, the two SALT participants again abstaining.

The United States explained that it could not support the original text of the resolution because, although it fully shared the motives of the resolution's sponsors, it did not believe it would be helpful to the SALT negotiators for the General Assembly to attempt to determine just what path the negotiations should follow.

A draft resolution endorsing the enlargement of the CCD and welcoming the eight new members (see p. 1) was submitted on December 1 by Canada, Ecuador, Iran, Mexico, and Nigeria, and slightly revised on December 8. The resolution also expressed the Assembly's conviction that, to effect any future change in the composition of the CCD, "the procedure followed at the 16th session of the General Assembly should be observed." This paragraph reflected the reservations expressed by Mexico and other delegations about the method and timing of the summer enlargement of the CCD, in particular its completion without the prior endorsement of the General Assembly. (At its 16th session in 1961

the General Assembly endorsed the establishment of the ENDC, which did not meet until 1962.)

On December 9 the U.S. Representative, James F. Leonard, noted with appreciation that the new members of the CCD had been universally welcomed during General Assembly debate. While regretting that divergencies had arisen with regard to the procedure followed in the enlargement, he felt the resolution itself was wholly positive and hoped it would obtain unanimous support. The resolution was adopted by the Committee on December 9 by a vote of 101 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions, and in plenary on December 16 by 113 to 0, with 6 abstentions.

On December 8 Italy, Ireland, and Japan submitted a draft resolution similar to those adopted in previous years calling on governments to intensify their efforts for "a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." The resolution, as later amended, also declared "the Decade of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade," and requested the CCD to prepare a comprehensive program to provide guidelines for its future work. The First Committee adopted the resolution on December 9 by a vote of 98 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions; the plenary vote on December 16 was 104 (U.S.) to 0, with 13 abstentions.

On December 1 Malta submitted two resolutions that requested CCD studies of radiological and laser weapons. The First Committee approved the resolutions on December 9 by votes of 51 to 0, with 52 abstentions (U.S.), and 51 to 0, with 53 abstentions (U.S.), respectively. On December 16 the plenary adopted the resolutions by votes of 79 to 0, with 37 abstentions, and 72 to 0, with 44 abstentions. The United States abstained on these resolutions because it believed consideration of radiological and laser weapons, which have not been developed as practical

weapons, would distract from more urgent items on the CCD agenda.

SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

The General Assembly repeated its 1968 request to the CCD to seek as a matter of urgency a treaty banning underground tests. On November 20 Sweden introduced a 13-power draft resolution similar to test ban resolutions of previous sessions. It was adopted in the First Committee on December 4 by a vote of 94 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions, and in plenary on December 16 by a vote of 114 to 1, with 4 abstentions.

On November 17 Canada and 27 other states submitted a draft resolution aimed at "the eventual establishment of an effective worldwide exchange of seismological information which would facilitate the achievement of a comprehensive test ban," which was based on previous Canadian proposals in the CCD. The resolution requested the Secretary-General to seek information from states concerning seismic stations whose records they would be prepared to supply on the basis of guaranteed availability. The First Committee adopted this resolution on December 4 by a vote of 78 (U.S.) to 8 (U.S.S.R.), with 9 abstentions. The plenary vote on December 16 was 99 (U.S.) to 7, with 13 abstentions.

CONFERENCE OF NON-NUCLEAR-WEAPON STATES

This topic, which had its origin in the 1968 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (NNC), consisted of three subitems: (1) the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the results of the conference, (2) his report on the provision of peaceful nuclear explosion services through the IAEA, and (3) his report on the role nuclear technology can play in the economic and scientific advancement of developing

countries. Although a large number of delegations commented on the efforts by the Secretary-General and the IAEA to be responsive to many of the NNC recommendations, in general there was substantially less debate than at the 23d General Assembly.

The first of the two resolutions adopted in connection with this item, an "omnibus" resolution on the implementation of the NNC resolutions, was submitted on December 5 and sponsored by the Netherlands and 11 other states. The resolution commended the study on the possible contributions of nuclear technology to the advancement of developing countries; recommended a further search by the IAEA, the IBRD, the UNDP, and other financing institutions for ways to promote and finance sound nuclear projects in developing countries; and requested further consideration of the subject at the 25th General Assembly. The resolution was approved on December 10 in the First Committee by a vote of 87 (U.S.) to 0, with 11 abstentions, and was adopted in plenary on December 16 by a vote of 110 (U.S.) to 0, with 10 abstentions.

On December 8 the United States, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Mexico, and the Netherlands submitted a draft resolution dealing with the provision of peaceful nuclear explosion services through the IAEA. Ambassador William B. Buffum, the U.S. Representative, said that the United States continued to believe that "the IAEA is the appropriate organization to discharge the responsibilities anticipated for an international body in article V of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons." The IAEA should also, in the U.S. view, "be the focal point for framing the agreement or agreements called for by article V." The First Committee approved the resolution on December 10 by a vote of 68 (U.S.) to 0, with 33 abstentions;

the vote in plenary on December 16 was 80 to 1, with 37 abstentions.

CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS

Both in public debate and in private consultations, the General Assembly gave extensive consideration to the subject of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. The topic had three subitems: (1) report of the CCD; (2) conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and on the destruction of such weapons; and (3) report of the Secretary-General. All told, six draft resolutions were submitted, four of them to be withdrawn as a result of compromises prior to voting.

President Nixon's November 25 statement announcing the U.S. intention to ratify the Geneva protocol of 1925 and renouncing the use of all methods of biological warfare was acclaimed by many delegations. The U.K. Representative, speaking on November 25, said that the President's decisions "cannot fail . . . to give great impetus to our work in the field of arms control and disarmament." He expressed particular gratification that the United States had associated itself with the U.K. draft convention which would ban the use of biological methods of warfare.

On September 19 the Soviet Foreign Minister had proposed a draft convention which would prohibit the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological weapons and would provide for the destruction of existing stockpiles. In the First Committee, the Soviet Union and its allies submitted a resolution endorsing this proposal.

In the course of debate several delegations alluded to the absence of verification provisions in the Soviet draft convention. "The establishment

of a verification system," the Japanese Representative told the First Committee on November 24, "poses the most complicated problem in our task of concluding a treaty on the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons. In our view, a serious defect in the draft treaty to ban chemical and biological weapons presented by the Soviet Union to the United Nations General Assembly lies in the fact that it entirely fails to deal with verification."

The Soviet draft resolution was withdrawn, and Italy decided not to seek a vote on a resolution urging all states to accede to the Geneva protocol and inviting all parties to that agreement to consider that in the meantime its prohibitions applied to all countries which refrained from violating it.

On December 8 the United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. joined 29 other countries in cosponsoring a resolution that combined the main features of a previous proposal by Hungary, Mongolia, and Poland and a draft resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom and eight other countries. The new 32-power draft resolution, *inter alia*, called for strict observance of the principles and objectives of the Geneva protocol, invited all states which had not done so to accede to the protocol or ratify it, welcomed the Secretary-General's report, requested that the report be widely distributed and publicized, and recommended it to the CCD as a basis for further consideration. The resolution also noted the Soviet and U.K. draft conventions and requested the CCD "to give urgent consideration to reaching agreement on the prohibitions and other measures referred to in the draft conventions . . . and other relevant proposals."

Ambassador Leonard drew attention to the fact that the language of the resolution was "carefully drawn to ensure that in the CCD the discussion will be completely open and without prejudice for or against any

of the various substantive proposals which that body may wish to take up." The resolution was approved by the First Committee on December 10 by a vote of 97 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions, and adopted in plenary on December 16 by 120 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention.

The other resolution adopted under this item was introduced by Sweden, submitted on November 25, and cosponsored by 21 states including the 12 nonaligned members of the CCD. This resolution was an effort to define the scope of the Geneva protocol's coverage, and in particular to dispel uncertainty about whether the protocol prohibited the use in war of riot control agents (tear gas) and herbicides. The operative paragraph declared "as contrary to the generally recognized rules of international law, as embodied in the [Geneva] Protocol . . . , the use in international armed conflicts of: (a) Any chemical agents of warfare—chemical substances, whether gaseous, liquid or solid—which might be employed because of their direct toxic effects on man, animals or plants; (b) Any biological agents of warfare"

Although the United States supported the principles and objectives of the Geneva protocol, it did not consider that the protocol prohibited the use in war of riot control agents or herbicides. It therefore opposed the Swedish resolution. On December 10 Ambassador Leonard explained the reasons for U.S. opposition:

First, we consider it inappropriate for the General Assembly to attempt to interpret international law as embodied in the Geneva protocol, or any other treaty, by means of a resolution. Second, we do not believe that the conclusion contained in the resolution with respect to what is prohibited under generally recognized rules of international law as embodied in the Geneva protocol can be justified.

On December 10 the First Committee approved the resolution by a

vote of 58 to 3 (Australia, Portugal, U.S.), with 35 abstentions. On December 16 the Assembly adopted the resolution in plenary by a vote of 80 to 3 (Australia,¹ Portugal,¹ U.S.), with 36 abstentions (Austria,¹ Belgium,¹ Bolivia, Canada,¹ Chile,¹ China,¹ Denmark,¹ El Salvador, France,¹ Greece,¹ Iceland,¹ Israel,¹ Italy,¹ Japan, Laos, Liberia,¹ Luxembourg,¹ Malagasy Republic,¹ Malawi,¹ Malaysia,¹ Netherlands,¹ New Zealand,¹ Nicaragua, Norway,¹ Paraguay,¹ Philippines, Sierra Leone,¹ Singapore,¹ South Africa,¹ Swaziland,¹ Thailand,¹ Tunisia,¹ Turkey,¹ United Kingdom,¹ Uruguay, and Venezuela¹).

DRAFT SEABED ARMS CONTROL TREATY

The CCD report to the General Assembly contained as an annex the draft seabed arms control treaty developed in Geneva (see pp. 1-3 above). At the opening of the disarmament debate on November 16 Ambassador Yost made it clear that the United States expected the draft to be reviewed carefully by the General Assembly. "For our part," he said, "we . . . will be prepared to consider further modifications, if they should seem called for, to meet concerns of the international community."

A number of working papers were submitted in connection with the draft treaty. Canada and Brazil submitted papers on the provisions of article III concerning verification; Sweden resubmitted its proposal for a new article which would bind parties to further negotiations; Mexico submitted a paper containing proposals on several aspects of the treaty, among them provisions to assure that the seabed treaty would be consistent with the Treaty of Tlatelolco; and Argentina submitted a paper containing a revised version of articles I and II and adding an article IV.

On December 12 the United

¹ Party to the protocol.

States introduced a resolution co-sponsored by 36 states that welcomed the submission to the General Assembly of the draft seabed treaty. The resolution also called upon the CCD "to take into account all proposals and suggestions that have been made at this session of the General Assembly and to continue its work

on this subject so that the text of a draft treaty can be submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration." The First Committee approved this resolution by acclamation on December 12, and the Assembly adopted it in plenary session on December 16 by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions.

Outer Space

1969 brought dramatic progress in the exploration of the moon and other celestial bodies. In his address to the 24th General Assembly on September 18, President Nixon said:

Of all of man's great enterprises, none lends itself more logically or more compellingly to international cooperation than the venture into space. Here, truly, mankind is one, as fellow creatures from the planet Earth exploring the heavens that all of us enjoy.

The journey of Apollo 11 to the moon and back was not an end, but the beginning.

The U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space,¹ with active U.S. participation in every phase of its work, continued to demonstrate its value as a forum for international consideration of ways for member states to profit from the benefits and solve the problems implicit in the use of outer space. The Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites met twice to study and report on technical/economic and political/legal/social implications of direct satellite broadcasting. The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee made con-

structive recommendations to promote the practical applications of space technology. The Legal Subcommittee continued its efforts to negotiate a convention on liability for damage caused by objects launched into outer space.

Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites

The United States contributed to the studies and the consensus reports of both sessions of the Direct Broadcast Satellites Working Group in 1969. The first session was held in New York February 11-20 to study and report on technical and economic considerations in the development of direct broadcast satellites. The Working Group made some rough estimates on costs of receivers and systems and concluded that, while direct broadcasting to augmented home receivers would be technologically feasible by 1975 and possibly earlier for community receivers, direct broadcasting from satellites to unaugmented home receivers was not foreseen for the period 1970-85. The report noted the urgency for the ITU to consider radio frequency requirements for satellite

¹ Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States.

broadcasting and the need for the World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications in 1971 (see p. 150) to make the necessary provisions if satellite broadcasting is to be accommodated on an operational basis.

A second session of the Working Group was held in Geneva July 28–August 7 to discuss the social, cultural, legal, and other implications of direct satellite broadcasting. It concluded that there was a potential for positive applications of direct broadcasting, but stressed the need for international cooperation and for strengthened international arrangements. The report of the Working Group recommended further study of legal, political, cultural, social, commercial, and copyright questions involved in direct broadcasting as well as of the potential contribution of direct broadcasting to help meet the needs of developing countries.

Scientific and Technical Subcommittee

The sixth session of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee was held in New York March 17–28. The Subcommittee, which included an active U.S. delegation, made several recommendations under five general headings: (1) Exchange of Information, (2) Encouragement of International Programs, (3) International Sounding Rocket Launching Facilities, (4) Education and Training, and (5) Future Work of the Subcommittee.

Under "Exchange of Information" the Subcommittee studied two reports prepared by the Secretariat: a report by member states on national and cooperative international space activities; and a review of the activities and resources of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other competent international bodies, relating to the peaceful uses of outer

space. The Subcommittee requested the Secretariat to bring these reports up to date annually and distribute them immediately after completion.

The major work of the Subcommittee came under the heading "Encouragement of International Programs." Acting on proposals by India and Sierra Leone, cosponsored by the United States, the Subcommittee recommended that (1) the Secretary-General appoint to the Outer Space Affairs Division a full-time specialist to promote practical applications of space technology, report on them to the Subcommittee, and maintain liaison between U.N. components and member states seeking information and assistance in this area; (2) member states consider designating an office or individual within their governments as a point of contact in this area; (3) member states take advantage of panel meetings to be organized in collaboration with appropriate U.N. agencies to consider specific topics of space application; and (4) the Secretary-General, with the help of the new specialist, assess needs for assistance in space application projects, particularly in developing countries, and consult with concerned U.N. bodies on convening in 1971 or soon thereafter a panel to discuss the applicability of remote sensing to the management of food resources.

Under the third heading, "International Sounding Rocket Launching Facilities," the Subcommittee recommended that the United Nations continue to sponsor the Thumba Equatorial Rocket Launching Station in India and, noting the work already accomplished by Argentina in developing sounding rocket facilities, expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would appoint a group of scientists to visit and report on the eligibility for U.N. sponsorship of the Mar Chiquita Station, near Mar del Plata, Argentina.

Under the heading "Education and Training," the Subcommittee re-

iterated its invitation to member states to make their specific training interests and needs known to the Secretary-General and recommended that the latter provide prompt and full implementation of the tasks entrusted to the Secretariat concerning dissemination of information on educational and training opportunities.

The Subcommittee agreed with respect to "Future Work of the Subcommittee," that Subcommittee members wishing to do so should send to the Secretariat working papers on subjects of general interest in this field, to be circulated 2 months in advance of each Subcommittee session.

Legal Subcommittee

The Legal Subcommittee held its eighth session in Geneva, June 9–July 4. The Subcommittee continued its work on a draft convention on liability for damages caused by the launching of objects into outer space but was unable to record substantial progress. Questions concerning settlement of unresolved claims, applicable law, international organizations, and limitation of liability continued to be both controversial and beyond the reach of agreement.

The most difficult problems concerned settlement of claims and applicable law. As the United States pointed out, if the convention is to fulfill the purpose of ensuring prompt and adequate payment of reasonable claims for damages arising in connection with outer space activities, it must make adequate provision for promptly resolving claims not settled by negotiation. Together with other Atlantic community countries and Japan, the United States proposed that if adequate payment were not made within one year, the claimant state should be entitled to invoke the jurisdiction of an independent and objective arbitral tribunal to decide

the issues of responsibility and amount of compensation. The United States proposed that the arbitral tribunal's objectivity and ability to reach a just decision without delay should be assured by including on it one member each designated by the launching and claimant states and a third, the chairman, to be designated by agreement of the two states or, failing agreement, by the U.N. Secretary-General. The Soviet Union insisted that the arbitral body must be composed according to a "principle of parity" according to which the claimant and launching state would each appoint a member and the resulting two-man body would take decisions only if both were agreed. The Soviets, moreover, vigorously opposed empowering the tribunal to hand down a decision legally binding upon the two parties.

A second major question concerned the law to be applied in determining what elements of a claim should be compensated under the convention once responsibility had been established. The United States asserted that a just formula would take into account both the established practice of nations in presenting and paying international claims as well as the law of the place where the damage occurred. Thus, for example, in presenting a claim on behalf of an American citizen injured by the reentering fragment of a vehicle launched by another country, the United States would present a claim including elements that would be compensable under traditional U.S. claims practice and the law of the state where the injury took place. The U.S.S.R. urged a formula under which compensability would be determined in accordance with the law of the launching state; when most members objected that that law was irrelevant, the Soviets offered the alternative of a simple reference to international claims practice, but most civil law countries found this unacceptable on the grounds of lack of precision and susceptibility to abuse.

Outer Space Committee

Two further problems arising from the effort to complete a satisfactory treaty instrument continued to be difficult. One was the question of the treatment of claims arising from injuries caused by the space activities of an international organization, a subject of considerable importance to European states in view of the development possibilities inherent in the European Space Research Organization. A final problem concerned a limitation on liability. Here, opposition mounted to a 1962 U.S. proposal for a specified ceiling establishing a maximum amount that could be presented under the convention to a launching state for damages arising from a single incident, some countries asserting that a ceiling was inconsistent with article VII of the Outer Space Treaty. It was generally considered within the Committee that a solution to the settlement and applicable law issues would make possible resolution of the international organization and ceiling questions.

The Legal Subcommittee also briefly discussed a number of topics in the context of its general study of definition and utilization of outer space. It asked the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee to undertake a study of a French proposal for a registration system applicable to outer space vehicles. It requested the U.N. Secretary-General to prepare background papers on the delimitation question and on the jurisdiction of the U.N. specialized agencies where the agencies involved considered their competence inadequate to permit them to take into account outer space activities. Czechoslovakia and the U.A.R. proposed the establishment of a new specialized agency for outer space activities; Argentina suggested a study of the legal status of material removed from the moon; and Poland called for further work on the legal regime applying to manned lunar activities. Consideration of these proposals was deferred to a later session.

The full Committee met in New York September 8-17 under the chairmanship of the Austrian Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Heinrich Haymerle. On September 17 the Committee unanimously endorsed the reports of the Direct Broadcast Satellites Working Group and the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. The latter endorsement was subject to reservations about where the new space applications expert should be placed in the Secretariat and questions concerning the future work of the Subcommittee.

The Committee decided to defer a final report on the work of the Legal Subcommittee until after a further effort to reach agreement on a liability convention. To this end the Committee held a resumed session between November 12 and December 5 and conducted informal consultations on the draft liability convention. In an agreed statement read by the chairman to the Outer Space Committee on December 5, he reported that there had been "a certain *rapprochement* of views," and that "there was agreement that the main outstanding issues in the elaboration of the convention were: first, the settlement of claims; secondly, the question of the applicable law; thirdly, the question of a limit on liability; and, fourthly, the problem of liability in connection with the activities of international organizations in the exploration and use of outer space."

General Assembly

EARTH RESOURCE SURVEYING

In his September 18 address to the 24th General Assembly, President Nixon announced the U.S. intention

to share "both the adventures and the benefits of space." He said:

As an example of our plans, we have determined to take actions with regard to earth resource satellites as this program proceeds and fulfills its promise.

The purpose of those actions is that this program will be dedicated to produce information not only for the United States but also for the world community. We shall be putting several proposals in this respect before the United Nations.

Addressing the First Committee on December 10, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador William B. Buffum, reviewed the development of the U.S. experimental earth resources technology satellite program which, when the satellite ERTS-A is launched sometime in 1972, will mark the first attempt to obtain earth resources data through telemetry. He explained the practical uses of remote sensing techniques to aid, for example, in the identification of areas of crop diseases, the location of mineral deposits, and the surveying of forests, rangelands, vegetation, soils, river basins, and ground water. He described a number of actions the United States proposed to take that would parallel the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee which had been endorsed by the Outer Space Committee in September. These included: (1) the convening of an international workshop on earth resources survey systems in the spring of 1971 to which U.N. member states would be invited; (2) expansion of NASA's international fellowship program to include courses at U.S. universities on the fundamentals of remote sensing; (3) provision of briefings and exhibits on earth resources surveying for U.N. members, the Secretariat, and specialized agency representatives; (4) sharing of information on earth resources surveying and international cooperation in solving technical problems such as data processing, interpretation, and utilization; (5) support of the Outer Space Com-

mittee recommendations for promoting practical applications of space technology and liaison on this subject between interested member states and relevant U.N. agencies; and (6) suggesting consideration of the establishment of a central data facility to serve U.N. agencies already active in the resources field.

ASSEMBLY ACTION

The General Assembly on December 16 adopted by a vote of 105 (U.S.) to 9, with 3 abstentions, a resolution cosponsored by the United States and seven others and forwarded to the General Assembly by the First Committee. The resolution called for the sharing of experience in the field of remote earth resources surveying and for international cooperation in the analysis, dissemination, and application of data obtained. It also called for further studies by the Outer Space Committee on means of cooperation, particularly in the U.N. framework, to make available the benefits of this new technology to both developed and developing countries.

An omnibus space resolution, cosponsored by the United States and 25 others, was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly on the same date. *Inter alia* it endorsed the recommendations contained in the report of the Outer Space Committee; noted with appreciation the two reports of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites, which was scheduled to meet again in 1970 to consider further the implications of direct broadcast satellites in social, cultural, legal, and other areas; welcomed the efforts of member states to share with other interested members the space ventures and the practical benefits of their space technology programs; and urged the Outer Space Committee to complete the draft convention on liability for consideration by the 25th General Assembly.

Seabed and Ocean Floor

On December 21, 1968, the 23d General Assembly created a 42-member Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction¹ replacing an *Ad Hoc* Committee in this field. The Assembly requested the Seabed Committee to make recommendations with respect to (1) legal principles that would promote international cooperation in the exploration and use of the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and the economic and other requirements that such a regime should satisfy in order to meet the interests of humanity as a whole; (2) ways and means of promoting the exploitation and use of the resources of this area; (3) studies carried out in the field of exploration and research; (4) prevention of the marine pollution which may result from such exploration and exploitation; and (5) reservation of the seabed exclusively for peaceful purposes, taking into account the studies and international negotiations being undertaken in the field of disarmament.

Seabed Committee

The Seabed Committee held four sessions in New York in 1969. At the first (February 6-7) Ambassador H. S. Amerasinghe of Ceylon was elected chairman, and two sub-

¹ Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, France, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Malagasy Republic, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia.

committees of the whole were established—a Legal Subcommittee and an Economic and Technical Subcommittee—chaired by Ambassador Galindo Pohl of El Salvador and Ambassador Roger Denorme of Belgium respectively.

At its second session (March 10-28), the Committee continued the effort of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to agree on legal principles. The Committee also considered the questions of progress in the techniques of exploration and exploitation, and international cooperation with respect to scientific research.

As a result of a general consensus that more work needed to be done informally to arrive at an agreed set of legal principles, consultations were held among a representative group of delegations, including the United States, between the end of the Committee's second session and the beginning of its third (August 11-29). These consultations took place under the auspices of the Chairman of the Legal Subcommittee, and an informal drafting group¹ meeting in June and July produced a report which was used by the Legal Subcommittee in August as the basis for its discussion of principles.

At both the March and August sessions of the Legal Subcommittee, the U.S. Representative reaffirmed support for principles along the lines of those proposed by the United States on June 28, 1968, and those worked out by the Western Group at the August 1968 session of the *Ad Hoc* Seabed Committee. The U.S. Representative stressed the need for a principle regarding the establishment of an internationally agreed precise boundary of the area beyond na-

¹ Brazil, India, Libya, Norway, U.S.S.R., and United States.

tional jurisdiction which, while reflecting no conclusion regarding the location of such a boundary, would lay the foundation for careful international consideration of this matter. He also emphasized that any international regime established should provide due protection for the integrity of investments in exploitation of the area beyond the limits of national jurisdiction undertaken prior to the establishment of any boundary.

The Legal Subcommittee set forth in its report a "synthesis" of related formulations reflecting points of agreement and disagreement with respect to principles. It was agreed that there is an area of the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, but there was no agreement on the inclusion of a principle referring to the establishment of a precise boundary for this area, a number of Latin American countries opposing any reference to the boundary.

It was agreed that the area beyond national jurisdiction should not be subject to national appropriation and that no state should exercise or claim sovereignty or sovereign rights over any part of it, but there was no agreement on whether a set of principles should rule out a state's granting or exercising exclusive rights in the area or whether the area should be termed the "common heritage of mankind." (The latter concept was urged by most of the developing countries.) It was agreed that there are principles and norms of international law that apply to the seabed beyond national jurisdiction, but there was no agreement on the extent to which existing international law would apply.

There was agreement that the seabed should be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes but no agreement on the scope of the prohibition of activities. Agreement was reached on the need to establish a regime for the area beyond national jurisdiction and on the use of the resources for the benefit of mankind irrespective of the

geographic location of states and taking into account the special interests and needs of the developing countries. It was not agreed whether the regime should apply to the area as a whole or only to its resources.

Freedom of scientific research was generally agreed as well as the idea of promoting international cooperation in this respect. The point was made by some countries, however, that a careful distinction should be made between scientific research and commercial exploration. Differences of opinion were noted on the relation between general freedom of scientific research and possible conditions that might be attached to it with respect to accessibility, availability, and dissemination of the results of the research.

The concepts of reasonable regard for the interests of states in their exercise of the freedom of the high seas and the need for the adoption of appropriate safeguards against pollution were accepted.

Both the full Committee and the Economic and Technical Subcommittee, which also met in August, considered primarily the Secretary-General's "Study on the question of establishing in due time appropriate international machinery for the promotion of the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the seabed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and the use of these resources in the interests of mankind." This study set forth some of the considerations involved in three possible types of international machinery: a registration office, a licensing agency, and an operational agency. While neither the Economic and Technical Subcommittee nor the full Committee reached any definite conclusions with respect to this study, it was agreed to continue considering the question of international machinery and to request the Secretary-General to pursue his study of this matter further.

The U.S. delegation advanced the preliminary view that "our objectives could be accomplished by machinery, as a part of an international regime, that would include an international registry of claims governed by agreed criteria and supplemented by appropriate procedures." The United States emphasized that such machinery should be appropriate to the task it was to perform, neither more nor less than needed. The regime should include provision for dedication as feasible and practicable of a portion of the value of the resources recovered from the deep seabed to international community purposes.

It should encourage the development of supporting services such as navigation aids, weather information, and rescue capability. Operational standards would have to be set. Investments would have to be encouraged and their integrity assured. Criteria for exploitation should include the types of resources to be exploited; the size of a claim, its duration, and termination; the accommodation of multiple uses of the seabed and water column; the eligibility and capability of a claimant; the relationship between exploration and exploitation rights; and minimum performance requirements. Liability for damages arising from exploitation of deep seabed resources and procedures for settlement of international disputes should also be provided. Finally, there should be criteria aimed at conservation and the avoidance of pollution. The U.S. Representative expressed opposition to any international agency that would itself explore and exploit seabed resources.

The Economic and Technical Subcommittee also considered the "Draft Comprehensive Outline of the Scope of the Long-Term and Expanded Program of Oceanic Exploration and Research, including the International Decade of Ocean Exploration" prepared by UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. The Long-Term and Expanded Pro-

gram has as a primary objective enhanced knowledge of the ocean. It is essentially a program of coordination of national projects. The International Decade was proposed by the United States and unanimously accepted by the General Assembly in 1968.

At this same session the United States distributed a set of preliminary maps published by the U.S. Geological Survey showing the world distribution of subsea mineral resources.

The report of the Seabed Committee was issued in October and included reports by the Subcommittees and by the Secretary-General on international machinery. The Committee noted that it had not been possible to make specific recommendations on the substantive matters before it, although the synthesis contained in the report of the Legal Subcommittee "reflects the measure of progress achieved in the sustained attempt to arrive at a formulation of principles." The Committee expressed the hope that it could continue with its deliberations in 1970, giving further attention to all of the subjects entrusted to it.

The Seabed Committee held its fourth session on November 11, 12, 18, 19, and 20 to consider the results of the negotiations on seabed arms control which had taken place at the CCD. Both the Soviet and U.S. Representatives gave explanatory statements in support of their draft Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, which had been transmitted to the General Assembly as a part of the CCD's report. The U.S. Representative noted that while the United States had no objection to a preliminary discussion of this matter in the Seabed Committee, the more appropriate time and place for detailed consideration of the draft treaty was in the Assembly's First Committee during its debate on the

disarmament item (see p. 10). Nevertheless, general views were exchanged and the Committee recorded them in an addendum to its report.

General Assembly

The First Committee of the 24th General Assembly discussed the seabed item October 31–November 10 and December 2. Five draft resolutions and six amendments thereto (with many revisions) were tabled. Four of these (as revised and amended) were brought to a vote and adopted by the Committee on December 2. These same four were later adopted without change by the General Assembly on December 15.

LAW OF THE SEA AND SEABED CONFERENCE RESOLUTION

This resolution requested the Secretary-General to “ascertain the views of member states on the desirability of convening at an early date a conference on the law of the sea to review the regimes of the high seas, the continental shelf, the territorial sea and contiguous zone, fishing and conservation of the living resources of the high seas, particularly in order to arrive at a clear, precise and internationally accepted definition of the area of the seabed and ocean floor which lies beyond national jurisdiction, in the light of the international regime to be established for that area.” The resolution was adopted in committee by a vote of 58 to 13 (U.S.), with 40 abstentions, and in plenary by 65 to 12 (U.S.), with 30 abstentions.

In explaining the U.S. vote against this resolution, Ambassador Christopher H. Phillips pointed out that the question to be put by the Secretary-General to member states was framed in a prejudicial way as it requested states' views on the desirability of “a” conference which could

lead to holding a single conference dealing with the full range of law-of-the-sea issues, including seabeds. Such a single conference could reduce the prospect of making progress on any of the issues.

SEABED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

This resolution, introduced by Belgium and cosponsored by 37 states, referred major issues back to the Seabed Committee, including the task of preparing a balanced statement of principles designed to promote international cooperation in the exploration and use of the deep seabed. It was adopted in committee by a vote of 112 (U.S.) to 0, and in plenary by 109 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention.

The United States supported this resolution as a part of its overall objective to refer all substantive matters back to the Seabed Committee. This position stemmed from the judgment that further work remained to be done, including the formulation of a set of legal principles, before the General Assembly should try to make substantive decisions with respect to the seabed.

INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY RESOLUTION

This resolution, introduced by Kuwait and cosponsored by 48 states, requested the Secretary-General to prepare a further study on various types of international machinery, particularly machinery having jurisdiction over the peaceful uses of the deep seabed including the power to control all activities relating to exploration and exploitation of seabed resources. It was adopted in committee by a vote of 99 (U.S.) to 1, with 13 abstentions, and in plenary by 100 (U.S.) to 0, with 11 abstentions.

The United States voted for this resolution since the followup study would deal with various types of international machinery, not just machinery with extensive powers, such as

was singled out for express mention. The U.S. Representative repeated in the General Assembly support for machinery that would include an international registry governed by agreed rules and criteria and reiterated U.S. opposition to an international operating agency.

MORATORIUM RESOLUTION

This resolution, introduced by Mexico and cosponsored by 11 states, declared that, pending the establishment of an international regime, states and persons, physical or juridical, were bound to refrain from all activities of exploitation on the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

The United States vigorously opposed this resolution which was

adopted in committee by a vote of 52 to 27 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions, and in plenary by 62 to 28 (U.S.), with 28 abstentions. The U.S. Representative stated that such a resolution would make more difficult the achievement of progress on seabed issues and could stimulate countries to make expansive unilateral claims of jurisdiction. He maintained that exploitation would not prejudice the solution of issues under examination in the Seabed Committee, such as the development of an international regime, and that a freeze on exploitation activities would have the effect of discouraging the exploitation and use of the seabed beyond national jurisdiction, the encouragement of which was the express object of the Assembly's resolutions in December 1968.

Peaceful Settlement

African Problems

MANIFESTO ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

An effort by the African nations in 1969 to express their views on and hopes for the southern portion of the African Continent resulted in a manifesto which was subsequently "welcomed" by the 24th General Assembly.

Steps Leading to Assembly Resolution

The 5th Summit Conference of East and Central African Heads of State and Government was held at Lusaka, Zambia, April 14-16 to consider the problems existing in southern Africa. A document called the "Manifesto on Southern Africa," but commonly referred to as the Lusaka Manifesto, was developed at the

meeting and all 14 participating nations¹ subscribed to it. Subsequently the Manifesto was adopted by the 41 members of the Organization of African Unity at the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government held at Addis Ababa September 6-10. Although the Manifesto contains some far-reaching recommendations, it is generally considered moderate in tone.

On October 6 the President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon, Ahmadou Ahidjo, in his capacity as President of the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, presented the Manifesto to the General Assembly with the request that the membership associate itself with the

¹ Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia.

document. On November 20 a draft resolution sponsored by 48 nations was introduced and adopted by the General Assembly without prior committee consideration. The resolution welcomed the Manifesto and recommended it to the attention of all states and peoples. The near-unanimous vote was 113 (U.S.) to 2 (Portugal and South Africa), with 2 abstentions (Cuba and Malawi).

U.S. Position

During the course of the 24th Assembly, U.S. views on the Manifesto were set forth on two occasions. The first statement was made by Ambassador Phillips in the Fourth Committee on October 16 during the debate on Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, and the Portuguese territories. The second was made by Ambassador Yost on November 20 in plenary prior to the vote on the resolution.

Both statements praised the Manifesto as "one of the most important political and human documents" to emerge from Africa and declared that the United States was in agreement with many of its points. Some of the points applauded by the U.S. Representatives were: (1) the aim that the peoples of southern Africa "shall be free to determine for themselves their own institutions of self-government"; (2) the desire to give these individuals "an opportunity to be men—not white men, brown men, yellow men, or black men"; (3) the categorical rejection of racialism; and (4) the preference "to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than to kill."

Ambassador Yost also pointed out, however, that the United States did not agree with all the views expressed in the document, e.g., certain references to alleged Portuguese activities and intentions, and the recommendation that South Africa be excluded from the United Nations and its agencies. He stated that "my Government does not approve the use of force either to advance or to obstruct the course of justice in southern Africa"

and reaffirmed the U.S. belief that "contact, dialogue and persuasion are the right means" to employ in seeking self-determination and nonracialism for the area.

SOUTH AFRICA—APARTHEID

South Africa's policies of racial discrimination were considered during 1969 by the General Assembly's Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa,¹ by the 24th General Assembly, and by other bodies in the U.N. system, including ECOSOC commissions and the specialized agencies.

Special Committee on Apartheid

The Committee began its work for the year on January 14. During the course of the year, the chairman and rapporteur brought to the attention of the Committee a number of developments relating to South African Government policies of apartheid, including the sentencing at Pietermaritzburg on March 26 of 11 Africans under the Terrorism Act; the trial of the editor-in-chief of the *Rand Daily Mail* and one of his reporters for publication of a series of articles in 1965 dealing with the ill-treatment of prisoners in South Africa; and the buildup of South Africa's military power and the assistance it was receiving from a number of countries.

On March 17 and 18 the Committee held a special session at U.N. Headquarters attended by invited representatives of church, student, trade union, and other nongovernmental organizations as well as representatives of other U.N. bodies. The stated purposes of the session were:

¹ Established by the General Assembly in 1962 to keep the question of apartheid under continuing review and to submit reports as appropriate to the General Assembly and the Security Council. The members are Algeria, Costa Rica, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, and Somalia.

(a) To provide an opportunity for an intensive discussion of the problem of apartheid and the international involvement in South Africa;

(b) To provide an opportunity for the consideration of the means for international action against apartheid and for consultations with experts on certain significant trends in South Africa;

(c) To provide the Committee with more information on the activities of nongovernmental organizations and on the forces which impede these activities against apartheid, and suggestions on ways in which the United Nations can help promote such activities;

(d) To provide nongovernmental organizations with greater awareness of U.N. activities with regard to apartheid, so that they can cooperate more closely with the Special Committee.

The Committee also took special note during the year of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (March 21) and of South Africa Freedom Day (June 26).

In its report to the General Assembly, the Special Committee discussed its activities during the year and set forth various conclusions and recommendations. The Committee noted that the United Nations had in the past followed three main lines of activity in dealing with the problem of apartheid: (1) measures such as the arms embargo and economic coercion to oblige South Africa to renounce its policies; (2) moral, political, and material assistance "to the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle to achieve their inalienable rights"; and (3) dissemination of information to secure full understanding and support for the efforts directed toward the elimination of apartheid.

While concluding that these lines constituted the most effective and appropriate courses of action, the Committee noted that the arms embargo and the recommendation by the General Assembly for economic sanctions had not had the desired effect and considered that, "at the present stage, the United Nations and member states can make the most significant contribution to the solution of

the grave situation in South Africa, and in southern Africa as a whole, by providing effective material assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their movement for liberation in their legitimate struggle." The Committee further suggested that the various committees with competence on southern African questions hold a joint session during 1970 "to consider the interrelationships of the problems of southern Africa and propose measures for greater coordination and more effective action." It also suggested that consideration be given to the enlargement of the Special Committee, to include, among others, permanent members of the Security Council and main trading partners of South Africa.

General Assembly

On October 21 the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly began its consideration of the apartheid policies of the South African Government. The Committee had before it the annual report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, the report of the Secretary-General on the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa, and related documents.

Two draft resolutions were introduced into the Special Political Committee on November 11 and 13 respectively, the first dealing with the subject of prisoners in South Africa and the second with the general question of apartheid.

The first resolution, eventually sponsored by 46 states, condemned the refusal of the South African Government to comply with resolutions calling for an end to oppression and persecution of all persons opposing apartheid, further condemned the South African Government for its repressive acts against the political movement of the oppressed people of South Africa, urged all states and organizations to exert appropriate efforts to secure release of political prisoners, reiterated that freedom fighters should be "extended humane

treatment in accordance with the humanitarian principles laid down in the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949"; and expressed solidarity with all those persecuted in South Africa for their opposition to apartheid.

The U.S. Representative on the Special Political Committee, Joseph E. Johnson, informed the Committee that the United States was prepared to vote affirmatively on this resolution, with the understanding that a separate vote would be taken on paragraph 4 (that dealing with freedom fighters and the Geneva Convention) on which the United States would abstain. The resolution was adopted in the Committee on November 14 by a vote of 101 (U.S.) to 1, with 4 abstentions, and in plenary on November 21 by 101 (U.S.) to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The general resolution on apartheid, *inter alia*, reiterated the Assembly's condemnation of apartheid as "a crime against humanity," reaffirmed the "legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa" for the exercise of the right to self-determination, and urged all states and organizations to provide increased assistance to "the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa against the policies of apartheid."

The resolution further invited all states to take steps "to prohibit financial and economic interests under their national jurisdiction from cooperating with the Government of South Africa"; to prohibit airlines and shipping lines registered in their countries from providing services to and from South Africa; to refrain from extending loans, investments, and technical assistance to the South African Government and to companies registered in South Africa; and to "take appropriate measures to dissuade the main trading partners of South Africa and economic and financial interests from collaborating

with the Government of South Africa and companies registered in South Africa."

The resolution went on to call upon all states to implement the Security Council resolutions concerning the embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa; called upon all organs of the United Nations, specialized agencies, and other international organizations to refrain from extending facilities to banks and other financial institutions which provide assistance to South Africa; recommended that the Security Council resume consideration of the apartheid question with a view to adopting measures under Chapter VII of the Charter "to eliminate the threat to international peace and security posed by the situation"; and urged all specialized agencies and other international organizations to withhold the benefits of international cooperation from the South African Government so long as it persists in its apartheid policies.

In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative made it clear that the United States totally rejected the doctrine of apartheid, which he characterized as "the direct, deliberate antithesis of a concept that was proclaimed nearly 200 years ago in our Declaration of Independence"—that all men are created equal. Equality, he noted, is also emphasized in the U.N. Charter. He explained that there were some provisions of the resolution with which the United States agreed and pointed out that we have repeatedly and strongly urged the South African Government to change its racial policies, that we instituted an arms embargo against South Africa before the passage of the relevant Security Council resolution, and that we continue scrupulously to enforce this embargo. He pointed out, however, that certain steps recommended in the resolution were, in the U.S. view, impractical. In this connection he stated:

I refer specifically to the question of measures under Chapter VII. Although

the situation in South Africa is deplorable my delegation cannot agree that it is a threat to international peace and security, thus warranting Chapter VII measures. This is a finding which is, under the Charter, reserved for the Security Council. The United States cannot therefore share in the recommendation that the Security Council should consider adopting such measures.

He further noted that in the application of sanctions "the very people we are seeking to help, the non-whites in South Africa, would be the first to suffer." The U.S. Representative also pointed out that the phrase "crime against humanity" has a precise legal connotation which would not apply in this instance and that the "main trading partners" provisions of the resolution were unrealistic. He went on to state:

We realize that there are other ways to approach the problem and we realize that it is impossible to ignore the clear acts of repression carried out by a stubborn government. There is cause for anger which leads to an inclination to seek more forceful means. I submit, however, that dialogue, in addition to other means of action, can also be an effective weapon. It was with great interest, therefore, that I noted the offer by the OAU heads of state through their president, President Ahidjo of the Cameroons, in his notable address before the Assembly on the Lusaka Manifesto, to discuss the situation and again offer a hand of conciliation. It would be in the interest of South Africa to heed this offer.

He concluded by voicing his regret that instead of adopting a course which might have achieved general acceptability, the cosponsors had made recommendations that were too far reaching and sweeping and which had been arrived at without proper consultation and reflection, pointing out that such proposals, however appealing they may be, "can only prove ineffectual and operate to the detriment both of the people of South Africa and of the United Nations."

The Special Political Committee approved the resolution on November 14 by a vote of 83 to 4 (U.S.), with 20 abstentions. The Assembly

adopted it in plenary session on November 21 by a vote of 80 to 5 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions.

PORTUGUESE-AFRICAN DISPUTES IN SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council held three series of meetings in 1969 at the request of African states which complained of attacks carried out against them from bordering Portuguese territories. In each case the Council adopted a resolution in effect endorsing the charges lodged against Portugal by the complaining state and calling on Portugal to desist from further violations of the state's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The debates in the Council on the three disputes centered on charges made, respectively, by Zambia, Senegal, and Guinea against Portugal and on countercharges brought against those states by Portugal. The Council also heard statements by a number of its members as well as other African states which asked to take part in the meetings. In general the statements concentrated less on the specific incidents than on what most claimed was the underlying cause—Portugal's unwillingness to grant self-determination and independence to its territories.

Portuguese Position

In all three instances, Portugal denied responsibility for the incidents, claiming the instigators were insurgents who were allowed to attack Portugal's territories from bases in neighboring African countries. Although it denied that most of the alleged attacks by its military forces took place at all, Portugal reserved its right of self-defense. The Portuguese Representative stressed, however, that in exercising that right his government's armed forces were under orders not to cross the frontiers of neighboring states. He also criticized Zambia, Senegal, and Guinea for resorting to the Security Council

rather than attempting to resolve the problems bilaterally through the use of mixed commissions and on-the-spot inquiries, procedures which he said had been successful in resolving disputes over previous incidents.

U.S. Position

The United States abstained on all three resolutions adopted by the Council. The U.S. Representative explained that the resolutions failed to take into account the conflicting claims of the two sides of each of the disputes. He stressed that the United States could not support one-sided resolutions in the absence of impartially confirmed evidence. The U.S. Representative noted that our position on the resolutions did not imply any change in our support of the right of the peoples of the Portuguese territories to self-determination.

Zambia-Portugal

On July 15 Zambia submitted a letter to the Security Council requesting an early meeting of the Council and referring specifically to a June 30 "bombing of a village, destruction of property, and the wounding and killing of two innocent and unarmed civilians at Lote," a village along the border between Zambia and the Portuguese territory of Mozambique.

At the first Council meeting July 18 and during subsequent sessions, Zambia repeated its charges and reviewed numerous incidents it claimed had occurred previously. Zambia countered Portugal's suggestion that differences over the incident be settled through bilateral channels by claiming that earlier such efforts had proved unsatisfactory, and that Council action against Portugal was now required.

The resolution adopted on July 28 by a vote of 11 to 0, with 4 abstentions (France, Spain, U.K., U.S.), was sponsored by Algeria, Nepal, Pakistan, and Senegal. This resolution (1) strongly censured the Portuguese

attacks on Lote village; (2) called on Portugal to stop "violating the territorial integrity" of and "carrying out unprovoked raids against" Zambia; (3) demanded the immediate release and repatriation of all Zambian civilians "kidnapped" by Portuguese military forces operating in Angola and Mozambique; (4) demanded the return of all property unlawfully taken from Zambia by Portuguese military forces; and (5) declared the Council would meet to consider "further measures" should Portugal not comply with the provisions of point 2 above.

Senegal-Portugal

In a letter dated November 27 Senegal requested an early meeting of the Council, charging that on November 25 the Portuguese Army based at Begene in Portuguese Guinea had shelled the Senegalese village of Samine. According to the complaint, the attack damaged a gendarmerie building, destroyed two houses, and left "one person dead and eight seriously wounded." Senegal further charged that this was not the first time that the regular Portuguese Army had "deliberately violated Senegalese national territory." On December 7 Senegal reported a further bombardment of the village in which it claimed five persons were killed and one wounded.

At the first Security Council meeting on December 4 and in subsequent sessions the Senegalese Representative repeated the charges and summarized a series of acts he said had been committed by Portuguese forces against Senegalese territory and citizens from 1963 on. He called for severe condemnation of the Portuguese "acts of aggression" and warned that if the "provocations" continued, Senegal would have to resort to force to ensure respect for its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The Portuguese Representative listed a series of provocations from Senegalese territory, including numer-

ous casualties, over a period of years. While disclaiming Portuguese responsibility for initiating any of the border incidents, including that at Samine, he acknowledged the possibility that Portuguese return fire, by accident not design, may have produced the results alleged by Senegal. He affirmed that after a proper bilateral investigation his country would be prepared to compensate Senegal for damage or injury which might be verified as having been caused by Portugal's defensive action. He noted that Senegal had refused to participate in such an inquiry, which he considered the normal procedure under the U.N. Charter for handling a complaint such as this.

On December 9 the Security Council adopted by a vote of 13 to 0, with the United States and Spain abstaining, a resolution (1) strongly condemning the Portuguese authorities for the shelling of the village of Samine on November 25 and December 7; (2) calling on Portugal to stop violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal; and (3) declaring that if Portugal did not comply, the Council would meet to consider "other measures."

Guinea-Portugal

In a December 4 letter to the Security Council President, Guinea requested a meeting of the Security Council to consider "the vile aggression recently committed by the Portuguese colonial army" against that country. In letters dated December 2 and 12 the Guinean Representative listed several incidents allegedly carried out from Portuguese Guinea, including the November 13 shelling of two Guinean villages. In addition to border incidents, he cited "the death and detention of Guinean citizens" involved in the capture of a motor barge and "the seizure of a Guinean aircraft by Portugal."

During the debate, which took place December 15-22, the Portu-

guese Representative denied most of the Guinean allegations and charged the shelling of Portuguese Guinea from the Republic of Guinea. He said that in addition to casualties suffered by residents of that territory, a number of Portuguese citizens were being held captive in neighboring Guinea.

On December 22 the Council adopted by a vote of 9 to 0, with 6 abstentions (U.S.), a resolution sponsored by Algeria, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, and Zambia. It (1) deplored the loss of life and damage inflicted by Portuguese military authorities; (2) called on Portugal to desist forthwith from "violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity" of the Republic of Guinea; (3) called for the immediate release of the Guinean civilian plane and crew captured March 26, 1968, and the Guinean motor barge and passengers captured August 27, 1969; and (4) warned that if "such acts" were repeated the Council would "seriously consider further steps to give effect to this decision." Abstaining on the resolution with the United States were China, Colombia, France, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

After the vote, the Portuguese Representative quoted a December 17 statement by Prime Minister Caetano which, *inter alia*, questioned whether it was worthwhile for Portugal to take part in such meetings "in which decisions are taken before the debates take place."

Cyprus

Although conditions on Cyprus remained relatively calm during 1969 and tensions stayed at a reduced level, there was no marked progress toward a settlement. The intercommunal talks begun under U.N. auspices in 1968 continued, however, and the improved atmosphere on the island led to hope that there could be some re-

duction in the size of UNFICYP, the mandate of which was extended until June 15, 1970.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION

The Security Council met June 10 and again December 11 to consider reports of the Secretary-General and on each occasion unanimously adopted resolutions continuing the existence of UNFICYP for an additional 6 months. The discussion at both meetings, in which representatives of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey participated at their request, was relatively brief and harmonious, but a number of Council members, including the United States, expressed concern at the slow pace of the talks on constitutional issues being conducted by the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot negotiators, Glafkos Clerides and Raoul Denktash, as well as the continuing problem of financing UNFICYP.

On June 10, for example, Ambassador Yost noted that the intercommunal talks had been in progress for a full year and echoed the concern expressed by the Secretary-General in his report that "no substantive results on the basic issues which separate the two sides have as yet emerged." While agreeing that UNFICYP's work was an indispensable element in maintaining the current calm in Cyprus and in promoting steps toward normalization, both prerequisites for progress in the talks, Ambassador Yost urged the parties to build on the progress achieved to date, press on with measures designed to normalize the situation, and pursue with determination the search for a negotiated settlement of their problems.

Ambassador Yost went on to suggest that all would be gratified if advance toward an ultimate solution and conditions of stability "were to make it possible and safe to reduce the size of the Force and eventually, over the longer term, to terminate its mis-

sion." He expressed hope that the Secretary-General would undertake a full examination of the possibilities for effective economies in operation of the Force, including a study of possible personnel adjustments consistent with UNFICYP's ability to continue fully to discharge its functions.

At the December 11 Council meeting the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Phillips, again registered concern over the slow progress of the intercommunal talks and, while commending the positive approach of the two negotiators, urged both sides to maintain attitudes of compromise and accommodation and to examine their positions "with a view to what will in the long term be best for the people of Cyprus as a whole." He welcomed indications reported by the Secretary-General of greater contacts between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and of improvements in such fields as agriculture, economic activities, and public services and expressed support for continuing efforts to resolve problems of freedom of movement and deconfrontation.

On the question of UNFICYP financing, the U.S. Representative on June 10 pointed out that the entire world community profited from the maintenance of peace in Cyprus and urged others, particularly Security Council members, to review their positions on financial contributions. Both in June and December the U.S. Representatives cited the substantial financial support provided UNFICYP by the United States and, while stating that such U.S. support for this peacekeeping effort would continue, called for a more equitable sharing of the burden. Ambassador Phillips urged "every member state, and particularly those with special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as the three governments most directly involved," to contribute as generously as possible to UNFICYP's support.

SURVEY TEAM REPORT

In part as a result of the U.S. suggestion in June, cited above, the Secretary-General on August 25 announced his intention to send a survey team composed of three senior Secretariat officials¹ to Cyprus "to look thoroughly into the financial situation of UNFICYP with particular attention to the possibility of reducing its cost." The team's report was annexed to the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council covering the period June 3 to December 1, 1969, which was considered at the December 11 Council meeting. After reviewing in some detail the UNFICYP financial situation and arrangements for financing the Force, as well as the relationship of the organization of the Force to the financial question, the survey team suggested several possible courses of action "which might over a period of time result in significant reductions in the cost of UNFICYP." These fell into four categories: reorganization, changes in deployment and operating methods, financial and related measures, and logistic costs and control of logistic requirements. The suggestions, the team noted, involved political and other problems and would in many cases require the consent of governments; they might, however, suggest to the Secretary-General and to the governments contributing troops and funds ways to meet the concern for a reduction of costs and more equitable distribution of the financial burden.

On December 11 the U.S. Representative welcomed the survey team's report and the comprehensive review that the team had carried out. He noted that the Secretary-General had found generally sound the team's suggestions on steps to achieve savings

¹ William McCaw, Deputy Controller; Brian Urquhart, Director in Offices of Under-Secretaries-General for Special Political Affairs; and Lt. Col. Louis Monteaale, Liaison Officer, Military Staff Committee.

without impairing the effectiveness of the Force and agreed with the Secretary-General that a number of the steps suggested might be feasible. He believed the suggestions on ways in which the Force might be reorganized to enable it to carry out its task at somewhat less cost deserved the most serious and careful consideration and expressed the hope that any decision on reorganization could be taken prior to the next troop rotation in March 1970. He hoped that other suggestions could also lead to prompt actions that would result in significant savings.

U.N. REPRESENTATION IN CYPRUS

On December 20 the Commander of UNFICYP, Lt. Gen. A. E. Martola of Finland, retired following 3½ years of service in Cyprus. The Secretary-General appointed as his successor Maj. Gen. Dewan Prem Chand of India, who had served the United Nations earlier in the Congo. The Secretary-General's special representative in Cyprus, Bibiano F. Osorio-Tafall of Mexico, continued in his post, assisting the parties and providing good offices as necessary.

Korea

THE EC-121 INCIDENT

On April 15 North Korean military aircraft attacked and shot down an unarmed U.S. reconnaissance aircraft (type EC-121) operating in international airspace over the Sea of Japan. In addition to actions ordered by the President, including the continuation of such reconnaissance flights with armed protection and the dispatch of a naval task force to the Sea of Japan, the United States protested the incident directly to the North Korean authorities at a meeting of the Military Armistice Commission at Panmunjom on April 18.

At the meeting, the senior member for the U.N. Command, Maj. Gen. James B. Knapp, made the following statement:

Three days ago your armed forces committed an unprovoked attack on an unarmed U.S. aircraft. An EC-121, flying a routine reconnaissance track parallel to North Korea over the Sea of Japan, was reported missing at around 1400 hours, Korean time, on April 15. About 2 hours later, at 1555 hours, April 15, your radio announced that North Korean military forces had shot down a "large-sized plane of the U.S."

This aircraft was flying a routine reconnaissance track similar to a large number of missions which have been flown over international waters in that area regularly since 1950. The aircraft commander was under orders to maintain a distance of 50 nautical miles from the coast of North Korea. All evidence confirms that the plane remained far outside your claimed territorial airspace.

When shot down, the aircraft was at a point approximately 41 degrees 12 minutes North and 131 degrees 48 minutes East. Debris from the aircraft was initially sighted and subsequently recovered in the vicinity of 41 degrees 14 minutes North and 131 degrees 50 minutes East. These points are approximately 90 miles from North Korea. There appear to have been no survivors from the 31 men on board the aircraft.

From the foregoing facts about your attack on the U.S. aircraft it is clear that:

1. At no time did the U.S. aircraft penetrate or even closely approach North Korean airspace. Since it was at all times clearly within international airspace, you had no right to threaten or interfere with it, let alone shoot it down.

2. The U.S. aircraft was engaged in completely legitimate reconnaissance operations. These operations are made necessary by your repeated acts and threats of aggression. So long as such flights are conducted outside your territorial limits you have no right to interfere with them. I note that your authorities seem, in some respects, to share this view, since they felt compelled to allege falsely that the aircraft was within your airspace.

3. No one can believe that a single unarmed propeller-driven aircraft can represent a threat to North Korea. It was not attacking you or preparing to attack you or supporting an attack on you. The shooting down of this U.S.

plane was not an act of self-defense. It was a calculated act of aggression.

4. This act cannot be justified under international law. On the contrary, the centuries-old tradition of freedom of the seas and the newer principle regarding freedom of the airspace over international waters clearly make your action illegal. International law and custom call you to account for the consequences of your violation of these principles.

This incident was not an isolated act. You have repeatedly regularly violated both the letter and the spirit of the Armistice Agreement and the rules of international law. I need only cite the attempt in January 1968 to assassinate President Pak, your lawless seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, your brutal mistreatment of her crew, your innumerable infiltrations into the Republic of Korea, and your other violations of the demilitarized zone.

The peace of this area is constantly being disturbed by your actions. The proper course for you to take in this instance is to acknowledge the true facts of the case: that you shot down the U.S. aircraft over international waters at a point approximately 90 miles from your coast and that this plane at no time entered your airspace. We, of course, expect that you will take appropriate measures to prevent similar incidents in the future.

On the same day the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations requested the President of the Security Council to circulate to all U.N. members as a Security Council document a letter containing the text of General Knapp's statement.

Reports of the U.N. Command documenting other North Korean aggressive acts, particularly serious violations of the armistice agreement, were submitted to the Security Council President on May 8 and October 30.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Korean question was again taken up by the General Assembly in 1969. In previous years the item had been placed on the provisional agenda by the Secretariat as a result of the receipt of the annual report of the U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea

(UNCURK)¹ addressed to the Assembly. Under the terms of a General Assembly resolution adopted in 1968, UNCURK was given the choice of submitting its report either to the General Assembly or to the Secretary-General. In the latter case, the report would not automatically appear on the provisional agenda. The first of two reports by UNCURK during the year was addressed to the Secretary-General on April 19. Before the second report was received a group of members (Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Syria, Ukrainian S.S.R., and U.S.S.R.—later joined by Iraq, Mali, Romania, Southern Yemen, and Tanzania) on August 15 requested inscription of an item entitled: "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations."

Subsequently, the same group, plus Guinea and Mauritania but minus Algeria, Congo (Brazzaville), Iraq, and Tanzania, requested an additional item entitled: "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea."

Following receipt of a report from UNCURK addressed to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General on September 11 proposed the addition of an item entitled: "Question of Korea: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea."

Thus three items relating to Korea appeared on the provisional agenda when the General Committee met on September 17 to make its recommendations on the agenda. A Soviet

attempt to have the General Committee recommend deletion of the item on the report of UNCURK was defeated by a vote of 17 (U.S.) to 4, with 3 abstentions. The Committee then adopted by a vote of 15 to 4, with 5 abstentions, a U.S. proposal recommending that the three interrelated items be combined, as they had been in previous years, under a single item entitled: "The Question of Korea," with the three listed as subheadings. The following day the General Committee recommended that the combined item be allocated to the First Committee.

In the plenary consideration of the General Committee's report on September 20, the Soviet Union once again sought to exclude the item on the report of UNCURK by requesting a separate vote on the main title and the subitem on the UNCURK report. The Assembly however approved retention of the title and the subitem by a vote of 76 (U.S.) to 26, with 15 abstentions.

Invitation Issue

In organizational meetings of the First Committee and through consultations it was agreed that the question of issuing invitations to Korean representatives to participate in the debate would be taken up in advance of the debate on the substantive issue. When debate on the invitation issue opened on October 28, two draft resolutions, almost identical to those considered in 1968, were before the Committee:

(1) a draft resolution cosponsored by 24 members (Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., U.A.R., Yemen, and Zambia) that would "invite simulta-

¹The Commission was established by a U.N. Security Council resolution on Oct. 7, 1950, to represent the United Nations in bringing about a unified, independent, and democratic Korea. Its members are Australia, Chile, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, and Turkey.

neously and without condition" representatives of both the Republic of Korea and North Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the debate on the Korean question; and

(2) a draft resolution cosponsored by the United States and 15 other nations (Australia, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Japan, Malagasy Republic, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Swaziland, Thailand, and Togo) that would invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in the debate and would reaffirm willingness to invite a representative of North Korea provided the latter first accepted—as had the Republic of Korea—"the competence and authority of the United Nations . . . to take action on the Korean question."

In the debate, the U.S. Representative, Congressman J. Irving Whalley, briefly recalled the history of the important role of the United Nations in Korea. He said the draft resolution cosponsored by his delegation and others took that history into account and placed "evenhandedly on both parties to be invited one simple, logical, and just prerequisite—that each accept the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question."

He noted that North Korea "not only committed aggression against the Republic of Korea and against United Nations forces, but also has in the past and continues to this day to denounce and reject our very right to discuss this subject." On the other hand, the Republic of Korea "has freely and openly cooperated with the United Nations in efforts to reduce tensions in the area and to work for the reunification of that too-long divided nation through peaceful and democratic means. It has consistently

and again recently reaffirmed its acceptance of the competence and authority of the United Nations It is truly equitable to ask no less of the North Korean regime."

The Committee voted on the two draft resolutions on October 30. The 24-power "unconditional" resolution was defeated by a vote of 40 to 55, with 27 abstentions.

Those in favor were:

Afghanistan	Libya
Albania	Mali
Algeria	Mauritania
Bulgaria	Mongolia
Burma	Nepal
Burundi	Nigeria
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Pakistan
Cambodia	Poland
Central African Republic	Romania
Ceylon	Somalia
Congo	Southern Yemen
(Brazzaville)	Sudan
Cuba	Syria
Czechoslovakia	Tanzania
Ethiopia	Uganda
Guinea	Ukrainian S.S.R.
Hungary	U.S.S.R.
Iraq	U.A.R.
Jordan	Yemen
Kenya	Yugoslavia
	Zambia

Those opposed were:

Argentina	Liberia
Australia	Luxemburg
Belgium	Malagasy Republic
Bolivia	Malawi
Botswana	Malaysia
Brazil	Malta
Canada	Mauritius
Chile	Netherlands
China	New Zealand
Colombia	Nicaragua
Congo (Kinshasa)	Niger
Costa Rica	Panama
Dahomey	Paraguay
Dominican Republic	Philippines
El Salvador	Rwanda
France	Senegal
Gabon	South Africa
Gambia	Spain
Greece	Swaziland
Haiti	Thailand
Honduras	Togo
Iceland	Trinidad
Ireland	and Tobago
Israel	Turkey
Italy	United Kingdom
Ivory Coast	United States
Japan	Uruguay
Lesotho	Venezuela

Those abstaining were:

Austria	Jamaica
Barbados	Kuwait
Cameroon	Laos
Chad	Lebanon
Cyprus	Maldives
Denmark	Mexico
Ecuador	Morocco
Equatorial Guinea	Norway
Finland	Peru
Ghana	Saudi Arabia
Guatemala	Sierra Leone
Guyana	Singapore
India	Sweden
Iran	

The U.S.-cosponsored 16-power resolution was then adopted by a vote of 65 to 31, with 26 abstentions.

Additional Item Again Proposed

The General Committee met November 11 to consider a request by Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., and Yemen for an additional "important and urgent" item entitled: "Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea."

The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Buffum, told the General Committee that the United States opposed the new item, finding it "utterly devoid of logic, reason, substance, or merit" in that it was repetitious of items already on the agenda and "what is more bizarre, this proposal to 'put an end' to the discussion comes from many of the very same group that took the initiative in precipitating a debate on Korea at this session." He suggested that their request was prompted perhaps by an attitude that "if the majority does not support their position on this subject then the Assembly should not take up this matter any more." He continued that if despite these reservations the item should be approved for inscription, he proposed that it be

inscribed as subitem (d) under The Korean Question and discussed by the First Committee together with the other subitems.

The General Committee decided to recommend inscription by a vote of 8 to 4 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. It then adopted the U.S. proposal by a vote of 14 to 3, with 6 abstentions. The General Assembly approved the General Committee's recommendation on the same day.

Substantive Debate

The First Committee considered the substantive aspects of the Korean question between November 11 and 17. Republic of Korea Foreign Minister Kyu Hah Choi, participating in the debates under the terms of the invitation resolution, addressed the Committee on November 11.

Four resolutions corresponding to the four subitems of the question and similar to those presented the previous year were before the Committee for discussion:

(1) A draft resolution cosponsored by Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., U.A.R., Yemen, and Zambia called for the withdrawal within 6 months of "all American and other foreign military personnel deployed in South Korea under the title of 'United Nations Forces.'"

(2) A draft resolution cosponsored by the same countries minus Iraq, Sudan, Tanzania, and U.A.R. called for the dissolution of UNCURK within 2 months.

(3) A draft resolution cosponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Japan, Luxembourg, Malagasy Republic, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicara-

gua, Philippines, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Kingdom, and United States reaffirmed the mandate of UNCURK. It also reaffirmed that the U.N. objectives in Korea "are to bring about, by peaceful means, the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government, and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area" and expressed the belief that these objectives should be achieved through "genuinely free elections."

(4) A draft resolution cosponsored by the same countries that requested inscription of the item, plus Mauritania and Zambia, noted that the United Nations lacked "the moral authority to participate in the solution of the Korean question" and called for an end to discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea.

The U.S. Representative, Congressman Whalley, urged adoption of the resolution reaffirming the mandate of UNCURK. Recalling recent violations of the military armistice agreements, he said:

These hostile acts of North Korea should make it evident to the members of this committee that that regime is intent upon undermining the Republic of Korea and taking over the entire peninsula.

The U.S. Representative described the economic and political achievements that the Republic of Korea had made as well as its constructive role in international affairs and stressed that these achievements "have been made possible by the protection afforded that country by the United Nations." Noting that the goal of peaceful reunification of Korea had not yet been achieved, he said the United States believed it imperative that the Commission continue to work toward bringing about "conditions which could lead to a peaceful settlement of this long outstanding problem, and to effect the unification

of the Korean people." He urged the Committee to reject the other draft resolutions—"proposals of that small, mechanical minority who annually seek to end the United Nations constructive role in Korea."

Mr. Whalley concluded:

The issue in Korea is real and important. It is not a remote issue on some distant planet. Korea . . . is a part of our world and the world has become a small place. . . .

The Korean people's destiny and ours—and that of the United Nations—are bound up together. When aggression occurred in Korea 19 years ago, it is to the everlasting honor of the United Nations that we did not pass by on the other side of the street. Through 3 years of war and 16 years of armistice, we have been faithful to our charge.

The immediate prospects for a solution may be far from bright. But let us not grow weary in a good cause. Let us faithfully pursue it until it can at last be fulfilled.

Assembly Action

On November 17 the First Committee voted on the four draft resolutions. The draft resolutions calling for the withdrawal of foreign forces and the dissolution of UNCURK were both overwhelmingly defeated by votes respectively of 29 to 61, with 32 abstentions, and 30 to 65, with 27 abstentions.

The draft resolution cosponsored by the United States and 18 other countries was adopted by a vote of 71 to 29, with 22 abstentions.

Those in favor were:

Argentina	Dominican
Australia	Republic
Austria	El Salvador
Barbados	Ethiopia
Belgium	France
Bolivia	Gabon
Brazil	Gambia
Canada	Greece
Chile	Guatemala
China	Guyana
Colombia	Haiti
Congo (Kinshasa)	Honduras
Costa Rica	Iceland
Cyprus	Iran
Dahomey	Ireland
Denmark	Israel

Italy
Ivory Coast
Jamaica
Japan
Laos
Lesotho
Liberia
Luxembourg
Malagasy Republic
Malawi
Malaysia
Maldives
Malta
Mauritius
Mexico
Morocco
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Norway

Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Rwanda
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
South Africa
Spain
Swaziland
Sweden
Thailand
Togo
Trinidad and
Tobago
Turkey
United Kingdom
United States
Uruguay
Venezuela

Those opposed were:

Albania	Mali
Algeria	Mauritania
Bulgaria	Mongolia
Burundi	Poland
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Romania
Cambodia	Southern Yemen
Central African Republic	Sudan
Congo (Brazzaville)	Syria
Cuba	Tanzania
Czechoslovakia	Ukrainian S.S.R.
Guinea	U.S.S.R.
Hungary	U.A.R.
Iraq	Yemen
Libya	Yugoslavia
	Zambia

Those abstaining were:

Afghanistan	Kuwait
Burma	Lebanon
Cameroon	Nepal
Ceylon	Nigeria
Chad	Pakistan
Finland	Sierra Leone
Ghana	Singapore
India	Somalia
Indonesia	Tunisia
Jordan	Uganda
Kenya	Upper Volta

The fourth draft resolution was then defeated by a vote of 29 to 65 (U.S.), with 28 abstentions.

On November 25 the General Assembly in plenary session adopted by a vote of 70 (U.S.) to 26, with 21 abstentions, the resolution recommended by the First Committee reaffirming the mandate of UNCURK and continuing the U.N. role in Korea.

Middle East

U.N. PEACEMAKING EFFORTS

Efforts continued throughout the year to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East in accordance with the provisions and principles set forth in the Security Council's Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967. U.N. Special Representative Gunnar Jarring, appointed by the Secretary-General under the resolution "to establish and maintain contacts with the states concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement" of the Arab-Israeli dispute, undertook a new round of individual discussions with the parties in the Middle East in late February and March. In the course of his visits to area capitals he submitted questions to the parties in an attempt to elicit replies that would enable him to identify areas of agreement and narrow the gap between the positions of both sides.

On April 9 the Secretary-General announced that Ambassador Jarring had returned to Moscow where for the time being he intended to resume his duties as Swedish Ambassador. In a clarifying statement issued the following day, the Secretary-General categorically denied this meant Jarring had given up his mission. He explained that a stage had been reached in which it appeared there was no further move Jarring could make and it was thus advisable to take some time to assess the situation and await new developments. He emphasized that Jarring would be kept informed daily of events in the Middle East, that he would remain in touch with all parties concerned, and that he would remain available to renew his activities at an appropriate time.

In the meantime, as a result of concern over the lack of significant progress in the Jarring mission and

continued tension and violence in the Middle East, joint meetings of the permanent representatives to the United Nations of France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union had begun on April 3 in New York. The object of these talks was to produce major-power agreement on guidelines for a final peace settlement that would enable Ambassador Jarring fruitfully to renew his contacts with the parties in accordance with Resolution 242. As such, they were intended to reinforce Jarring's mission of promoting agreement on a peaceful settlement, and not to weaken or replace it. The consultations continued on a weekly basis until early July, when they were recessed for several months. They resumed on December 2, following a long series of U.S.-U.S.S.R. talks in Washington and Moscow and intensive discussions among the Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers and the parties concerned during the 24th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

On September 20 a U.N. spokesman read the following statement:

The Foreign Ministers of France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States met with the Secretary-General for a discussion.

They directed their attention to the situation in the Middle East, which they regarded as increasingly serious and urgent.

They reaffirmed that resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council dated 22 November 1967 should be supported and carried out.

They agreed that durable peace should be established in the Middle East.

They reaffirmed that all states in the Middle East have an inalienable right to exist as independent and sovereign states.

With the above objectives in mind the conversations and contacts already established will be continued.

On December 2 the permanent representatives of the Four Powers issued a communique following the first resumed Four Power meeting. They reaffirmed their objective of promoting peace in the Middle East

in accordance with Security Council Resolution 242 and the statement of the four Foreign Ministers. They expressed their readiness to consider specific questions concerning the implementation of Resolution 242 in all its aspects as a "package deal" relating to the entire region of conflict, and said they wished to assist the Secretary-General's Special Representative to resume his task as soon as possible.

U.S. Role

Throughout 1969 the United States continued to support U.N. peacemaking efforts in the Middle East. U.S. officials followed Ambassador Jarring's activities closely and repeatedly urged the parties to do their utmost to facilitate his efforts to help them find a peaceful settlement. In early 1969, when it became apparent that despite the persistent efforts of Ambassador Jarring the mutual suspicions of the parties continued to block movement toward a settlement, the United States decided it should play a more direct role in seeking to facilitate a solution. U.S. participation in Four Power and bilateral talks was dictated by a direct security interest in peace in the Middle East, as well as by the U.S. responsibility as a permanent member of the Security Council to do everything possible in support of the Council's resolution. The United States regarded these talks as a means of defining a realistic framework for agreement and of providing Ambassador Jarring with a basis for getting the parties together in a negotiating process under his auspices. In the U.S. view, agreements among other powers cannot be a substitute for agreement between the parties themselves.

During the course of these talks, the United States presented two papers setting forth its ideas on balanced guidelines to assist Ambassador Jarring in getting the parties together. On October 28 the United States presented in bilateral talks with the

U.S.S.R. proposals for guidelines concerning an Israel-U.A.R. settlement. On December 18 the United States presented in the Four Power talks a proposal for guidelines concerning an Israel-Jordan settlement. The essential elements of these papers were set forth publicly by Secretary of State William P. Rogers in a December 9 address before the Galaxy Conference on Adult Education in Washington, D.C.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTIVITY

While the search for a general political settlement in the Middle East continued, constant tension and almost daily violence marked relations between Israel and neighboring Arab States. These cease-fire violations, together with disputes arising from Israeli actions in occupied Jerusalem, led to four series of Security Council meetings during 1969.

Cease-Fire Violations

COUNCIL MEETINGS: MARCH 27-APRIL 1. On March 26 Jordan requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider an Israeli air attack earlier that day on villages and civilian centers in the area of Es-Salt, in which 18 persons were reported killed and 23 wounded. In his letter to the Council President the Jordanian Representative called for adequate and effective measures to check Israeli aggression. The next day Israel requested that the Security Council meet to consider Jordan's "grave and continual violations" of the cease-fire, including acts of terrorist groups operating from Jordanian territory and firing by regular Jordanian forces across the cease-fire lines.

The Council convened on March 27. At its eighth meeting, on April 1, it adopted by a vote of 11 to 0, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Paraguay, U.K., and U.S.), a resolution sponsored by Pakistan, Senegal, and Zambia that condemned "the recent

premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas," and warned that if such acts were repeated the Council would consider more effective steps.

The United States was unable to support a one-sided resolution condemning only the Israeli raid and including no criticism of other violations of the cease-fire. The United States had expressed regret over the tragic loss of life in the March 26 raid, but regarded it basically as one of a whole series of incidents in the preceding weeks. These included: fe-dayeen activities (such as explosions within Israel, cross-border raids, and attacks on Israeli civil aircraft abroad); sniping and shelling in the Suez Canal area; and frequent, almost routine, air strikes by Israel against suspected terrorist concentrations in Jordan. In our view, all such incidents were related to the overall problem of the absence of peace in the Middle East, and individual incidents could not be treated in isolation.

In explaining the U.S. abstention on April 1, Ambassador Yost said further that, in view of our belief that such air attacks invariably took innocent lives, we were prepared to support Council condemnation of the Israeli action. However, these attacks were provoked by equally indiscriminating attacks on innocent Israeli civilians. Had the sponsors of the resolution been willing to add a simple operative paragraph condemning or deploring all violations of the cease-fire, he said, the United States would have been able to support it.

COUNCIL MEETINGS: AUGUST 13-26. On August 13 the Council began consideration of a Lebanese complaint regarding an August 11 Israeli air attack on villages in southern Lebanon and an Israeli countercomplaint of repeated terrorist attacks from Lebanese territory in violation of the cease-fire. Lebanon charged that four civilians had been killed in the Israeli raid and that napalm had

been used. It urged the Council to condemn Israel strongly, to apply sanctions against Israel, and to declare that Israel must pay compensation for the damage caused to civilians. Israel, on the other hand, maintained that 21 terrorist attacks had been launched against Israeli settlements from Lebanon since July, and that Israel had no alternative but to resort to self-defense. It urged the Council to call on Lebanon to respect its obligation to abide by the cease-fire.

The Council met six times to debate the Lebanese and Israeli complaints. On August 26, following intensive consultations among Council members, it adopted unanimously a resolution presented by the Council President as representing a consensus of members' views. The resolution recalled the Lebanon-Israel Armistice Agreement of March 1949 and the 1967 cease-fire resolutions, condemned the August 11 Israeli air attack, and deplored all violations of the cease-fire. It also deplored the extension of the area of fighting, declared that actions of military reprisal and other grave cease-fire violations could not be tolerated, and warned of "further and more effective steps" which the Council would have to consider to ensure against their repetition.

In explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Yost noted that the resolution did not deal in as balanced a fashion as we would have wished with the cycle of provocation and reprisal that had extended the area of violence to the Lebanon-Israel frontier. Nevertheless, he said, it made clear the Council's strong disapproval of all violations of the cease-fire, from whatever source, and thus reaffirmed the strict obligations on all concerned to avoid such violations. In this respect, he found the resolution consistent with the goal of ending the violence that was seriously impeding efforts to establish a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

Ambassador Yost also explained that the United States would have preferred omission of the resolution's preambular reference to the 1949 Israel-Lebanon Armistice Agreement because the Agreement's status and continued validity were disputed by the parties. In the U.S. view, however, this reference, which was coupled with a reference to the 1967 cease-fire resolutions, did not prejudice the position of either party.

Jerusalem

COUNCIL MEETINGS: JUNE 30-JULY 3. In a letter to the Security Council dated June 26 the Government of Jordan called attention to certain legislative measures, arrests, deportations, expropriations, and demolitions allegedly carried out by Israeli authorities in East Jerusalem. It requested that the Council meet urgently to consider "continued Israeli defiance" of its resolution of May 21, 1968, in which the Council had declared invalid all Israeli legislative and administrative measures that tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem and had called on Israel to rescind them and refrain from taking others in the future.

Speaking on July 1, Ambassador Yost made clear that the status of Jerusalem was not an isolated problem, but an integral part of the whole complex of issues that comprised the Arab-Israeli conflict. He said the United States considered the part of Jerusalem that came under Israeli control during the 1967 war to be occupied territory and thus subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying power. He pointed out that among such obligations that bind Israel are provisions that the occupier has no right to make changes in laws or administration other than those temporarily necessary for its security, and that an occupier may not confiscate or destroy private property. He expressed regret that Israel's actions in the occupied portion of Jeru-

salem had given rise to concerns that the eventual disposition of East Jerusalem might be prejudiced and that the rights and activities of its population were being affected and altered. He noted the United States had consistently refused to recognize unilateral measures taken with respect to Jerusalem as having anything but a provisional character, and he affirmed they could not affect the city's ultimate status.

On July 3, at the fourth meeting devoted to its consideration of the Jordanian complaint, the Council unanimously adopted a resolution sponsored by Pakistan, Senegal, and Zambia that: (1) reaffirmed its resolution of May 21, 1968; (2) deplored Israel's failure to show any regard for that resolution and two earlier ones adopted by the General Assembly in July 1967; (3) censured "in the strongest terms" all measures taken to change the status of Jerusalem; (4) confirmed that all Israeli legislative and administrative measures and actions purporting to alter the city's status were invalid and could not change its status; (5) urgently called for the rescission "forthwith" of all measures taken by Israel that might tend to change the status of Jerusalem, and for the avoidance by Israel of all future actions likely to have such an effect; (6) requested Israel to inform the Council without further delay of its intentions with regard to implementing the resolution; (7) determined that in the event of a negative or no response from Israel the Council should convene without delay to consider what future action might be taken; and (8) requested the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the resolution.

Before adopting the resolution, the Council voted separately, at the request of the United States, on the paragraph calling for the rescinding of earlier measures in Jerusalem and approved it by a vote of 14 to 0, with the United States abstaining.

Following the vote, Ambassador Yost stated that the United States viewed the resolution as a whole as consonant with our position on Jerusalem. We had abstained in the separate paragraph vote, however, since we found the description of Israel's actions as measures that "may tend to change the status of the city of Jerusalem" to be inconsistent with the paragraph clearly confirming that such measures could not change the city's status. Moreover, the United States did not regard the call for Israel to rescind measures it had taken as practical and believed it was likely to place the Council in an invidious position in the future. He also made clear that our vote for the resolution as a whole did not commit us to any specific course of action during any future Council consideration of the issue.

Pursuant to this resolution, the Secretary-General submitted a report to the Council on December 5 consisting mainly of an exchange of correspondence with the Permanent Representative of Israel. In a letter of November 27 transmitted by the Permanent Representative, the Israeli Foreign Minister noted Israel's objective of advancing the economic welfare of the entire city and criticized the Council for working against Jerusalem's "peaceful union" and censuring "measures taken to ensure the livelihood of all its inhabitants."

COUNCIL MEETINGS: SEPTEMBER 9-15. On August 22 representatives of 25 Muslim nations submitted a joint letter to the Secretary-General expressing their distress over the August 21 fire at the Al-Aqsa Mosque in East Jerusalem and emphasizing the urgency of suitable U.N. action aimed at an impartial investigation of the fire and the prevention of any further acts against the city's holy places. On August 28, 25 representatives requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider "the grievous situation resulting from the extensive damage caused by arson

to the holy Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem.”

Protracted consultations among the Muslim delegations delayed the first meeting until September 9, and it was not until the fourth meeting—held on September 12—that a draft resolution was formally introduced. Sponsored by Pakistan, it dealt only incidentally with the fire and primarily with the overall question of Jerusalem and Israel’s policies there. The draft resolution *inter alia* (1) said that any act of destruction or profanation of the holy places or “any encouragement of, or connivance at” such an act might “seriously endanger international peace and security”; (2) determined that the “execrable act of desecration and profanation of the holy Al-Aqsa Mosque” emphasized the immediate need for Israel to comply with the Council’s earlier resolutions on Jerusalem and rescind forthwith “all measures and actions taken by it designed to alter the status of Jerusalem”; (3) called upon Israel to observe scrupulously the provisions of the Geneva conventions and international law governing military occupation and to refrain from hindering the Supreme Muslim Council of Jerusalem in the discharge of its established functions, including cooperation with Muslim countries in the maintenance and repair of the Islamic holy places; (4) condemned Israel’s failure to comply with the Council resolutions of May 21, 1968, and July 3, 1969; and (5) reiterated the Council’s determination to consider further action in the event of Israeli noncompliance.

At its sixth meeting, on September 15, the Council adopted the Pakistan draft resolution by a vote of 11 to 0, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Finland, Paraguay, and U.S.). In explaining the U.S. abstention, Ambassador Yost recalled that barely 9 weeks had passed since the Council unanimously reaffirmed the international community’s special interest in Jerusalem. He said that the U.S. posi-

tion regarding Israel’s responsibilities as an occupying power had not changed. In our view, however, it was neither appropriate nor desirable to link the deplorable Al-Aqsa fire to the whole tragic Arab-Israeli conflict, particularly since we had seen no evidence that the fire resulted from anything other than a demented, individual act.

Ambassador Yost regretted that the resolution had gone so far beyond the purpose for which the Council had been called into session. The United States, he said, could have voted for a resolution that dealt substantively only with the concerns expressed by the Muslim representatives in their August 22 letter to the Secretary-General—that is, an impartial investigation of the fire and measures for the maintenance, repair, and protection of the holy places, including provision for adequate participation of Muslim representatives.

U.N. RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST

At its 24th session the General Assembly again had before it the annual report of the Commissioner General of UNRWA, Laurence Michelmore. Opening the debate in the Special Political Committee on November 17 with the presentation of his report, he placed major emphasis on the continuing financial difficulties confronting UNRWA and appealed to the General Assembly to take urgent action to set the Agency’s finances on a firmer foundation. (For more on financial aspects, see below, p. 43.) He drew attention to the continuing needs of the Palestinian refugees and those persons displaced by the hostilities of June 1967. Although encouraged by progress made in providing improved shelter and other facilities for the inhabitants of the emergency camps established in East Jordan and Syria following the June war, he made clear that life for the refugees of 1967 remained precarious.

Commenting on reports that commandos had taken control of UNRWA camps in Lebanon, the Commissioner General stated that in the previous few weeks armed men were present in some of the camps and the Lebanese police and other authorities responsible for maintaining security in the camps were absent. He said, however, that UNRWA's services were continuing almost normally, and he was satisfied "that the integrity of these UNRWA operations has been maintained, that UNRWA assistance goes, as it is intended, to needy refugees, and that it is not diverted to other purposes." Dr. Michelmores added that UNRWA was consulting with the Lebanese Government with a view to maintaining services to the refugees and resolving any difficulties that existed.

In the ensuing debate, which continued through December 5, the Committee heard representatives of over 60 states. The Committee also agreed to hear members of the "Palestine Arab delegation" and the "Palestine Liberation Organization," stipulating as in previous years that its permission to allow these representatives to speak did not signify recognition of those organizations.

During the debate Arab representatives repeated their longstanding complaints of nonimplementation of past Assembly resolutions on the refugee problem, attacking Israel in particular in this respect. Condemning Israel for its continued occupation of Arab territories and alleged violations of human rights in those areas, many Arab and some other delegations expressed support for the fedayeen movement. A number of representatives again urged Israel to permit the return of those who had fled from areas occupied by Israel in the war of June 1967 and who now wished to return.

Israel refused to accept any special responsibility in connection with the refugee problem, indicating it could be resolved only in the context of an

overall peace settlement negotiated between Israel and the Arab states concerned. The Israeli Representative described his government's efforts to improve living conditions of Arabs in the occupied territories. He pointed out that it was unreasonable to expect a large-scale repatriation of the newly displaced persons while hostilities were continuing, since Israel had to reconcile the question of their return with the need to ensure the safety, welfare, and security of the local population and of Israel itself.

U.S. Position

On November 25 the U.S. Representative, Mr. Johnson, reaffirmed support for UNRWA and its two-decade struggle to care for the victims of war in the Middle East and formally introduced a draft resolution (circulated November 20) calling for UNRWA's continued efforts and additional support from governments. (See below.) However, in pointing out the historical linkage between the refugee problem and the other issues that have divided Israel and the Arab states, he emphasized that a permanent solution of this problem could be achieved only as part of an overall peace settlement. This fact, he noted, was clearly reflected in the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, which affirms, along with other requirements, the necessity for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.

In this connection he said:

... my Government is engaged in intensive consultations with representatives of other major powers as well as with the parties directly concerned, in an effort to find means to assist Ambassador Jarring in carrying out the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council 2 years ago. The continuing plight of the refugees is only one of the factors that make it so vital that these efforts succeed.

Referring to the continuing consequences of the 1967 hostilities and the escalation of violence in the area, he expressed particular concern over

the situation in the refugee camps in Lebanon. He was encouraged, he said, by the Commissioner General's assurances that UNRWA services were continuing and that the integrity of its operations had been maintained. He also welcomed the Agency's progress in rectifying the ration rolls, which resulted in making more rations available for several thousand children previously excluded from the ration rolls for budgetary reasons. He was pleased at UNRWA's continuing efforts to rehabilitate refugees, notably through the increased educational opportunities made possible by substantial contributions from several governments and private organizations, including an American group, Near East Emergency Donations, Inc.

In calling attention to the deteriorating financial position of UNRWA, the U.S. Representative expressed the hope that the General Assembly would not leave UNRWA with only one alternative—to curtail its services—particularly in view of the increased hardship to the refugees and unsettling political consequences which could result. He noted the U.S. Government's past support of UNRWA, which he said would continue, but emphasized that other governments should contribute more to meet the Agency's urgent needs.

Mr. Johnson reiterated the U.S. position that UNRWA's burden could be eased if, in accordance with the Security Council resolution of June 14, 1967, Israel facilitated the return of those persons who had fled the areas where military operations took place in the June 1967 war. He felt that thus far Israel had made only token progress in this regard.

Speaking again on December 4, Mr. Johnson commented on the violent nature of the debate and expressed the belief that the extreme views of some representatives regarding the settlement of the refugee problem were unacceptable. He said that, in accordance with paragraph 11 of General Assembly Resolution 194

(III) of December 11, 1948, the United Nations must not countenance any proposed solution which ignored the wishes of the refugees. He added, however, that that resolution did not give the refugees an unconditional right of free choice. The resolution not only conditioned the refugees' right of return to their homes upon a willingness to "live at peace with their neighbors," but the United Nations had a clear responsibility not to accept any proposals that would threaten the existence of a member state.

U.S. Draft Resolution

Except for the provision in the 1968 resolution extending UNRWA's mandate for an additional 3 years, the resolution introduced by the United States on November 25 was virtually identical to that adopted by the 23d General Assembly. After recalling past resolutions on the subject it:

(1) noted with deep regret that repatriation or compensation of the refugees had not been effected, that there had been no substantial progress in reintegrating refugees by repatriation or resettlement, and that therefore the situation continued to be a matter of serious concern;

(2) thanked UNRWA's Commissioner General and staff, as well as other agencies and organizations, for continued assistance to the refugees;

(3) directed the Commissioner General to continue his efforts, including rectification of the relief rolls, to assure, in cooperation with the governments concerned, the most equitable distribution of relief based on need;

(4) noted with regret that the U.N. Conciliation Commission for Palestine had been unable to find a means to achieve progress on the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly Resolution 194 (III) (which provided for refugee repatriation or resettlement with compensation) and requested the

Commission to exert continued efforts toward its implementation;

(5) directed attention to the critical financial position of UNRWA;

(6) noted with concern that contributions continued to fall short of requirements; and

(7) called upon all governments to make the most generous efforts possible to meet UNRWA's anticipated needs.

The resolution was adopted in committee on December 5 by 101 (U.S.) to 1, with 4 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 10, by 110 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention.

12-Power Resolution

Late in the debate, on December 4, Afghanistan, Burundi, Congo (Brazzaville), Guinea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, and Yugoslavia co-sponsored a draft resolution which, after recalling several earlier resolutions that called upon Israel to ensure the welfare and security of the inhabitants of the occupied territories and to facilitate the return of persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 hostilities, (1) reaffirmed "the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine;" (2) drew the attention of the Security Council to the "grave situation resulting from Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories and Israel's refusal to implement the above resolutions;" and (3) requested the Security Council to take effective measures in accordance with the Charter to ensure the implementation of those resolutions.

In explaining on December 5 why the United States would vote against this proposal, Mr. Johnson cited in particular difficulties with the first and third operative paragraphs. The first was vague and open to differing interpretations, some totally unacceptable to the United States. Moreover, this provision would needlessly complicate the search for peace in the Middle East by driving the parties to the conflict further apart. The United

States opposed the request to the Security Council since it called for action against only one side of the dispute at a time when permanent members of the Council had just resumed efforts to find a solution to a problem troubling the area for a quarter of a century. In the U.S. view, this would make more difficult, rather than facilitate, the search for peace.

The draft resolution was approved in committee on December 5 by a vote of 50 to 22 (U.S.), with 38 abstentions. During its consideration in plenary on December 10, the Representative of Somalia proposed that the Assembly determine that under article 18 of the U.N. Charter the resolution required only a simple, rather than a two-thirds, majority for adoption. This procedural motion was approved 50 to 46 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. The Assembly then adopted the resolution by a vote of 48 to 22 (U.S.), with 47 abstentions.

Humanitarian Resolution

Sweden, with 17 cosponsors, on December 4 submitted a third draft resolution, emphasizing the humanitarian aspects of the problem of persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 war. It reaffirmed resolutions on the subject adopted by the General Assembly in 1967 at its fifth emergency special session and at its 22d and 23d regular sessions; endorsed UNRWA's efforts to provide humanitarian assistance, as far as practicable and on a temporary and emergency basis, to displaced persons in serious need as a result of the 1967 war; and appealed to governments, organizations, and individuals to contribute generously for these purposes to UNRWA and other organizations concerned.

This resolution was adopted in committee on December 5 by a vote of 102 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions, and in plenary on December 10 by 108 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions.

Financial Aspects

In reporting to the Committee on UNRWA's financial condition, the Commissioner General said that the continuing consequences of the hostilities of June 1967 and other factors had added materially to UNRWA's budgetary problems. He estimated that continuing UNRWA's current program in 1970 would cost about \$44.6 million, compared to \$46.4 million for 1969. He pointed out, however, that after excluding nonrecurrent costs, which were unusually large in 1969, UNRWA estimated that the costs of carrying out its regular services to the refugees rose about \$2.5 million in 1969 and would rise another \$.9 million in 1970. This increase in costs was due to rising food prices, salary increases for certain UNRWA employees, higher school enrollments, increased demands for health services, and the continued expense of providing assistance to newly displaced persons, for which special contributions were not as easy to obtain as in the period immediately following the June war. Dr. Michelmore said that there was little reason to expect significant reductions in the Agency's administrative costs.

He presented several possible measures for reducing or eliminating the deficit of \$4-\$5 million forecast for 1970, and said he would welcome any guidance the Assembly might wish to give. He added that unless it directed him otherwise, he would assume that the Assembly supported his intention to reduce services to the refugees if, by the beginning of 1970, the necessary funds had not been made available to UNRWA. He warned that a cutback in services would entail extremely serious consequences by adding to the hardship of hundreds of thousands of human beings already suffering as a result of hostilities and dislocation, and by increasing the tensions in the area which were already at a dangerous level. The Assembly took no action

to provide guidance to the Commissioner General on this point.

Pledging Conference

At the annual pledging conference held on December 11, 41 countries pledged a total of almost \$13.9 million. The U.S. Representative expressed appreciation to the Commissioner General and his staff for their achievements during 1969 in difficult circumstances and noted that their work had never been more essential and important. No one could now be unaware, he said, of the Agency's critical financial situation and the serious consequences that a continued budgetary deficit could have. He reiterated that the international community could not, in good conscience, leave UNRWA with no alternative but to curtail its services.

Although unable to announce a formal pledge because necessary congressional action had not yet been completed, he expressed hope that such action would not be long delayed. He noted that the U.S. Government had contributed almost 70% of the \$700 million that UNRWA and its predecessor agency had received to date and would continue to support UNRWA so long as it continued the essential humanitarian services it has rendered in past years. He again urged other governments, particularly those that had not done so in the past, to respond generously to UNRWA's appeals for essential funds.

Oman

The United Nations in 1969 handled the question of Oman in much the same perfunctory manner it has since 1966. Although the 23d General Assembly had asked the Committee of 24 to examine the situation in the territory, the Committee's only action in 1969 was to decide without discussion to consider the matter at its

next session subject to instructions from the General Assembly.

On December 9 Iraq and Indonesia introduced in the Fourth Committee (Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) a draft resolution finally sponsored by 28 states. The draft resolution deplored the failure of the United Kingdom to implement past resolutions on the subject; reaffirmed the right of the people of Oman to self-determination and to their own resources as well as their right to dispose of these resources in their best interests; urged the United Kingdom to implement the Colonialism Resolution and other relevant resolutions; called upon the specialized agencies to assist the people of the territory; and asked the Committee of 24 to continue its examination of the situation. The draft resolution was adopted on December 10 by a vote of 59 to 15 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions; the United Kingdom did not participate in the vote. The U.S. vote was based on our long-standing and often-stated view that Oman is an independent state with which we have had treaty relationships since 1833.

The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 12 without debate by a vote of 64 to 17 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions.

West New Guinea (West Irian)

The 24th General Assembly took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the act of self-determination conducted in West New Guinea (West Irian) by the Republic of Indonesia. In doing so it acknowledged the fulfillment by the Secretary-General of the responsibilities entrusted to him under the terms of the 1962 Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian). The

result of the "Act of Free Choice" was an expression by the representatives of the people of West Irian of their desire that the territory remain a part of Indonesia. The Assembly action marked the final formal step in resolving the question of the political status of West Irian.

BACKGROUND

Sovereignty over the western half of the island of New Guinea had been a disputed issue between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands from the time of the establishment of an independent Indonesia in 1949 until the signing of an agreement between the two governments in 1962. During this period the Netherlands maintained that its transfer of sovereignty over the Netherlands East Indies to Indonesia did not include West New Guinea, whereas the Government of Indonesia claimed that West New Guinea became a part of its sovereign territory on the date of Indonesian independence. Following several unsuccessful attempts by the parties to resolve the issue bilaterally and in the United Nations and after armed clashes between forces of the two governments in December 1961 and January 1962, the U.N. Secretary-General appealed to and obtained the agreement of the parties to resume informal, private negotiations in the presence of a mutually acceptable third party representing the Secretary-General. On the basis of proposals put forward in the talks by the Secretary-General's representative, and following subsequent formal negotiations under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General, the two parties and the Secretary-General reached agreement on August 15, 1962.

The 1962 Agreement

Under the terms of the Agreement Between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands

Concerning West New Guinea (West Irian), the Netherlands transferred administration of the territory to a United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA), which in turn was to transfer administration to Indonesia beginning in May 1963. Once full administration of the territory was transferred to Indonesia, the latter would undertake to carry out a number of stipulated responsibilities. Among these was a requirement that Indonesia make arrangements to give the people of the territory the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice in determining whether they wished to remain with or to sever their ties with Indonesia, and that Indonesia invite the Secretary-General at the appropriate time to appoint a representative who would advise, assist, and participate in these arrangements. The act of self-determination was to be completed before the end of 1969, after which Indonesia and the U.N. Representative were to submit a final report to the Secretary-General. He in turn was asked to report on the conduct of the act of free choice to the General Assembly.

Following ratification by the two governments, the Agreement came into force with the adoption by the 17th General Assembly, on September 21, 1962, of a resolution which took note of the Agreement, acknowledged the role conferred on the Secretary-General, and authorized him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him in the Agreement.

Implementation of the Agreement

The first part of the Agreement—those articles dealing with transfer to UNTEA and the period of UNTEA administration—was implemented and full administrative control was transferred to Indonesia on May 1, 1963. Implementation of the second part of the Agreement—Indonesian administration and the arrangements for the act of free choice—was interrupted however by the withdrawal of

Indonesia from the United Nations in 1965 and by the announcement by President Sukarno later the same year that West Irian was an integral part of Indonesia and that no act of free choice was necessary. General Suharto, who formally replaced Sukarno as President in 1968, reversed Sukarno's position, brought Indonesia back into the United Nations, and pledged to honor Indonesia's commitment to the Agreement. On April 1, 1968, the Secretary-General appointed Fernando Ortiz-Sanz as his representative in West Irian. The U.N. staff under Mr. Ortiz-Sanz entered West Irian in August 1968 and remained until August 4, 1969, during which period it carried out the Secretary-General's responsibilities to advise, assist, and participate in the arrangements for the act of free choice.

The Act of Free Choice

The Act of Free Choice was carried out by the Indonesian Government between July 14 and August 2, 1969. During this period the question whether West Irian should remain with or sever its ties with Indonesia was put to eight "consultative assemblies" (with a total membership of 1,026) which consisted of the existing representative councils enlarged by "an appropriate number" of representatives elected by the people of West Irian. The answer given by the consultative assemblies was a unanimous consensus that West Irian should remain with Indonesia. Indonesian Foreign Minister Malik informed the Secretary-General by telegram on August 2 that the act had been completed in accordance with the Agreement and that "The people of West Irian through their elected representatives have in assembly sessions in eight Regencies held between July 14th and August 2nd 1969 clearly and unequivocally expressed their unanimous decision to remain within the Republic of Indonesia."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

At the request of the Secretary-General, the 24th General Assembly included on its agenda an item entitled "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian): Report of the Secretary-General regarding the Act of Self-Determination in West Irian." The report of the Secretary-General, a three-page statement to which was appended the lengthy reports of his representative and of the Indonesian Government, was circulated on November 6.

The Secretary-General's statement noted, *inter alia*, (1) his representative's conclusion that "with the limitations imposed by the geographical characteristics of the territory and the general political situation in the area, an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian, in accordance with Indonesian practice, in which the representatives of the population expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia"; (2) the determination of the Indonesian Government, as expressed in its report, to concentrate the efforts of the Government and the people of Indonesia on the development and progress of West Irian; and (3) his own conclusion that the result of the act of free choice was the decision of the consultative assemblies, without dissent, in favor of the territory's remaining with Indonesia.

Debate on the item began on November 13. Indonesia and the Netherlands, joined by Belgium, Luxembourg, Malaysia, and Thailand, sponsored a draft resolution which called on the Assembly to take note of the Secretary-General's re-

port, acknowledge the fulfillment by the Secretary-General and his representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement, and express appreciation for "any assistance provided through the Asian Development Bank, through institutions of the United Nations or through other means to the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote the economic and social development of West Irian." Following statements by Netherlands Foreign Minister Luns, Indonesian Foreign Minister Malik, and others, including several African representatives who stated they had had insufficient time to study the Secretary-General's report, debate was postponed until November 19.

When debate resumed on November 19, Ghana introduced amendments to the six-power draft resolution which replaced several and inserted new preambular paragraphs reflecting reservations about the conduct of the act of free choice and concern over the welfare of the people of West Irian, and entirely replaced the operative paragraphs with ones which took note of the report of the Secretary-General and his representative "on their efforts to fulfill their responsibilities," called for a new act of free choice by the end of 1975, and deleted reference to the Asian Development Bank.

In the afternoon session, the Assembly proceeded to vote. The Assembly rejected the Ghanaian amendments by a vote of 15 in favor, 60 opposed (U.S.), with 39 abstentions. The six-power draft resolution was then adopted by a vote of 84 in favor (U.S.), 0 opposed, with 30 abstentions.

General Political Problems

Peacekeeping

The 23d General Assembly had requested the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Committee of 33)¹ to continue its study on facilities, services, and personnel for U.N. peacekeeping, and to submit not later than the 24th Assembly a comprehensive report on the military observers authorized by the Security Council and a progress report on other models of peacekeeping it might be able to study. The Committee fell considerably short of this objective. The continued deadlock on politically sensitive issues showed that there was still a divergence among key members over fundamental principles for authorizing and financing peacekeeping, and that these differences set limits to the U.N. capacity to organize effective action for peace. Procedures and techniques continued to be improvised for the ongoing peacekeeping operations in Cyprus, the Middle East, and Kashmir.

COMMITTEE OF 33

The full Committee met only six times during the year: in February to agree on procedures under which its Working Group could continue drafting guidelines for observer missions; in June to hear a progress re-

port from the Working Group; twice in September and again in October and November to formulate its report to the General Assembly.

The Working Group, established in April 1968, was composed of the four officers of the Committee (Mexico, Canada, Czechoslovakia, and U.A.R.) and the four permanent members of the Security Council that are also members of the Committee of 33 (France, U.S.S.R., U.K., and U.S.).

In 49 meetings between March 25 and September 11 the Working Group approved for release to U.N. members the documentation compiled by the Secretariat in 1968 describing past peacekeeping experiences; formulated an outline of a study for Model I operations (i.e., groups of military observers established or authorized by the Security Council for observation purposes); and prepared draft guidelines for such operations, working from papers submitted by Canada, the United States, and jointly by Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R.

The outline provided for eight chapters: (1) authorization; (2) establishment, direction, and control; (3) legal arrangements; (4) financial arrangements; (5) organization, development, and functioning of the military observer mission; (6) operating procedures; (7) equipment, facilities, and services; and (8) administrative matters.

During the summer the Working Group completed the text of five of the chapters, but despite extensive consultations differences remained on chapters dealing with direction and control, financing, and legal arrangements. Consultations were also held but no agreement was reached on a possible title and framework for a

¹ Members of the Committee are Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. On Dec. 12 Sweden announced its decision to withdraw, and on Dec. 17 the President of the Assembly appointed Denmark to replace it.

study of Model II, i.e., peacekeeping operations of a larger scale, involving organized military contingents.

In September the Committee received the Working Group report on Model I, including the explanation by the chairman of the difficulties that prevented completion of the three chapters. The U.S. Representative, Seymour Maxwell Finger, noted that the original purpose in the study was to improve advance preparations by member states and the Secretariat for readying personnel for U.N. observer missions, using the procedures for establishment and control which were currently effective. He noted that for this purpose the documentation prepared by the Secretariat would be of great value to governments, since it detailed clearly and concisely how past and present operations were authorized, established, assembled, and financed; how they related to host countries and the other parties directly concerned; and how they functioned in the field. However, some members of the Working Group had pressed for consideration of key political questions as well, such as which U.N. organ should decide on strength, equipment, composition, direction, and control of observer missions. The United States had agreed to such consideration, but the Working Group had been unable to overcome longstanding differences on certain difficult issues. He proposed that the Committee concentrate on completing the three remaining chapters of Model I, begin consideration as soon as possible of Model II, and seek early action on devising more reliable and equitable methods of financing future peacekeeping operations.

Some members expressed dissatisfaction that no more had been achieved, though a number pointed out that the group had for the first time come to grips with some of the most intractable issues confronting the United Nations. The Soviet Representative noted that there were new

elements of agreement and that differences on fundamental principles could not be settled by "waving a wand," and the French Representative said that difficult questions required a patient approach. A number of members not represented on the Working Group, such as the Netherlands Representative, thought there was "little reason to conceal disappointment." Both the Netherlands and Indian Representatives advocated more extensive consultation between the Working Group and other members of the Committee.

The Committee's report to the General Assembly was largely a summary of the Working Group's actions. It also recommended opening to all Committee members opportunity for participating in the Working Group, but did not propose changing the membership.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 24th Assembly's Special Political Committee considered U.N. peacekeeping operations at three meetings between December 8 and 10. The Chairman of the Committee of 33 noted that the Committee's report registered limited progress, and it was hardly surprising that some representatives were disappointed and were suggesting that the Assembly contemplate new ways of dealing with the peacekeeping issue. However, he considered that the Committee of 33 had every chance of being successful, urged its continuance, and urged more attention to overcoming the financial deficit and financing future operations.

Addressing the Special Political Committee on December 8, Ambassador Yost noted that this was the fifth year that peacekeeping had been on the Assembly agenda, and the time was ripe to move from the present *ad hoc* system of conducting peacekeeping to more systematic and reliable procedures. He remarked on the more positive and forward looking

approach in the Committee of 33 and the signs of readiness to discuss issues in practical and realistic terms. Progress was likely to be difficult, particularly on the issues of financing, legal arrangements, and rules for the establishment, direction, and control of observer missions, but the United States was ready "to work intensively to complete a set of mutually acceptable and realistic procedures for the conduct of observer missions and then to proceed to the other major type of peacekeeping operations—those involving organized contingents."

In the U.S. view the main concern of such discussions should be to improve the effectiveness and reliability of U.N. peacekeeping operations once an operation had been duly authorized. To be practical, procedures must provide for political responsiveness to the authorizing body and for sound operational practices to insure efficient and effective management. Moreover, such procedures had to be flexible and adapted to the unique and often rapidly evolving circumstances of each case.

The U.S. Representative noted three key requirements for effective peacekeeping and proposed that intensive and serious discussions take place on these points. The first was an acceptable and workable balance of responsibilities between the Security Council and the Secretary-General so as to take account of both political and operational necessities.

The second requirement was to assure that personnel and facilities were available and ready to move on short notice. The United States believed that the most practical course was to continue to improve and perfect the present system of earmarking contingents, but was open to persuasion that other methods were better and practical. The United States would continue to help provide logistical support when requested and would be prepared to cooperate in joint meas-

ures to strengthen the earmarking system.

Adequate financing was the third requirement. Expenses of U.N. peacekeeping should be, so far as possible, a collective financial responsibility, and the present *ad hoc* and voluntary system was inequitable and undependable. The U.S. Representative proposed examining the practicality of a U.N. peace fund to supplement financing based on apportionment for specific purposes.

Several representatives, notably the Canadian and Norwegian, stressed that in view of the complex problems involved the Committee of 33 was justified in examining the peacekeeping question in systematic stages and selecting limited aspects for study—such as guidelines for military observer groups—in an attempt to reach common ground. The Brazilian Representative stated that peacekeeping operations could not be adequately handled within the constitutional and political framework established by the Charter, since they differed from both the peaceful settlement envisaged in Chapter VI and the enforcement measures mentioned in Chapter VII. He believed some way should be found to relate the U.N. institutional machinery more closely to the reality of contemporary international life, but indicated that doubts and disagreements arose only when the question of Charter reform was brought up. A number of representatives, notably the Irish, called for better financing arrangements. The Soviet Representative reiterated that the Security Council had exclusive competence in all matters relating to the maintenance and restoration of international peace and security including peacekeeping operations. He advocated the timely formulation of definite principles for the execution of the operations in strict conformity with the Charter and expressed gratification at the rapprochement of op-

posing views in the Committee and the serious and pragmatic approach of the participants.

On December 10 the Special Political Committee adopted by a vote of 77 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention, a resolution sponsored by the eight states on the Committee of 33's Working Group. It repeated the previous Assembly's request for the Committee of 33 to continue its work and submit to the 25th Assembly both a comprehensive report on the military observer missions authorized by the Security Council and a progress report on any other peacekeeping models the Committee might be able to study. The resolution was adopted in plenary on December 15 by a vote of 109 (U.S.) to 1, with 1 abstention.

Membership

No applications for admission to the United Nations were received in 1969 and the total membership remained at 126.

MICRO-STATE PROBLEM

The absence of any new membership applications provided an opportunity time for a renewed effort to find a solution to a problem that has been of increasing concern to the United States—how to accommodate in the United Nations, without seriously undermining the prestige and usefulness of the organization, the growing number of very small new states. Previous efforts beginning in 1965 on the part of both the United States and the U.N. Secretary-General and directed along the same general lines—the development of minimum criteria to serve as guidelines for the consideration of future membership applications, and the development of some form of associate status short of full U.N. membership—had proved unproductive.

U.S. INITIATIVE

In a letter of July 14, 1969, the U.S. Acting Permanent Representative, Ambassador Buffum, requested the President of the Security Council to initiate appropriate consultations looking toward an early meeting of the Council to consider the "micro-state" problem. In his letter Ambassador Buffum recalled the previous discussion of this matter that Ambassador Yost and he had had with the Council President on July 8 and also the letter of December 13, 1967, that Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, then U.S. Permanent Representative, had addressed to the President of the Council. Ambassador Buffum referred next to the Secretary-General's remarks on this subject in the Introductions to his 1967 and 1968 Annual Reports to the General Assembly and stated:

The United States believes consideration is long overdue of the problems raised by the Secretary-General in these reports, wherein he suggested a comprehensive study of the criteria for membership in the United Nations with a view to laying down the necessary limitations on full membership for the emerging states which are exceptionally small in area, population, and human and economic resources, while also defining other forms of association which would benefit both the "micro-States" and the United Nations.

The U.S. initiative was preceded, and was to be followed, by extensive private consultations which revealed widespread opposition to any discussion of criteria but a somewhat more receptive attitude toward the concept of associate membership. Therefore, no meeting of the Council having been held in July, Ambassador Yost concentrated on the latter concept in a letter of August 18 to the President of the Council. In this letter he recalled his conversation of August 12 with the Council President "concerning my Government's desire for an early meeting of the Security Council," and said:

My delegation would appreciate an opportunity to present its views on the problem posed by the association of emerging very small states with the United Nations. We will recommend to the Security Council that it formally request the Secretary-General to place the question of associate membership before the General Assembly and that it establish an expert committee of the Security Council to study this question and to report its recommendations to the Security Council at a later date in time to transmit these recommendations to the General Assembly at its 24th session.

U.S. POSITION

The Security Council discussed Ambassador Yost's letter at meetings on August 27 and 29. It also had before it a U.S. draft resolution under which the Security Council would request the Secretary-General to inscribe on the provisional agenda of the 24th General Assembly an item entitled "Creation of a Category of Associate Membership."

Ambassador Yost opened the Council's discussion with a detailed exposition of U.S. views. After defining the problem he quoted from the Secretary-General's earlier observations on it and stated:

From these considerations the Secretary-General drew certain conclusions which, in my Government's view, are entirely sound and which I commend to the Council:

—That full membership in the United Nations "may, on the one hand, impose obligations which are too onerous for the 'micro-States' and, on the other hand, may lead to a weakening of the United Nations itself."

—That "it appears desirable that a distinction be made between the right to independence and the question of full membership in the United Nations."

—That "it may be opportune for the competent organs to undertake a thorough and comprehensive study of the criteria for membership in the United Nations, with a view to laying down the necessary limitations on full membership while also defining other forms of association which would benefit both the 'micro-States' and the United Nations."

Recalling previous U.S. efforts to bring this problem before the Council, Ambassador Yost said:

Now again we have a brief opportunity to act on the basis of general principles, because again at this moment no applications for membership lie before the Security Council. The major question of principle can thus be addressed in the proper perspective, without the distraction and controversy that are likely to arise from debate over individual cases. This moment is not likely to last long. I urge that we do not again let slip this opportunity to make decisions which are becoming increasingly necessary and urgent.

To illustrate the dimensions of the problem, the U.S. Representative noted that while the exact number of very small dependent territories that may obtain independence and seek U.N. membership cannot be predicted, available facts "show a total of nearly 50 territories which may gain (or, in one or two cases, have already gained) juridical independence, each of which has a population of less than 100,000." If to these are added, he continued, about 15 somewhat larger territories, all of these potential candidates for U.N. membership together "possess 0.2% of the total population of the present membership" but if added to the present membership "would comprise one-third of the votes in a General Assembly of 190 members."

Speaking from the standpoint of the organization, he declared:

The United Nations is, in the words of the Charter, "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members." That is a necessary and historically valid principle; for the community of nations has long included states widely varying in population and in power. . . .

But this very same principle will remain valid only as long as it is not carried to an ultimate extreme. The U.N. can no longer afford to waive that judgment of an applicant's ability to fulfill its Charter obligations that the Charter itself provides the organization shall exercise. A line must indeed be

drawn; otherwise the United Nations, which has been truly called the hope of the world, risks losing its relevance to the real world of nations and being reduced to an absurdity. That cannot be allowed to happen. We therefore believe that members of this organization must hereafter take into account the pertinent capabilities of an applicant for membership in determining whether it is in fact able to carry out the obligations of the Charter, however willing it may be to do so.

He then addressed himself to the interests of the very small states themselves, pointing out the drain on their limited resources of U.N. membership and the maintenance of even a minimum level of representation at the United Nations. "Yet without such commitment of resources," he said, "membership would be reduced to an empty symbol." At the same time, he observed, "Even the smallest newly independent state, merely by virtue of its independence, is sure to feel in need of, and entitled to, certain of the benefits of the U.N. system appropriate to its independence—and no longer available to it by way of the former ruling power." As examples of the kinds of U.N. benefits and privileges that should be open to micro-states, the U.S. Representative cited the benefits of the various U.N. agencies in the economic and social fields, participation in the regional economic commissions, membership in some of the specialized agencies, access to the International Court of Justice, the maintenance of offices at U.N. Headquarters where practical, and participation without vote in U.N. meetings of particular interest to them.

Ambassador Yost then stated:

The best solution to this problem, in the view of my Government, is the creation of a new status of association with the United Nations, which might be called "associate member." A status such as that of associate member would carry with it such benefits and privileges as I have just indicated. Perhaps equally important, it would stand as a universal sign and symbol of the inde-

pendence of the state concerned, and of the recognition of its independence by the community of nations.

Such a status, he said, could be created by the General Assembly, which could then recommend to other U.N. organs such as the Security Council and the International Court "that they each give suitable recognition and privileges to associate members."

Introducing the U.S. draft resolution, Ambassador Yost observed that it was one of two steps his delegation was recommending to the Security Council. The other

. . . is that the Security Council itself should make its own substantive contribution to a solution of this problem, and thereby facilitate the General Assembly's consideration of it, by referring it for study to a committee of experts of the Council. The committee of experts should be asked to consider the entire problem. The committee should report the results of its study and its recommendations to the Council within 2 months, which would bring us to the beginning of November, in time for the Council in turn to make recommendations to the General Assembly during the 24th session.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION

All members of the Council except Zambia spoke during the ensuing debate, which revealed substantial differences among the members not only on specifics but also in emphasis and approach. Most members stressed the complexity of the subject and a number of them, including the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R., cautioned against haste. The British believed that "the whole question of the relationship of the United Nations to small states and also small territories still dependent" should be considered in terms of "how the United Nations can best meet the positive needs and aspirations of small countries," an approach endorsed by Pakistan. France and Hungary questioned

whether a new type of U.N. membership could be established without Charter amendment. Nepal, Senegal, and Spain endorsed the concept of universality and opposed any consideration of criteria.

There was general support for the idea of referring the question to a Security Council committee of experts for study but reluctance to see any deadline set for the committee to report. The Security Council President's statement at the meeting of August 29 establishing the committee on a "no objection" basis therefore set no date for it to report to the Council. However, Ambassador Bufum at the close of this meeting reiterated the U.S. desire to see the committee's work concluded in time for "this Council to consider the matter again in order that it may recommend appropriate action" during the 24th General Assembly. The U.S. draft resolution was not put to a vote, the general consensus being that any decision on a request for the inscription of an item on the Assembly's agenda should be deferred pending conclusion of the committee of experts study.

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

In the Introduction to his 1969 report to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General expressed his gratification that the problem of micro-states had been "discussed at length" in the Security Council and that the Council had decided to refer the problem to a committee of experts, whose conclusions, he said, he awaited "with the greatest interest."

The committee, composed of all Council members, held its first meeting on September 12 and decided that its meetings should be closed except when the committee decides otherwise. The committee held three more meetings during 1969 but had made no report by the end of the year.

25th Anniversary of The United Nations

SPECIAL COMMEMORATION PLANNED

On October 31 the General Assembly adopted with no negative votes a 37-power draft resolution on the celebration in 1970 of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. This resolution, which the United States cosponsored, was based on the report of the Preparatory Committee for the anniversary established by the Assembly at its 23d session in response to a suggestion by the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his 1968 Annual Report to the Assembly. Noting the need to "renew our efforts to promote the cause of international understanding and rededicate ourselves to the principles of international order and morality set out in the Charter," the Secretary-General had seen "an occasion for rededication" in the approaching anniversary of the founding of the organization.

Preparatory Committee

The Preparatory Committee¹ on January 27 elected Ambassador Richard M. Akwei of Ghana as its chairman, the Permanent Representatives of Bulgaria, Guyana, and India as vice chairmen, and Mario Franzi of Italy as rapporteur. The Committee had as its mandate the preparation of recommendations and plans for the anniversary and was to report early in the 24th session of the General Assembly.

¹The Committee is composed of the members of the General Committee of the 23d General Assembly: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Canada, China, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Iran, Italy, Lebanon, Mauritania, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

The Secretary-General, in a note of February 14, asked for any views or suggestions member states might have to assist the Preparatory Committee in formulating its recommendations and also what activities they might be contemplating at the national level in commemoration of the anniversary. Later in the month, he sent similar notes to the heads of the specialized agencies and the IAEA. Other U.N. bodies and agencies were also approached, as were nongovernmental organizations in consultative status with ECOSOC.

In a reply of April 30 to the Secretary-General's note, Ambassador Yost said:

The United States considers that both the special significance of the anniversary and the imperative needs of the United Nations and its members warrant treating this occasion more as a dedication to the future than as a celebration of the past.

The United States therefore believes it might be appropriate to define in advance of the 25th anniversary, and in as clear terms as possible, some principal objectives for the United Nations in the decade 1970-1980. These would naturally take into account any decisions and conclusions of the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade. Once formulated, these could serve, in whole or in part, as themes for the commemoration. . . . In addition, certain topics related to increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations might be selected for special emphasis during the commemoration, taking into account the findings of studies currently under way or that may be undertaken by member states officially or privately as part of their individual contributions to the commemoration.

On the national level, Ambassador Yost stated, the U.S. proclamation in 1969 of October 24 as United Nations Day would "call upon the people of this nation and its citizen groups to anticipate the organization's 25th anniversary in 1970 by planning such community and organizational programs as will contribute both to an appreciation of the accomplishments of the United Nations and to a realis-

tic understanding of its aims, its limitations, and its potentialities."

The Committee held 19 meetings in preparing its report to the Assembly. Forty-five governments, 14 specialized agencies and other U.N. organizations, and numerous nongovernmental organizations replied to the request for their suggestions. The Preparatory Committee's report, issued on October 9, included an analysis of these suggestions and conclusions and recommendations drawn from them.

General Assembly Action

The Assembly began consideration of its agenda item entitled "Celebration of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations" in plenary on October 23. The ensuing debate which occupied four meetings indicated general agreement that the commemoration should be of a substantive rather than purely ceremonial character and should be directed toward making the United Nations more effective in fulfilling the purposes of the Charter—an approach clearly reflected in the resolution adopted on October 31.

The resolution provides, *inter alia*, for a short commemorative session to be held during the 25th General Assembly, which would culminate on October 24, 1970, and in which, it was hoped, as many Heads of State or Government as possible would participate; and for a 25-member Committee on the 25th Anniversary¹ to plan and organize suitable activities for the anniversary, to consider proposals and suggestions for increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations, and to prepare, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, a suitable text or texts for consideration early in the 25th session with a view to signature or adoption during the commemorative session.

¹ The Assembly President on Oct. 31 appointed the same members to this Committee as had previously served on the Preparatory Committee.

The 25th anniversary of the United Nations coincides with the 10th anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and with the beginning of the Second U.N. Development Decade. These, therefore, together with disarmament and principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states, were singled out in the resolution for special mention as areas in which the adoption of suitable proposals or texts would be desirable. Stating that the "involvement of world youth in the commemoration is most desirable in relation to the present and future tasks of the organization," the resolution further provided for a world youth assembly to be held in 1970 and invited members to consider the inclusion of youth representatives in their delegations to the 25th General Assembly. The resolution also appealed to members to give "urgent consideration" to the ratification of, or accession to, a number of multilateral conventions that have either not entered into force because of an insufficient number of ratifications or accessions or that could be strengthened by additional ratifications or accessions.

U.S. Position

The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Yost, spoke at the beginning of the discussion of this item, immediately following the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee. Expressing the belief that "none of us is under the illusion that the 25th anniversary should be a time for self-congratulation or complacency," he declared that, rather, "it must be a time for soul-searching and for candid recognition of how far we have fallen short of the purposes of our Charter and of effective means of carrying them out." He then stated:

I think we have only to glance at some of the key provisions of the Charter to see how far we have fallen short of

making them living realities, how substantially we have failed to develop the institution and the sort of international society which the authors of the Charter had in mind.

Do we in fact "take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace"? Do we "accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council"?

Do all of us, do *most* of us, settle our "international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered"? Do we all "refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state"?

In electing new members to our organization do we judge objectively whether they "are able and willing to carry out" the obligations of the Charter? In electing nonpermanent members to the Security Council does this Assembly pay due regard "in the first instance to the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization"? Does the Security Council and do the member states "take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice"?

These questions only need to be asked in order, unhappily, to be answered in the negative. We have in fact only just begun, after 25 years, to implement our Charter. Perhaps it needs in some respect to be amended; but more important and more urgent, it needs to be implemented.

Recalling the Secretary-General's warning that we may have only 10 years in which to reverse the fatal course of conflict, armament, overpopulation, and underdevelopment that we are now pursuing, Ambassador Yost said:

I can think of no more suitable task, no more imperative duty, for us to perform next year than, first, to take whatever concrete action to deal with these problems we can agree to take during that anniversary year and, second, to lay down, collectively insofar as possible, concrete objectives, adequately responsive to the disastrous impact of these problems, for implementation before the end of the decade. Whatever we may decide to do of a ceremonial character in celebration of the anniversary should merely emphasize and reinforce

the practical steps we should take or propose to meet this overriding responsibility.

Ambassador Yost further recalled that President Nixon in his address to the 24th General Assembly had drawn attention "to the challenge and opportunity that lie before us." The job, however, the U.S. Representative said, "must be done by the member states. The U.N., after all, has virtually no power of its own. Its success rests entirely on the readiness of its members to put their power at its service, and to subordinate their parochial concerns to the common cause of a more peaceful and secure world."

While recognizing that it would be premature "to outline today a definitive program of goals for the next decade," Ambassador Yost briefly described "certain approaches" that he thought might be explored during the coming year with respect to peace and disarmament, the second development decade, decolonization and human rights, and youth and the United Nations. In connection with the latter, he said that the United States would propose an agenda item for the 25th Assembly so entitled that it "could include a discussion of the results of the youth assembly, could help to coordinate actions concerning youth in various U.N. bodies, and would enable us to explore fully the role of youth in strengthening the United Nations." He asserted: "Personally, I look forward to this infusion of new blood and new ideas into the work of the United Nations."

Concluding, he declared:

What is supremely important is not this institution but the purposes it was created to serve. If it does not serve those purposes, history will sweep it away. But who can believe that sovereign governments, without the United Nations, without a common institution and a common code of conduct, would serve the same purposes? Let no one suppose that the U.N., this organization, these buildings, these meetings, could cease to exist and the world not suffer things far worse than it suffers today. In these 25 years something of the fate of humanity has become bound

up with what is done—or not done—in these halls. "We cannot escape history." We, and the governments we represent, *must* make this institution a better instrument of man's needs. The 25th anniversary should be above all an occasion for common efforts to that end.

Committee on 25th Anniversary

The new committee held its only meeting in 1969 on December 9, electing the same officers as those of its predecessor committee. A 13-member working group was also decided upon, consisting of the committee's bureau plus the United States, United Kingdom, France, U.S.S.R., Somalia, Iran, Mauritania, and Peru.

CHARTER REVIEW

Speaking during the Assembly's discussion of the U.N. 25th anniversary, the Colombian Representative, on October 30, recalled that both the President of Colombia, addressing the Security Council in June 1969, and the Foreign Minister, in his general debate statement at the 24th General Assembly, had advocated universality for the United Nations. The Colombian Representative regretted that the proposed program for the commemoration did not reflect this concept. Steps should be taken, he said, "which will lead to opening the organization to all the peoples of the world." At the same time he recognized that this would require changes in the Charter.

Subsequently, in a letter to the General Assembly President dated November 21, he requested inclusion in the agenda for the 24th session as an item of an "important and urgent" character the "Establishment of a Special Committee to consider suggestions for revising the Charter of the United Nations." At the same time he submitted an explanatory memorandum and a draft resolution. The memorandum, noting "an obvious and growing concern" about the need to bring the Charter up to date,

which had been expressed by many members, stated that in the view of the Colombian delegation "there would be no better occasion than the 25th anniversary of the United Nations on which to undertake a revision of the principles of the Charter in the light of present circumstances, of the experience gained since the inception of the United Nations and of the need to provide it with adequate juridical instruments with which to tackle, more effectively, the problems of the present and of the future."

Under the draft resolution the proposed special committee would "collect and analyze the suggestions submitted by member states concerning possible amendments to the Charter" and report to the 25th General Assembly not later than September 20, 1970. Members would submit their suggestions prior to June 30.

The Assembly's General Committee on November 26 decided to recommend inclusion of the proposed item on the agenda after Colombia had accepted the following rewording, "Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations," and also to recommend its referral to the Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee. The General Committee's recommendation was accepted by the General Assembly on December 1.

The Sixth Committee considered the item on December 9 and decided by a vote of 52 to 9 (Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cuba, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian S.S.R., and U.S.S.R.), with 22 abstentions (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, U.K., and U.S.), to recommend to the General Assembly that the item be included on the provisional agenda for the 25th General Assembly since there had been insufficient time to

examine it adequately at the 24th session.

The Assembly adopted this recommendation on December 12 by a vote of 69 to 11, with 22 abstentions (U.S.). The United States did not speak in either the committee or the plenary consideration of this item. In explanation of his negative vote in plenary, the Soviet Representative reiterated the U.S.S.R. position "concerning the inappropriateness at the present time of any revision whatsoever of the United Nations Charter."

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Soviet Proposal

Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in his general debate speech September 19 proposed inclusion on the General Assembly's agenda of an item on "The strengthening of international security." During General Committee consideration of the proposal on September 23, the U.S. Representative expressed misgivings about some of the phraseology of the draft resolution accompanying the item and the fact that it included many subjects already on the Assembly's agenda. He did not oppose inscription, however, and said the item was worthy of consideration if it reflected a sincere desire to reach agreement. Upon the Committee's recommendation, the plenary on September 24 approved the new item for the agenda without objection and referred it to the First Committee for consideration.

The draft resolution submitted by the U.S.S.R. took the form of an "Appeal to all states of the world." It combined reaffirmations of broad Charter principles, in many cases as interpreted by the Soviet Union, with calls for progress in areas already under consideration by U.N. organs and related bodies and restatements of certain Soviet propaganda themes. The lengthy text included six main

operative sections under which the Assembly would do the following:

1. (a) declare it necessary to ensure without delay "the withdrawal of troops from territories occupied as a result of action by the armed forces of some states against other states and peoples" defending independence won as a result of "the collapse of the colonial system," the cessation of measures "for the suppression of the liberation movements of the peoples still under colonial rule and the granting of independence to all such peoples," and observance of Security Council decisions on "withdrawal of occupation troops from foreign territories"; and (b) declare that failure of a state to observe the above constitutes "a gross violation" of the Charter;

2. declare the need for all states to abide by the principles of peaceful coexistence, sovereignty, equality, territorial inviolability, noninterference in internal affairs, respect for the rights of all people freely to choose their social system, and peaceful settlement of disputes;

3. call on all states to study the question of establishing "effective" regional security systems "based on the joint efforts of all states of the areas concerned";

4. recommend that the Security Council (a) convene periodic meetings under article 28 (2) of the Charter (i.e. with representation by a member of the government or some other specially designated representative) to elaborate "urgent" measures to strengthen international security, and (b) take effective "practical" steps against aggression, using its "full powers" when required;

5. invite intensified efforts to formulate a generally acceptable definition of aggression, agree on principles of friendly relations and cooperation of states, and arrive at an understanding on U.N. peacekeeping operations "on the basis of strict observance of the United Nations Charter"; and

6. (a) call on all states to inform the General Assembly and Security Council of steps they will undertake in connection with "this Appeal," (b) resolve to include a followup item on implementation of the "Appeal" on the 25th Assembly's agenda, and (c) request the Secretary-General "to transmit this Appeal to the Governments of all states of the world."

U.S. Position and Other Views

During the 2-week committee discussion of the item many delegations supported the general idea of encouraging measures to strengthen international security and to secure broader application of pertinent Charter principles, but there was widespread criticism of the specific content of the Soviet proposal. It was noted, for example, that such subjects as disarmament, economic development, and respect for human rights were not touched upon in the draft resolution, while other matters were dealt with in a prejudicial way.

Speaking on October 16, the U.S. Representative, William T. Coleman, Jr., took note of President Nixon's September 18 observation to the Assembly that "good words are not a substitute for hard deeds, and noble rhetoric is no guarantee of noble results." The U.S. Representative pointed out the need for "real work addressed to specific problems . . . rather than generalized resolutions, exhortations, or declarations," particularly declarations "designed to recast Charter principles in the mold of the philosophy of one or a few members rather than all 126." He urged the Assembly to pursue greater international security through progress on such specific problems as disarmament, peacekeeping, and economic and social development.

The First Committee adjourned consideration of the item on October 28 in order that informal consultations on specific action to be taken could proceed while the Committee

moved on to other business. A number of proposals were discussed during these informal consultations, but no consensus emerged on any draft dealing with the substantive issues involved. Throughout these discussions the United States took the position that the Assembly should not try to adopt a substantive proposal, on which there were widely differing views, but should limit itself to action essentially procedural in nature. This was the view that prevailed.

Assembly Action

On December 9 Finland submitted a largely nonsubstantive resolution referring the question to the 25th General Assembly, but also inviting the Security Council to consider convening periodic meetings under Charter article 28 (2) to elaborate measures to strengthen international security. On December 10 Barbados and 19 other Latin American delegations submitted another draft also referring the question to the next Assembly.

Further informal consultations led to an amalgamation of these two proposals and the introduction on December 12 of a draft cosponsored by Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela. After several Arab delegations agreed not to press to a vote brief amendments they had proposed, the Committee adopted the 24-state draft by acclamation.

The resolution, which was adopted in plenary without objection on December 16, (1) provides that the Assembly on the occasion of the U.N. 25th anniversary should consider "appropriate recommendations" on strengthening international security and that an item on the subject should be included on the 25th Assembly's

agenda; (2) invites member states to study the proposals and statements made during the 24th Assembly's consideration of the item and to inform the Secretary-General not later than May 1, 1970, of their views on this subject and of any measures they take to strengthen international security; and (3) requests the Secretary-General to report to the 25th General Assembly on the communications he receives.

Chinese Representation

Attempts during 1969 by supporters of Communist China to replace representatives of the Republic of China with those of Communist China once again were unsuccessful. Thus the position of the Republic of China was maintained throughout the year in the Assembly and all other U.N. organizations and related agencies of which it is a member.

The principal challenge to the Republic of China in the United Nations, as in previous years, was initiated in the General Assembly with the submission on September 8 of a request by 14 nations (Albania, Algeria, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Romania, Southern Yemen, Syria, Tanzania, Yemen, and Zambia) for the inclusion of an item on the agenda entitled: "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China."

The United States, consistent with the position it has taken in the past, did not oppose the inscription of this item. On September 17 the Assembly's General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of the item on its agenda. This recommendation was accepted by the Assembly on September 20.

Debate on the question of Chinese representation began in plenary ses-

sion on November 3. Two draft resolutions were considered:

(1) A draft resolution submitted October 17 by Australia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Gabon, Japan, Malagasy Republic, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Philippines, Thailand, and the United States (joined later by Haiti, Lesotho, Malawi, Spain, Swaziland, and Togo). This draft resolution, similar to that adopted at previous sessions, reaffirmed the decision of the Assembly in 1961 that any proposal to change the representation of China was an important question under article 18 of the U.N. Charter (and therefore required a two-thirds majority for adoption).

(2) A draft resolution submitted October 22 by the same countries that had requested the inscription of the "Restoration of the lawful rights . . ." item on the agenda, plus Iraq, Pakistan, and Sudan. This draft resolution, identical to one rejected by the Assembly in 1968, would "restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China," recognize its representatives as "the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations," and expel "the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek."

U.S. POSITION

On November 4 Congressman Whalley set forth the U.S. position on the question of Chinese representation. He urged the Assembly once again to reaffirm the important-question principle and to reject the Albanian resolution.

The U.S. Representative noted that the important-question resolution embodied a "long-established position of the General Assembly." The issue was "not simply a matter of replacing one set of representatives with another," but of "deciding to remain faithful to a basic rule of the Charter on which the orderly conduct of our work—perhaps even the future of some of us in the United Nations—depends." He continued:

To insist on the integrity of this Charter provision is in the manifest self-interest of us all. For surely all here must recognize that to permit a perhaps temporary simple majority . . . to expel a Member of the United Nations . . . would set a most dangerous precedent. Those who may be tempted now to disregard the Charter's safeguards because of their views on the present issue should ponder well whether, at some future time on some future issue, they might not find themselves in a challenged position similar to that in which they now seek to place the Republic of China.

The U.S. Representative then condemned the Albanian resolution particularly for its proposal to expel the Republic of China, "a Government which has been a member of this organization from its founding and which has committed no act that would justify its arbitrary expulsion but which, on the contrary, has contributed faithfully and constructively to the work of the organization. . . ."

Many believe that an area as large as mainland China and an authority as real and as potentially influential as that in Peking cannot be ignored and should be represented in the United Nations and brought out of isolation. While these views are understandable—and my Government shares the conviction that it is important for mainland China to return to the family of nations—they ignore the real obstacles which mainland China itself raises to its participation here under present circumstances.

Citing actions and attitudes of Peking itself that have "placed obstacles in the path of its participation" in the community of nations, the U.S. Representative stated:

We are entitled under such circumstances to question whether it is a hostile world that has isolated Peking or rather a still-hostile Peking that isolates itself.

Under such circumstances one must question whether the participation of Peking in the United Nations would contribute to the cause of peace or to the work of this organization.

Nonetheless, despite these discouraging circumstances and despite continued hostility and rebuff, my Government continues to share the conviction of

many others that the current state of tension in relationships with Peking should not continue.

He noted the steps taken by the United States to open channels of communication and to remove irritants in its relations with mainland China. He concluded however that these efforts "cannot be furthered" nor the interests of the United Nations be served by adoption of the Albanian resolution—a step which "would encourage intransigence, debase the Charter, and perpetrate a grave injustice against a member of the United Nations."

ASSEMBLY ACTION

Debate concluded on November 11 with 44 delegations having presented their views. The U.S.S.R., for the first time in the history of debate on this question, did not speak on the resolutions. The Assembly proceeded on the same day to vote on the two draft resolutions.

The 18-power important-question resolution, as at previous recent sessions, was adopted by an overwhelming majority: 71 in favor, 48 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Those in favor were:

Argentina	Guatemala
Australia	Guyana
Belgium	Haiti
Bolivia	Honduras
Botswana	Iceland
Brazil	Iran
Cameroon	Ireland
Canada	Israel
Central African Republic	Italy
Chad	Ivory Coast
Chile	Jamaica
China	Japan
Colombia	Jordan
Congo (Kinshasa)	Laos
Costa Rica	Lebanon
Cyprus	Lesotho
Dahomey	Liberia
Dominican Republic	Luxembourg
Ecuador	Malagasy Republic
El Salvador	Malawi
Gabon	Maldives
Gambia	Malta
Greece	Mauritius
	Mexico
	Netherlands

New Zealand	Spain
Nicaragua	Swaziland
Niger	Thailand
Panama	Togo
Paraguay	Trinidad and Tobago
Peru	Turkey
Philippines	United Kingdom
Rwanda	United States
Saudi Arabia	Upper Volta
Senegal	Uruguay
Sierra Leone	Venezuela
South Africa	

Those opposed were:

Afghanistan	Mauritania
Albania	Mongolia
Algeria	Morocco
Bulgaria	Nepal
Burma	Nigeria
Burundi	Norway
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Pakistan
Cambodia	Poland
Ceylon	Romania
Congo (Brazzaville)	Singapore
Cuba	Somalia
Czechoslovakia	Southern Yemen
Denmark	Sudan
Ethiopia	Sweden
Finland	Syria
France	Tanzania
Ghana	Tunisia
Guinea	Uganda
Hungary	Ukrainian S.S.R.
India	U.S.S.R.
Iraq	U.A.R.
Kenya	Yemen
Libya	Yugoslavia
Mali	Zambia

Those abstaining were:

Austria	Malaysia
Barbados	Portugal

Equatorial Guinea, Indonesia, and Kuwait were absent.

The 17-power resolution to replace the representatives of the Republic of China with those of Peking was then defeated by a vote of 48 to 56, with 21 abstentions.

Those in favor were:

Afghanistan	Cuba
Albania	Czechoslovakia
Algeria	Denmark
Bulgaria	Ethiopia
Burma	Finland
Burundi	France
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Ghana
Cambodia	Guinea
Ceylon	Hungary
Congo (Brazzaville)	India
	Iraq

Kenya
 Libya
 Mali
 Mauritania
 Mauritius
 Mongolia
 Morocco
 Nepal
 Nigeria
 Norway
 Pakistan
 Poland
 Romania
 Somalia

Those opposed were:

Argentina
 Australia
 Barbados
 Bolivia
 Botswana
 Brazil
 Cameroon
 Central African
 Republic
 Chad
 China
 Colombia
 Congo (Kinshasa)
 Costa Rica
 Dahomey
 Dominican
 Republic
 El Salvador
 Gabon
 Gambia
 Greece
 Guatemala
 Haiti
 Honduras
 Ireland
 Israel

Southern Yemen
 Sudan
 Sweden
 Syria
 Tanzania
 Uganda
 Ukrainian S.S.R.
 U.S.S.R.
 U.A.R.
 United Kingdom
 Yemen
 Yugoslavia
 Zambia

Ivory Coast
 Japan
 Jordan
 Lesotho
 Liberia
 Luxembourg
 Malagasy Republic
 Malawi
 Malaysia
 Malta
 Mexico
 New Zealand
 Nicaragua
 Niger
 Panama
 Paraguay
 Peru
 Philippines
 Rwanda
 Saudi Arabia
 Senegal
 Sierra Leone
 South Africa
 Spain
 Swaziland
 Thailand

Togo
 Turkey
 United States

Those abstaining were:

Austria
 Belgium
 Canada
 Chile
 Cyprus
 Ecuador
 Equatorial Guinea
 Guyana
 Iceland
 Iran
 Italy

Upper Volta
 Uruguay
 Venezuela

Jamaica
 Kuwait
 Laos
 Lebanon
 Maldives
 Netherlands
 Portugal
 Singapore
 Trinidad and
 Tobago
 Tunisia

Indonesia was absent.

On December 15 the question of Chinese representation was also raised in the Assembly's Credentials Committee. A motion by Sudan to declare invalid the credentials of the Republic of China was defeated by a vote of 3 in favor (Mongolia, Sudan, and U.S.S.R.) to 5 opposed (Bolivia, Nicaragua, Thailand, Togo, and U.S.), with 1 abstention (Iceland). The Committee then accepted the credentials of all the representatives to the 24th General Assembly by a vote of 6 to 0, with 3 abstentions (Mongolia, Sudan, and U.S.S.R.). The Committee's report was adopted by the plenary on December 16 by a vote of 81 (U.S.) to 0, with 21 abstentions.

Part II

Cooperation in the Economic, Social, Scientific and Human Rights Fields

Second Development Decade

Committee for Development Planning

The General Assembly in 1961 had declared the 1960's a U.N. Development Decade as the result of a U.S. initiative. The goals set, however, were extremely general, and no effort was made to coordinate the development policies of member states and the organizations of the U.N. system until much later in the period. Nevertheless, the potential of the concept was widely recognized and detailed preparations for the Second U.N. Development Decade began as early as 1965.

The General Assembly and virtually all the bodies reporting to ECOSOC participated during 1969 in preparations for the Second U.N. Development Decade, which will begin January 1, 1971. This effort by so many organizations to formulate a global program for economic and social development reflected the crucial importance of improving the well-being and living conditions for the people of the developing countries.

The U.N. bodies most importantly involved during the year in developing an international development strategy for the Decade were the Committee for Development Planning, UNCTAD's Trade and Development Board, the Preparatory Committee for the Second U.N. Development Decade, ECOSOC, and the General Assembly.

The Committee for Development Planning (CDP) is composed of 18 experts, serving in their individual capacities, who are appointed by ECOSOC for 3-year terms. Dr. Max Millikan of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was a member until his untimely death at the end of 1969.

At its two sessions in 1969 (New York, March 17-21, and Bangkok, May 7-16) the CDP reviewed the principal problems involved in formulating an effective international development strategy and prepared a provisional set of recommendations, based in part on replies to specific questions it had addressed in 1968 to U.N. specialized agencies and other organizations concerned with economic and social questions. The CDP recommended that the Decade be launched by a general declaration to which all U.N. members might subscribe, and it suggested that the declaration include a statement of the principal objectives, the means for attaining them, the actions to be taken by developing and developed countries, particularly through U.N. organizations, and arrangements for

regularly appraising the progress toward the objectives.

Setting as a fundamental objective the marked acceleration in the less developed countries of the growth of gross product per head, the CDP proposed targets, somewhat higher than those subsequently accepted as possible by the Preparatory Committee (see below), of a 6-7% annual average rate of expansion in total gross product and a 3.5-4.5% per capita growth rate. To achieve these targets the CDP expected that agricultural output would be increased by 4% annually and industrial production by 8-9%. Developing countries would aim at increasing their "capacity to import" by 7-8% annually and their ratio of domestic savings to 15-20% of gross product by the end of the Decade.

The CDP reports were made available to the Preparatory Committee.

Trade and Development Board

The United States is a member of UNCTAD's 55-state Trade and Development Board which had responsibility for suggesting policies for the Decade in the field of trade and aid. The Board engaged in long negotiations at its eighth and ninth sessions and representatives of Board members held weeks of additional informal discussions in an effort to reach agreement on trade and aid issues. These issues included commodity policy, aid flows, trade policies (including preferential treatment by developed countries of imports from developing countries), shipping and insurance matters, and tourism. A major issue which delayed agreement on many important points was the desire of the developing countries to seek additional specific commitments from the developed countries on major substantive issues, such as agreement that developed countries

would provide annually 1% of their gross national product as net financial transfers to the developing countries. The United States and other developed countries argued that the Decade was a continuing development effort for which the basic strategy should not be delayed pending agreement on individual issues raised in the UNCTAD forum.

Preparatory Committee

The Preparatory Committee for the Second U.N. Development Decade, established by the General Assembly in 1968, is composed of the 27 members of ECOSOC (see p. 227) and 27 additional members¹ appointed by the President of the General Assembly. It is responsible for the overall preparation of the draft international development strategy for the Decade.

The Committee held four sessions in 1969: February 25-March 4, April 14-May 1, June 30-July 11, and September 26-October 8. It agreed that the development strategy would consist of five major sections: (1) preambular declaration, (2) goals and objectives (including an overall growth target for the Decade), (3) policy measures designed to fulfill the objectives, (4) review and appraisal of both objectives and policies, and (5) mobilization of public opinion.

The Committee took note of the several growth targets proposed by the Committee for Development Planning, but proposed "as a working hypothesis" a figure of 6% for the average annual rate of growth in real

¹ Algeria, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Italy, Lebanon, Mauritius, Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, U.A.R., and Venezuela. Although members, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Poland, Romania, and U.S.S.R. did not participate.

terms of the gross product of the developing countries. Such a rate, if accompanied by an annual population growth rate not exceeding 2.5%, would give a per capita growth rate sufficient to double average per capita incomes in developing countries within 20 years.

Although the Committee discussed in a preliminary manner the content of each approved section of the draft strategy, work on the actual language of the separate sections awaited receipt of numerous contributions, including those from UNCTAD, some of the specialized agencies, regional economic and functional commissions, and other U.N. bodies concerned with economic and social development. Many of these submissions did not become available until after the end of the year.

ECOSOC Action

On August 5 the 47th ECOSOC adopted by a vote of 19 (U.S.) to 0, with 2 abstentions, a resolution on the Second Development Decade based in part on the reports of the Preparatory Committee. The resolution, *inter alia*, agreed that the international development strategy should consist, in principle, of the five sections recommended by the Preparatory Committee; expressed its concern that the progress in defining goals and objectives had not yet been matched by agreement on concerted policy measures for reaching the goals; expressed the hope that the contribution of the Trade and Development Board would be finalized at its resumed 9th session; and called on member states and the organizations in the U.N. system to

make additional efforts in their contributions to the preparatory work of the Decade.

General Assembly Action

On December 13 the General Assembly, by a vote of 85 (U.S.) to 0, with 11 abstentions, adopted a resolution on the international development strategy that noted the agreements reached so far, including the agreement that the main objective of the Decade should be "to promote sustained economic growth, especially in developing countries, to ensure a higher standard of living consistent with human dignity, to bring about sustained improvements in the well-being of the individual, and to facilitate the process of narrowing the gap between the developed and developing countries." In other paragraphs the resolution, *inter alia*, expressed concern that the Preparatory Committee had not been able to complete the preliminary draft of the strategy in time for the 24th Assembly to consider it, instructed the Committee to concentrate particularly on objectives and policy measures at its forthcoming sessions, and called on all organizations of the U.N. system to make available as soon as possible the contributions to the strategy expected of them.

In a separate resolution on the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, adopted October 31 (see p. 53), the Assembly decided to consider the draft international development strategy during the early part of its 25th session with a view to having it adopted during the commemorative session.

Economic Cooperation

Economic Commission for Europe

ECE, the oldest of the regional economic commissions, was established immediately following the Second World War to assist in the reconstruction of the European economy. Its original concerns were with the basic sectors of the economy and with the fundamental problems of production, distribution, and trade in Europe. Today, over a generation later, almost all its members have highly industrialized economies and their problems are related to growth, complexity, and technology. As a result, ECE is concerned with many issues, such as environment, which go beyond economic problems. In addition, the rapid pace of technological innovation has enhanced the interest of member governments in an exchange of information on a widening range of subjects.

ECE has 31 members—the European members of the United Nations, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United States; Switzerland is an observer. Its activities, however, are not limited to its members and any U.N. member can participate in ECE meetings on subjects of interest to it. An example is Japan's active participation in the ECE Inland Transport Committee's Working Party on the Construction of Automobiles.

At its 24th plenary session, held in Geneva April 9–23, ECE approved its Executive Secretary's proposals for the reorganization of the Commission and its program of work. These proposals altered ECE's structure and activities to make it responsive and relevant to today's concerns

without increasing its budget. The discontinuance of the Industry and Materials Committee and the creation of the Working Party on Air Pollution are examples of this effort.

Also at its 24th session, the Commission instructed its Executive Secretary to prepare an analytical report and recommendations regarding the facilitation of East-West trade. The report will form a major agenda item at the 25th session in 1970.

The preparations for the ECE Conference on the Environment, to be held in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in 1971, were approved by the Commission at its 24th plenary, and the Executive Secretary was asked to proceed with a preparatory meeting of experts for the conference and to prepare the necessary documentation.

ECE continued its significant economic and technical cooperation. In addition to the exchange of information, substantive discussions during 1969 took place concerning the establishment of international safety standards on the construction of automobiles, the standardization of customs regulations and documentation regarding the shipment of goods by containers, the pollution of surface and ground waters by oil products, and the standardization of agricultural products. These discussions and meetings, all of which included government representatives from both Eastern and Western Europe, took place with little reference to contentious political issues.

In the fall of 1969 ECE's Steel Committee toured U.S. steelmaking facilities as guests of the U.S. Government and the American steel industry. Efforts are underway to arrange another similar meeting in the United States in the field of urban mass transportation.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East

ECAFE, with 27 members and 3 associate members, has a geographical scope extending from Iran to Western Samoa. During the past year it continued to seek ways to shift the emphasis of its activities from study and research to operational programs for promoting economic development in the region. At the start of the year it established a Population Division within its secretariat to undertake an expanded population and family planning program. It also sought to expand its programs for trade promotion and offshore minerals prospecting.

As one of the five nonregional members (France, Netherlands, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.), the United States took part in all major ECAFE meetings during the year, including the Commission's 25th plenary session in Singapore, April 15-28, which adopted a number of resolutions on, *inter alia*, strategy for the second U.N. Development Decade, support for the formation of an Asian coconut community, the establishment of an Asian handicraft center, the establishment of a regional computing center, and the need to integrate social development planning in the overall national planning process. The United States also took part in the annual meetings of ECAFE's standing committees on trade, industry and natural resources, and transport and communications. Other meetings attended during the year by the United States dealt with typhoons, statistics, railroads, population and family planning, housing, hydraulic engineering and water resources development, offshore prospecting for minerals, petroleum, mining legislation, and regional industrial development.

In addition the United States helped ECAFE by providing the services of experts and advisers in such

fields as data processing, water resources, industrial and trade development, tectonic geology, and offshore minerals prospecting.

The United States continued to contribute to the program of the Mekong Coordination Committee¹ which is developing, under international auspices, plans for several hydroelectric and irrigation projects. In 1969 the United States provided the services of a water resources adviser, a systems analyst, and a private consulting firm to assist the Mekong Committee in the preparation of the draft of an Amplified Mekong Basin Development Plan.

The United States accelerated the feasibility investigations being done for the Mekong Committee on the first stage of the Pa Mong multipurpose mainstream project on the boundary between Laos and Thailand (the final report was expected early in 1970) and helped the Committee to begin ecological studies of aquatic weed growth and water borne diseases, and studies of fisheries development, improved resettlement of persons displaced from reservoirs, the probable effects of irrigation on soil salinity, and power demand in the Basin.

Construction of the \$31 million Nam Ngum Dam in Laos continued and an access bridge, a diversion tunnel, and the coffer dam were completed. The United States is providing 50% of the costs of the dam which is financed by an IBRD-managed fund.

Economic Commission for Latin America

ECLA was established in 1948 to assist member governments in solving problems related to formulating and coordinating economic development

¹ Committee for the Coordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin.

policies and technical assistance programs. Its members are 24 Latin American countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, and Canada; British Honduras and the West Indies Associated States are associate members.

ECLA meets biennially to study the recent economic development of the area, review the activities of its committees and subgroups, and establish a program for future work. The 13th plenary session of the Commission met in Lima, Peru, April 14-23. The principal issues were the strategy for regional development during the Second U.N. Development Decade and the question of Latin American trade policies.

The prevailing concerns of most members were reflected to a large degree in the resolution on the Second Development Decade that was adopted by a vote of 24 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention. This resolution stressed the urgent need for the international community to adopt programs in the coming decade to overcome external restrictions on Latin American development, including greater access to the markets of the developed countries, establishment of generalized preferences, elimination of problems created by tied loans, increase of external financial assistance and improvement of the terms and conditions of this assistance, reorientation of private foreign investment, improved shipping conditions, and the transfer of technology. The resolution called on the ECLA secretariat to cooperate with the Preparatory Committee for the Second Development Decade, UNCTAD, and other pertinent bodies interested in this work. Several countries, including the United States, had reservations on portions of the resolution. The U.S. Representative explained that he had voted in favor as an expression of support by the United States for the efforts to attain a set of objectives it had previously supported in

ECLA and other international forums. However, the U.S. vote did not imply the assumption of new or expanded obligations.

Another resolution, adopted unanimously, reaffirmed the principle that Latin American development depends essentially on the countries' own efforts, considered that it was necessary to make a more searching analysis of economic and social problems so that governments could select the best strategies and alternatives, and emphasized that regional economic integration was a basic instrument for stimulating economic and social progress. The resolution set forth in detail basic aspects of ECLA's work program relating to development strategy and policy and called for special attention to studies, research, and advisory services on these aspects. It also contained a clause calling for the modernization of the secretariat's statistical methods and services.

In a related resolution, adopted 26 (U.S.) to 1, with no abstentions, the Commission recommended that its Executive Secretary strengthen the operational capacity of the Commission's Montevideo Office so that it might intensify its advisory services to the Latin American Free Trade Association.

ECLA's original plan to convene a meeting of its Trade Committee immediately prior to the 13th session had been abandoned. Instead, a working group of the whole on trade policy was created to meet during the plenary session. The debates of this working group reflected a considerable divergence of view between the developing and developed nations. To a large degree the group became a forum for the restatement of dissatisfaction with U.S. trade policy. The resolution that this group proposed was adopted by ECLA by a vote of 21 to 0, with the United States and the 4 other developed countries abstaining. The resolution noted many of the trade-related concerns of

the Latin American countries, but in the U.S. view it was not adequately focused on the need for sound internal Latin American policies to promote trade, and it implied that economic difficulties originated entirely from sources external to Latin America.

The Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning had been established by ECOSOC in 1962 as a project of the U.N. Special Fund with the support of the Inter-American Development Bank, which ensured its financing for an initial 5-year period. The Chairman of the Institute's Governing Council provided ECLA with a detailed report of the Institute's activities and concluded by expressing his concern about the Institute's precarious financial position. Delegations generally agreed that adequate provision should be made for the continuation of the Institute and ECLA adopted a resolution urging the U.N. Secretary-General and the UNDP to provide the necessary support to convert the Institute into a permanent body and to ensure its long-term financing. The resolution also requested member governments to continue their support of the Institute. The United States did not participate in the vote because although it did not oppose additional financial support it was not convinced of the need to make the Institute permanent.

In the past, the ECLA Committee of the Whole has met biennially in those years when there was no session of the full Commission. However, in the light of comments by the representative of the U.N. Secretary-General that both the General Assembly and ECOSOC have emphasized the need to reduce as far as possible the number of meetings of U.N. bodies, ECLA decided to dispense with the regular meetings of the Committee of the Whole, although it reserved the right to convene an extraordinary session if necessary.

Finally, the Commission adopted

by a vote of 25 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention, a resolution endorsing the program of work and priorities for 1969-71, and reaffirming the resolutions adopted during the session relating to specific projects in the program.

Economic Commission for Africa

ECA is the only U.N. regional commission of which the United States is not a member. However, the United States actively supports ECA by maintaining a full-time liaison office at its headquarters, by attending a number of its meetings as an observer, and by providing technical and economic assistance.

The most important ECA event during 1969 was the ninth plenary session of the Commission, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, February 3-14. This session also marked ECA's 10th anniversary. The major substantive results of the session were the adoption of resolutions calling for a greater operational role for ECA in carrying out the U.N. program of technical cooperation in Africa, and recommending the establishment of a special U.N. program in favor of the "least developed among the developing countries." In connection with the 10th anniversary observances, the United States participated in an exhibition of small-scale industries, a subject of considerable interest to ECA members.

Another important ECA meeting was the training course on Manpower and Human Resources Development held in October in Dakar, Senegal. The United States provided the expert assistance of Arthur A. Fletcher, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Wage and Labor Standards, to this course. Besides participating in many of its meetings, the United States supported ECA activities by providing training for Africans, and by providing Ameri-

can experts in such fields as agriculture, industrial development, water resources, manpower training, statistics, and demography. In addition the United States continued to provide a special adviser on agricultural matters to the Executive Secretary of ECA.

With money provided by the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, to which the United States has been the major donor, ECA in 1969 established a population division within its secretariat and is now planning the establishment of two regional population-demographic training centers—one for French-speaking African nations, and the other for English-speaking nations.

U.N. Development Program

The UNDP responds to requests from member states for preinvestment assistance designed to provide the necessary basis for the attraction of investment capital. Three- to five-year projects in the fields of agriculture, education, transportation, and resource exploration are typical of the kinds of projects undertaken. In addition, the UNDP undertakes smaller projects, usually without any provision of equipment, designed either to train nationals by means of fellowships or to provide the countries with the required expertise through the use of advisers.

The UNDP has its headquarters in New York and its present Administrator is an American, Paul Hoffman. During 1969 the Deputy Administrator, David Owen, a British national, retired, and the Administrator appointed C. V. Narisimhan, an Indian, to the position. Mr. Narisimhan is also an Under Secretary-General of the United Nations and Chef de Cabinet to the U.N. Secretary-General.

The UNDP's policies are established by a 37-nation Governing

Council which generally meets twice a year. The Council approves the projects presented by the Administrator and since it is entrusted with the supervision of all U.N. technical co-operation activities it also reviews the program of technical assistance financed from the regular U.N. budget.

In addition to the Governing Council the UNDP has an Inter-Agency Consultative Board (IACB), an advisory body which provides consultative participation in the decision and policy-making process. The IACB is composed of the U.N. Secretary-General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies, IAEA, UNCTAD, and UNIDO. The Executive Directors of the World Food Program, UNICEF, and UNHCR are invited to participate as appropriate. Although projects are funded from UNDP resources, they are usually carried out by one of 17 executing and participating agencies, and the IACB generally meets prior to each Governing Council session to review the proposed projects and to advise the Administration on the appropriate agencies for executing them.

ROLE OF RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVE

A key element in the UNDP operation is the field representative who advises the host government on U.N. assistance and coordinates the operations of the UNDP-financed programs within the country under his jurisdiction. During 1969 the total number of resident representative posts increased from 87 to 93. Offices were opened in Mauritius and Mauritania; a small liaison office was established in Arusha, Tanzania, to deal with the East African community; and the offices in Bangui, Central African Republic, Fort Lamy, Chad, and Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, were elevated from suboffices to full resident representative posts.

As part of its continuing policy to strengthen the role of the resident representative, the United States, together with Belgium, Indonesia, and

the United Kingdom, sponsored at the 47th ECOSOC a resolution which stressed the importance of governments giving their full support to the resident representative. In addition, the resolution stated that the resident representative should be able to call on the country representatives of the specialized agencies, where they exist, for assistance and advice in carrying out his functions. Finally, the resolution invited the organizations of the U.N. system to ensure that resident representatives are consulted in the planning and formulation of development projects carried out by the agencies, and are furnished with reports on the progress of the projects. This resolution was adopted on August 8 by a vote of 18 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions.

FINANCING

The financial resources of the UNDP come principally from voluntary contributions pledged by governments. During 1969, 130 governments pledged \$198.6 million; in addition, assisted governments contributed about \$16 million for local costs of projects. The United States pledged \$71 million subject to the condition that the U.S. contribution should not exceed 40% of the total governmental contributions, including local costs.

PREINVESTMENT

The largest projects mounted by the UNDP are in the preinvestment component. All states that are members of the United Nations, specialized agencies, or IAEA are eligible for assistance. During 1969 the Governing Council approved 156 preinvestment projects, raising the cumulative total of such projects approved by the UNDP (and not subsequently canceled) to 1,075. These 1,075 projects call for UNDP earmarkings of \$1,038 billion as well as \$1,498 billion in counterpart contributions (in cash and kind) from local recipient

governments for a total of \$2,536 billion.

By field of activity the projects break down as follows: surveys of natural resources and/or feasibility studies, 427; technical education and training, 387; applied research, 234; and economic development planning, 27. By geographic region the 1,075 projects are distributed as follows: Africa, 397; the Americas, 252; Asia and the Far East, 268; Middle East, 73; Europe, 83; and Inter-Regional, 2.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

New continuous programing procedures went into effect in 1969 that make it possible for developing countries and territories to plan for technical assistance projects lasting up to 4 years. Expenditures on the projects are determined on the basis of country targets approved by the Governing Council each year, and provisionally for each of the 3 subsequent years. At its seventh session, in January, the Governing Council approved 1969 country targets totaling \$47,070,000 and earmarked an additional \$11,884,855 for regional and inter-regional projects.

At its eighth session, in June, the Governing Council authorized the UNDP Administrator to review and approve regional and interregional projects with an anticipated cumulative cost of less than \$200,000 each. Similar projects of \$200,000 or more will still be reviewed and approved by the Governing Council itself.

CAPACITY STUDY

In June 1966 the Governing Council asked the Administrator to undertake a study of the administrative capacity of the UNDP to handle a greatly enlarged program. Sir Robert Jackson of Australia, appointed by the Administrator to make the study, reported on its progress to the seventh and eighth sessions of the Governing Council. The report, "Review of the

Capacity of the U.N. Development System," was released to members of the Governing Council and to the executive heads of the specialized agencies on November 24 and made public on December 1.

Sir Robert prepared the report in two volumes totaling some 600 pages. The first volume was a summary of the findings. The second discussed the development of the U.N. economic and social system; present constraints on the capacity of the system; potential lines of development; proposals for an action-oriented program; proposals for an informational system; and proposals for organization, personnel, financial, and administrative reform.

In general the report concludes that the *ad hoc* development of the present system has resulted in cumbersome machinery, and it recommends a wide-ranging series of reforms to ensure the creation of a centralized policy-making body located in a reorganized and strengthened UNDP.

One of the proposals is for the establishment of a U.N. Development Cooperative Cycle which would help ensure that all the resources in the U.N. system are addressed to expertly examined economic and social priorities and based on total country programs. This would require a greater role for the resident representative who would be responsible for ensuring successful completion of projects approved within the context of a country program. The country program would be discussed by the UNDP Governing Council and approved on a 5-year basis, with the Council reviewing annually the progress toward the achievement of the objectives set forth in the country programs.

The recommendations in the Jackson report will be considered at a special session of the Governing Council in March 1970, pursuant to procedures to be worked out at the ninth session in January 1970.

Financed from the U.N. assessed budget, the Regular Program of Technical Assistance amounted to \$6.9 million in 1969. \$1.5 million of this went for industrial development projects that were reviewed and approved by the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO (see p. 79). The remaining \$5.4 million went for projects in the fields of social development, public administration, human rights, and narcotics control that were reviewed and approved by the UNDP Governing Council.

The Secretary-General submitted to the seventh Governing Council in January a report reviewing these activities and proposing guidelines for the future. His report recommended that preference in the allocation of Regular Program resources should be given to those areas less favored by other technical assistance programs, i.e., social development, public administration, and certain economic fields such as planning, public finance, and trade promotion. Since the Regular Program is almost the sole source of funds for projects in human rights and narcotics control, the report also urged that consideration be given to "moderate increases" in allocations for these programs.

The Secretary-General proposed revising the programing and budgeting procedures of the Regular Program and suggested that he be authorized to exercise a coordinating role to harmonize the views of the interested program-formulating bodies with respect to program level. He also recommended that the current system of separate section appropriations for each field of activity be converted to a chapter approach in the form of more flexible targets. The approval of individual projects based on governmental requests would be left to the Secretary-General, and the continuous programing approach used by the UNDP technical assistance component would be extended

to the Regular Program, but without country and regional target figures.

The United States supported these proposals which were accepted by the seventh session of the Governing Council and approved by ECOSOC at its 47th session. The third session of the Industrial Development Board, however, recommended retention of a separate section for industrial development, and the 24th General Assembly on November 21, by a vote of 77 to 7 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions, endorsed its recommendation. The Industrial Development Board will, therefore, continue to recommend the level of the industrial development section of the budget, and the Secretary-General will not be able to move funds from that section to other fields of activity supported by the Regular Program.

CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

The General Assembly established the 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 development financing at less than market rates but greater attention to existing institutions. The United States and some other developed countries also objected to the fact that the administrative expenses of the Fund were to be borne by the assessed budget of the United Nations.

In 1967 the General Assembly placed the Fund under the management of the Administrator and the Governing Council of the UNDP because the pledges to the Fund did not amount to enough to make a separate administration economic.

During 1969 there was a decline in tangible support for the Fund. Twenty-nine U.N. members pledged some \$819,000 (equivalent in local currencies) compared with total pledges of about \$1.3 million in each of the two preceding years. As in the past, the United States neither at-

tended the 1969 pledging conference nor made a pledge. While the total amounts pledged exceed \$3.4 million (of which nearly 90% is in nonconvertible currencies), only about \$700,000 had actually been paid in as of December 1969.

Through December 31 the Fund had undertaken no projects, although a few were under negotiation.

U.N. Conference on Trade and Development

The United States is a member of the Trade and Development Board (UNCTAD's permanent organ) as well as all principal UNCTAD committees.

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Board held four sessions in 1969: its eighth (January 21–February 10), eighth resumed (May 5–20), ninth (August 26–September 15), and ninth resumed (September 15–23). Much of its time was devoted to a consideration of UNCTAD's contribution to the Second U.N. Development Decade (see p. 64). At the resumed ninth session the Board agreed on an outline and decided to complete the substance of its contribution at a second resumed session early in 1970.

On other agenda items, the Board agreed unanimously at its eighth session to hold an intergovernmental meeting to examine outstanding questions on trade expansion, economic cooperation, and regional integration among developing countries, and to recommend ways and means of implementing the "Concerted Declaration" on this subject adopted in New Delhi in 1968 at UNCTAD II. In a resolution adopted without objection, the Board authorized the UNCTAD Secretary General to convene a small group of experts to make a special study of monetary issues

relating to development finance and trade of developing countries. A third resolution authorized the UNCTAD secretariat to undertake an initial study of restrictive business practices. Pursuant to a resolution adopted at New Delhi in 1968, the Board by unanimous action also invited UNCTAD's Secretary General to convene a group of experts to examine the special problems involved in the promotion of the trade and economic development of landlocked countries. Finally, a resolution was adopted unanimously that asked the Secretary General to present proposals for increasing UNCTAD activity in informing public opinion about both UNCTAD's objectives and the problems of development.

The first part of the Board's ninth session was devoted primarily to discussing questions of supplementary finance, flow of funds, and the transfer of technology. Consideration of all these items will be continued at subsequent meetings.

COMMITTEES

The Committee on Commodities devoted its fourth session, held in Geneva May 19-31, to trying to complete action on certain draft resolutions that had been referred to it by UNCTAD II. Final texts were worked out for four of these—synthetics and substitutes, special measures for the least developed countries, elements of a commodity policy, and study on organization and structure of trade network in the field of commodities.

The third session of the Committee on Invisibles and Financing related to Trade was held in Geneva, February 17-March 1. The main subjects discussed were the flow of public and private capital to developing countries, the terms and conditions of assistance, the mobilization of domestic resources, and international monetary issues. The Committee decided to request the UNCTAD secretariat to prepare a study of the outflow of

financial resources from developing countries, paying particular attention to the question whether measures could be taken at the international level to control such outflow to conform to the development objectives of the developing countries. Most of the developed countries, including the United States, refused to be associated with this resolution.

The Shipping Committee held its third session in Geneva, April 9-25. It decided to establish a working group on international shipping legislation to review economic and commercial aspects of international legislation and practices in the field of shipping from the standpoint of their conformity with the needs of economic development, in particular of the developing countries, and to identify areas where modifications are needed. The Committee adopted a resolution on conference practices and recommended that the UNCTAD secretariat undertake a study of the problems of way-port conferences on the basis of selected routes. The Committee also adopted resolutions on terms of shipment, freight factors in balance-of-payment statistics, development and improvement of ports, and technical assistance in maritime transport.

The Special Committee on Preferences at its second (April 28-May 2) and third (June 30-July 3) sessions continued its consideration of the progress made toward the establishment of a system of generalized non-reciprocal and nondiscriminatory tariff preferences which would be beneficial to the developing countries.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 24th General Assembly based its discussion of UNCTAD on a consideration of the annual report of the Trade and Development Board. On December 13 the Assembly adopted without objection a resolution urging the Trade and Development Board to improve and accelerate its work, particularly in those fields which deter-

mine UNCTAD's participation in the international development strategy for the Second Development Decade. The Assembly adopted two other resolutions of particular importance to UNCTAD which call for action by the Board. The first, adopted unanimously on November 14, urged the members of UNCTAD to engage in constructive consultations so that the Board can arrive at satisfactory arrangements for the preferential or free entry of exports of manufactures and semimanufactures from developing countries into the developed countries. The second, adopted without objection on December 13, affirmed the need to alleviate the problems of the least developed among the developing countries and requested the U.N. Secretary-General to recommend special measures within the framework of the Second U.N. Development Decade for dealing with those problems.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

The GATT is an international agreement, to which all of the major trading nations of the free world are parties, whose purpose is to promote economic growth by eliminating barriers to world trade. It is the main forum in which the United States works with other nations to expand world trade.

The GATT consists of schedules of tariff concessions made by the contracting parties, agreed rules (which are binding legal obligations) designed to insure that international trade is conducted on a fair and equitable basis, and procedures for the application of these rules. It also provides a forum in which disputes regarding the application of these rules may be settled and in which the contracting parties can consult with each other on trade problems. A country that feels the benefits it could

reasonably expect under the GATT are being nullified or impaired by another contracting party can secure a multilateral examination of its problems and recommendations on their solution.

Although the GATT is not a part of the U.N. system, it cooperates closely with U.N. agencies in fields of joint interest. The principal U.N. agency operating in the trade policy field is UNCTAD. GATT and UNCTAD jointly operate a Trade Center to assist developing countries in their trade promotion efforts.

Since the GATT entered into force on January 1, 1948, it has provided the framework for six rounds of general tariff negotiations. The last one was the Kennedy Round which came to a successful conclusion on June 30, 1967. Among the important results of the Kennedy Round were tariff cuts averaging 35% on a broad range of industrial products. These cuts are being staged over a 4-year period. The European Communities, the United Kingdom, and several other countries made 40% of their scheduled cuts on July 1, 1968. Other countries, including the United States, made 20% of their cuts on January 1, 1968, and another 20% on January 1, 1969. Except for Canada which has already put all of its tariff reductions into effect and Switzerland which is expected to do so early in 1970, all participants are committed to make cuts of another 20% on January 1, 1970, January 1, 1971, and January 1, 1972.

The GATT's most important work during 1969 and in the immediate future is in three main fields: agriculture, nontariff barriers, and trade of developing countries.

Although the Kennedy Round achieved some concessions in agricultural items, it revealed a wide gulf between the views of the United States and those of the European Communities with respect to the expansion of trade in agricultural commodities. The GATT Agriculture Committee has gathered factual data

Commodity Trade

on the contracting parties' policies affecting agricultural production and international trade, and has identified the principal problems arising therefrom. The next task of the Committee is to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

As the protective impact of tariffs has been reduced by successive negotiations over the years, greater attention has focused on nontariff devices as barriers to trade. During 1969 the Committee on Trade in Industrial Products examined a voluminous compilation of such nontariff barriers in preparation for exploring possibilities for concrete actions to reduce or remove nontariff barriers. This Committee also continued work on studies of the tariff situation as it will exist after the Kennedy Round cuts are fully in effect. A GATT working party is presently examining GATT rules and international practices regarding border adjustments. Since the United States relies mainly on direct taxes for which border adjustments are not allowed under the GATT, it has been argued that U.S. products are at a disadvantage in international trade. In addition, some aspects of the GATT rules need to be clarified.

The Committee on Trade and Development has devoted a great deal of attention to such problems of the developing countries as trade in tropical products, import restrictions imposed by developed countries on products of particular interest to developing countries, and ways to expand trade among the developing countries. The developing countries have been generally dissatisfied with the results of the Kennedy Round, and those party to the GATT subsequently formed a Trade Negotiations Committee with a view to expanding trade among themselves. They have been exchanging pertinent information and hope to begin negotiations in 1970.

In 1969 there was a broadening of the range of primary products receiving intergovernmental attention as a result of the efforts of UNCTAD and FAO to study and alleviate the trade problems of developing countries. There were also decisions by the Executive Directors of the IMF and World Bank Group on the types of financial and technical assistance which they would be prepared to give to the efforts to deal with these problems. Reasonable progress was made in clarifying the market situation and outlook of some particular products and in widening the area of agreement on the appropriate approaches to the problems revealed. There was considerable emphasis in a number of cases on improving access to markets and other measures to stimulate demand.

There were no important new commodity agreements or other concrete forms of international action, regarded by many as the prime objective of intergovernmental commodity activity. Rather, the year provided considerable evidence of the practical difficulties involved in concluding international commodity arrangements.

ACTION ON INDIVIDUAL COMMODITIES

The unanimously adopted UNCTAD II resolution concerning international action on commodities continued to provide general guidance to the commodity activities of UNCTAD, FAO, and the autonomous specialized commodity organizations. There was, however, some altering of the priorities given to particular products in light of changing circumstances. Improved prices eased the pressures for action in a number of cases while in others, notably tea, the reverse situation obtained.

Little further progress was made in the negotiations for a cocoa agree-

ment, which were once given highest priority in UNCTAD's program of action and had reached an advanced stage. In 1968 a "package deal" settling key issues regarding the price mechanism of an agreement had been worked out and accepted by all but one producing country. The Secretary General of UNCTAD convened a meeting of the 14-nation Cocoa Consultative Group in June 1969 to take stock of what was agreed and what issues remained open, preparatory to reconvening the formal negotiating conference. At this meeting another producing country rejected the whole basis for an agreement which had been developed through 7 years of on-and-off negotiations. Plans for reconvening the conference were dropped and the Secretary General reverted to the process of informal consultations with interested governments to determine whether there were sufficient grounds for the resumption of negotiations.

At the other extreme was the rapid buildup of pressure for action to halt the decline of prices on tea, a product not given high priority in the UNCTAD II recommendation. Due to differences among producing countries regarding the need for intergovernmental action, tea had received only sporadic attention internationally, through *ad hoc* FAO consultations, prior to 1969. However, at the Third *Ad Hoc* Consultation held in Kampala, Uganda, in January 1969, it was not only agreed to recommend creation of a permanent Consultative Committee on Tea, but India and Ceylon secured support from the newer producing countries in Africa and some consuming countries for a recommendation to initiate early discussion of an international tea agreement. Specifically, it was recommended (the United States abstaining) that a Working Party on International Arrangements for the Stabilization of Tea Prices meet in the spring, without waiting for the FAO's Committee on Commodity

Problems to review the report on the Consultation and its recommendations. The United States attended the meeting of the Working Party in May 1969 but did not find that a case had been made for proceeding immediately to the drafting of a long-term agreement.

The producers recognized that negotiation of a formal agreement would be a long process and subsequently worked out an informal export quota arrangement among themselves, to take effect January 1, 1970, in the hope of averting a further decline in prices. The first session of the new Consultative Committee on Tea, held in December 1969, agreed to establish a formal Exporters Group within the Committee to review the operation of this arrangement and report to the Committee. The Committee also set in motion a program of studies designed to throw more light on the basic problems of tea, and established a Working Party on Long-Term Measures. In line with U.S. recommendations this group was instructed to consider the need and justification for a long-term agreement in light of all available information on production, quality, and market structure of tea as well as consumption trends. Without foreclosing the possibility that an agreement might be appropriate, the United States has emphasized the need for greater restraint in expanding tea production and for increased trade promotion efforts as a means of curbing the decline in tea prices.

The work on other commodities covered by the UNCTAD II resolution proceeded routinely. Meetings were held by the commodity study groups for rubber, hard fibers, jute and allied fibers, cotton, wool, rice, citrus fruit, bananas, wine, tungsten, and lead and zinc; there was also an FAO *ad hoc* consultation on meat and poultry. Plans were completed for a special session of the FAO/UNCTAD Study Group on Oilseeds, Oils, and Fats early in 1970 and for

an *ad hoc* meeting, under UNCTAD auspices, on iron ore.

The commodity councils which administer existing commodity agreements for coffee, wheat, sugar, tea, and olive oil were also active.

IMF/IBRD REPORT ON COMMODITY PROBLEMS

The IMF and IBRD Governors in 1967 requested their agencies to prepare a joint staff study on the problems of commodity trade, their possible solutions, and the scope for assistance by the IMF and World Bank Group on these problems. Part I of the study, a general analysis of commodity problems and policies, was issued in 1968. The balance of the report, including the conclusions of the Executive Boards on the scope for assistance, was completed in mid-1969 and formally submitted to the Boards of Governors of the two institutions at their fall meeting.

The chief potential significance of the decisions concerning assistance on commodity problems of developing countries lies in the greater emphasis to be given by the World Bank Group to diversification aimed at reducing or restraining overproduction of particular products, to assistance in strengthening the competitive position of primary products exported by less developed countries, and to other measures aimed at the root causes of the commodity trade problems. In addition, provision is made for certain types of support for international commodity arrangements, including assistance in financing buffer stocks. This last was virtually a political necessity, since the absence of some source of international financing for buffer stocks had become a major political issue in the United Nations and the two financial institutions were under intense pressure to remedy the situation. Both the IMF and IBRD reports conclude that there are likely to be few serious candidates for an interna-

tional buffer stock operation, but recognize that where a buffer stock can play a constructive role assistance may be appropriate, particularly assistance from the IMF. Both agencies have framed the authority for such assistance most cautiously.

National stocks are recognized as a generally constructive and more common type of stockholding, which can normally be financed with domestic resources, but may entail some indirect foreign exchange costs. Accordingly, IMF or IBRD assistance of national stocking operations is also authorized.

The IMF decision authorizes 3- to 5-year credits to help countries which are in balance-of-payments difficulties make a required contribution to an international buffer stock that meets certain criteria (e.g., producer-consumer support, sound objectives, and good prospects for financial success). The buffer-stock financing facility is closely linked to the IMF's compensatory financing facility, which provides balance-of-payments assistance to offset severe shortfalls in export earnings such as result from commodity price declines. The IMF will also be prepared to help cover the indirect foreign exchange costs of national stocking operations which it finds to be consistent with the objectives of commodity agreements and serving the general interests of the international community. Such support of national stocks is not a marked departure from present IMF credit operations, but the intent is to give more attention to the financial requirements of stocking and to the "appropriateness" of such stock in terms of their international effects.

The IBRD visualizes no more than a contingent, residual role for itself in the financing of stocks—in part because it is felt that the holding of stocks for a long term is not, in general, sound and should not be facilitated.

U.N. Industrial Development Organization

UNIDO is an autonomous organization within the U.N. system which was established in 1966 to promote and accelerate the industrialization of the developing countries.

UNIDO's administrative and research activities are funded by the regular U.N. budget; its operational activities are funded primarily by voluntary contributions given through contributions to the UNDP or through an annual pledging conference. A secondary source of operational funds is the U.N. Regular Program of Technical Assistance. In addition, UNIDO has a Special Industrial Services Fund, a small revolving fund which under certain circumstances can be replenished by UNDP.

A total of 50 nations contributed \$1.5 million to UNIDO at the annual pledging conference on November 11. In keeping with its view that operational funds for UNIDO should come through the UNDP, the United States did not make a pledge at this meeting. The administrative and research budget for 1969 was \$9,693,200.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The United States is a member of UNIDO's Industrial Development Board, the policy-formulating body of 45 states which meets annually to review past activities and approve future programs of work. The third session of the Board met April 24-May 15 at UNIDO's headquarters in Vienna and was attended by all Board members as well as a large number of observers from other U.N. organizations and private groups.

The session was preceded by the first meeting of the newly created UNIDO Working Group on Program and Coordination, April 8-22. This

group was established largely at the urging of the developed countries, including the United States, to study in detail UNIDO's work program and budget. Although the U.S. delegation to the Working Group felt that some divisions of the secretariat did not adequately justify their work program and that a clearer statement of work priorities needed to be established, the businesslike session was considered a useful development aimed at increasing UNIDO's effectiveness.

The third session of the Industrial Development Board was generally harmonious with no serious confrontations between the industrialized and developing countries. As in past years, the developing countries called upon UNIDO to be more vigorous in fulfilling its task to accelerate industrialization. Three major issues at this session were:

(1) The need to establish a workable system of priorities for ranking the many projects proposed by the secretariat, which was stressed, principally by developed countries, both in the general debate and in the consideration of specific topics. The United States supported this view as a way to encourage UNIDO to concentrate on the essentials of industrialization. The compromise reached on this point with the less developed countries resulted in a list of activities considered appropriate for undertaking by UNIDO.

(2) The most important new issue was a joint proposal by the United States and Canada that the Board commission an independent study of UNIDO's work program to consider a possible long-term reorientation of the program and organizational structure. Despite extended debate and the tabling of two different proposals no compromise was reached between the desire of the developed countries for an outside group of experts to conduct the study and the feelings of the developing countries that the Board members themselves should perform the task. The issue

will be considered again at the next Board meeting in 1970.

(3) The question of convening a special UNIDO meeting of all member states during the 25th General Assembly was raised early in the session. The United States opposed such an extraordinary session, but was prepared to accept the majority view if the meeting were confined to a discussion of the long-term role of UNIDO, did not involve additional expenditure, and were held within the framework of the 25th General Assembly. The only resolution adopted on this subject was a request to the Executive Director to survey all UNIDO members to determine their interest in such a meeting. The matter was raised again during the 24th General Assembly in New York in the form of a revised proposal that the meeting be convened in Vienna at the highest possible level of government representation. On December 15 a resolution was adopted by a vote of 61 to 8 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions, that requested the 1970 session of the Industrial Development Board to consider the matter again.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

As a relatively new organization, UNIDO continued to increase the number of projects undertaken in its area of responsibility and to respond to an ever-broadening demand for assistance.

The first 10 UNIDO industrial development field advisers began their work in 1969. Strongly supported by the United States as a technique for increasing the effectiveness of the organization in the field, these advisers are financed by UNDP and attached to the offices of its resident representatives. An additional 10 advisers are planned for 1970 to complete a network of 20 advisers with regional responsibilities for UNIDO activities. During the year UNIDO also sponsored a large number of meetings, seminars, and training courses to

assist the developing countries to industrialize.

In response to the Board's urging, the UNIDO secretariat formalized its coordinating role in the field of industrialization by concluding agreements with several U.N. bodies including FAO and the regional economic commissions.

U.N. Population Program

During 1969 the United States continued to encourage and assist the United Nations and its specialized agencies to develop and expand effective action programs in the population/family planning field. The importance given to the U.N. role in this area was highlighted by President Nixon's unprecedented July message to Congress on population, in which he stated:

It is our belief that the United Nations, its specialized agencies and other international bodies should take the leadership in responding to world population growth.

The President pledged that the United States will cooperate fully with their programs.

The first significant steps in the development of an effective U.N. population program were taken in 1969 with funds provided by the U.N. Fund for Population Activities. During the year the UNDP Administrator, at the request of the Secretary-General, assumed responsibility for management of the Population Fund. To help support the Fund, the United States contributed a total of \$2,265,000 during the year. A part of this amount was intended to help the Fund support a major program of WHO for introducing family planning services as a component of its programs in member countries.

From November 3 to 14 the United States participated in the 15th session of the U.N. Population Commission, in Geneva, which recommended a considerably expanded program of

action by the United Nations and its specialized agencies in the population field. Another noteworthy achievement of the session was the adoption of an important resolution, cosponsored by the United States, on population policies and the Second U.N. Development Decade. The resolution was designed to ensure that the international development strategy for the Decade gives appropriate recognition to the implications of high population growth rates for the economic and social development of developing countries.

Statistical Activities

The U.N. Statistical Commission did not meet in 1969, but the United States continued, by its participation in U.N. regional statistical conferences and working groups and its collaboration in the work of the U.N. Statistical Office, to work for improved quality and greater international comparability of economic and social statistics, and to seek better coordination in the statistical work of international organizations. On October 7 Julius Shiskin, Assistant Director for Statistical Policy, Bureau of the Budget, was sworn in as the U.S. Representative on the Statistical Commission, succeeding Raymond T. Bowman.

NATIONAL ACCOUNTS STATISTICS

Substantial progress was made in the work on national accounts carried on by the U.N. Statistical Office with the collaboration of national statistical services and the regional statistical conferences of ECE, ECA, and ECAFE. U.S. experts participated actively in this work which included (1) development of questionnaires for the international reporting of national accounting data in accordance with the revised (1968) version of the U.N. System of National Accounts (SNA); (2)

formulation of draft detailed definitions, classifications, and standard accounts and tables for the balance-sheet and revaluation accounts of the new SNA; (3) development of draft guidelines on the concepts, definitions, classifications, and methods of compilation of statistics and indexes of prices and quanta which fit into the accounting framework of the new SNA; (4) preparation of draft international guidelines for a system of statistics on the distribution of income and wealth that would complement the SNA; and (5) initial steps in the development of proposals for a system of demographic, manpower, and other social statistics that would be correlated with the national economic accounts.

Continued attention was given to developing links between the new SNA and the revised System of Material Product Balances (MPS) used in countries of Eastern Europe, and to other steps for improving international comparability of national accounts statistics, including completion of a provisional trilingual list of standard national accounting terms. Work also continued on a U.N. project on international product and purchasing power comparisons that is being conducted in collaboration with the University of Pennsylvania under a grant from the Ford Foundation.

INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS

Following regional and national consultations in which U.S. experts participated, the U.N. Statistical Office completed draft recommendations for the 1973 World Program of Industrial Statistics. The recommendations deal with the general statistical objectives and content of the program, lists of products and materials on which data should be collected, and practical guidelines for the organization and conduct of industrial censuses. Following circulation to national statistical offices for review and comment, the draft

recommendations will be submitted to the Statistical Commission for action at its 16th session in 1970.

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL COORDINATION

In response to a 1968 ECOSOC resolution that had been adopted on U.S. initiative, a Statistical Commission Working Group held consultations in March 1969 with representatives of the U.N. Secretariat and the specialized agencies on the need for an integrated international statistical program based on long-term planning. It was made clear that the Statistical Commission would seek to influence the development of such a program by means of review, comment, and advice, and not by budgetary or other administrative controls.

In the light of the discussion, the Statistical Commission Working Group formulated recommendations on the form and content of statements to be prepared on the statistical work of the United Nations and each of the specialized agencies for consideration at the 16th session of the Commission. It was also suggested that it would be useful to have such statements from those international organizations outside the U.N. system which have significant statistical activities.

OTHER SUBJECTS

During the year U.S. experts served as members of expert groups, attended working group meetings, and in other ways worked on such widely varying subjects as classification of commodities by industrial origin, revision of the Standard International Trade Classification, statistics of science and technology, educational statistics, statistics of the distributive and service trades, electronic data processing, and current economic indicators. In these, as in other statistical fields in which work was carried on at the international level, the United States sought to secure better

understanding of needs for data, better guidance on practical ways of filling needs for economic and social development, and improved coordination in the statistical activities of international organizations.

U.N. Institute for Training and Research

UNITAR is an autonomous institution within the U.N. framework and has two principal functions: (1) operational research and planning directed toward practical measures to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations and its related agencies, and (2) training of persons for assignments with the United Nations and for national service related to the United Nations. UNITAR is financed by voluntary contributions and is guided by a Board of Trustees (appointed by the Secretary-General in consultation with the presidents of the General Assembly and ECOSOC) which is responsible for determining its basic policies and its budget. In June 1969 Professor Richard N. Gardner of Columbia University was appointed to the Board in place of Ambassador Charles W. Yost who resigned on becoming the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

At its annual meeting in September the Board of Trustees discussed and approved the training and research plans submitted by the Executive Director, Chief S. O. Adebayo of Nigeria, and discussed below. The Board authorized the Executive Director to prepare a feasibility study of a U.N. staff college. It also asked him to look into the possibilities of appointing senior fellows of UNITAR under the provisions of the Institute's statute and of recruiting a small group of high quality researchers with some permanence of tenure with whom outside scholars would come to work. Among the important adminis-

trative actions in 1969 was the expansion of the Geneva office to serve as a center for UNITAR operations in Europe.

The Board adopted a budget estimate for 1970 of \$1,343,500, virtually the same as the revised budget for 1969 (\$1,337,700), thus reflecting the approach favored by the United States that UNITAR should consolidate and strengthen existing programs and improve their quality, direction, and relevance. The Executive Director indicated that he plans a gradual program expansion to a budget level of \$2 million a year. The United States again made a voluntary contribution of \$400,000 to be paid on a matching basis so that cumulative payments would not exceed 40% of the total contributed by all governments.

TRAINING AND RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Training programs in diplomacy, technical and financial cooperation, and international law were continued, and UNITAR expanded its interest to include international organization and multilateral diplomacy. Increased emphasis was placed on training international officials and on programs which cannot be adequately performed by other organizations or national governments. It was announced that "interim training assistance to developing countries," such as training for junior diplomats, would be phased out as countries become able to make their own arrangements for such training.

In 1969 UNITAR completed major studies on criteria and methods of evaluation in the development field (which was extensively discussed at the ECOSOC meeting in July); status and problems of micro-states; and a study of measures for facilitating wider acceptance of multilateral treaties. UNITAR also prepared preliminary reports on the use by mass media of information on the United Nations and on the motiva-

tions and conditions bearing on the "brain drain" (international migration of professionals from developing to developed countries). Research continued on the transfer of technology from enterprise to enterprise in developing countries, relations between the United Nations and regional organizations, techniques and methods of training, the application of modern management techniques to international organization, and an account of the IAEA safeguards system as a case study of verification of treaty obligations.

In its general review of research policies, criteria, and priorities the Board of Trustees singled out for future interest (1) research on U.N. structure and procedures; (2) methods of conflict resolution and peaceful settlement, particularly the use of good offices and factfinding by the Secretary-General; (3) study of means for verifying the observance of economic sanctions, as part of the broader examination of verification of international treaties; (4) newer management techniques as applicable to the United Nations; and (5) the impact of science and technology on international development and law.

On a broader plane the Board of Trustees accepted the Executive Director's recommendation that, for future use, the research activities of UNITAR be classified in six categories: (1) U.N. structure and procedures, (2) economic and social development activities of international organizations, (3) conflict resolution including the peaceful settlement of disputes, (4) public information and communications relating to the United Nations, (5) progressive development of international law and human rights, and (6) international implications of developments in science and technology.

ECOSOC ACTION

A resolution of the 20th General Assembly requested UNITAR's Ex-

Executive Director to report annually to both the General Assembly and ECOSOC on the activities of the Institute. The Executive Director reported to ECOSOC at its 46th session and the Council on May 28 took note of the report. The UNITAR study on "Criteria and Methods of Evaluation" was included with other evaluation studies on the agenda of the 47th ECOSOC and commented on by many delegations. At the same session, in an effort to limit the number of items on its agenda, ECOSOC decided on August 8 no longer to include an item on UNITAR unless in any given year the Executive Director or the Council deemed that a report was required or a UNITAR study of special interest to ECOSOC had been completed.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

The Second Committee of the 24th General Assembly discussed UNITAR on October 24 and November 3. The Executive Director's opening statement on October 24 noted the new emphasis on staff training and stressed that a review of research policies and priorities reinforced the concept that UNITAR research is most relevant when directly related to the effectiveness of the United Nations in pursuit of its major objectives. He noted that 80 countries had made financial contributions for a total of \$4.5 million by the end of 1969. In addition grants from non-governmental sources amounted to \$763,000. He appealed for adequate and secure financing to allow the Institute to raise its budget from the present \$1.3 million to \$2 million. Various delegations commented on the report, commending in particular UNITAR's decision to regionalize training activities and to stress the training of senior officials. Singled out for favorable comment by various delegations were research programs on peaceful settlement of international disputes; the relation of the

United Nations to regional organizations; the development of manpower and administrative machinery in the developing countries; "brain drain"; micro-states; the transfer of technology; and the use of mass media to disseminate information about the United Nations. Many delegations supported the Executive Director's plea for more financial support though few raised their pledges.

Ambassador Finger, speaking for the United States, stated that UNITAR's training and research activities had helped improve U.N. efficiency and noted that on the whole UNITAR's studies and research were characterized by a practical approach. Noteworthy were the completed research projects on criteria and methods of evaluation, wider acceptance of international treaties, and the status and problems of small states, and the studies in progress on the settlement of disputes, relations between the United Nations and regional organizations, and new management and operational techniques. With regard to contributions, he hoped that some countries already contributing would make a greater effort and that those that had not yet contributed, including those in Eastern Europe, would begin to do so.

On November 3 the Committee adopted unanimously a resolution, introduced by Denmark October 24 on behalf of 25 sponsoring states, that (1) noted with satisfaction the report of the Executive Director, (2) recognized the importance of UNITAR training and research in enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of economic and social development, and (3) supported "the case presented by the Executive Director and endorsed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations for fresh financial support for the Institute." The General Assembly unanimously adopted this resolution on November 21.

Social Cooperation

Social cooperation includes activities in such fields as health and nutrition, labor, education, vocational training, housing and urban development, crime prevention and control, and social welfare.

ECOSOC's Commission for Social Development has the primary responsibility for developing U.N. policy and programs in these fields, but specific aspects of social policy are also the concern of the Population Commission; the Commission on Human Rights; the Commission on the Status of Women; the Commission on Narcotic Drugs; and the Committee on Housing, Building, and Planning.

Programs are carried out by a number of U.N. bodies including WHO, ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF, UNHCR, and the regional economic commissions.

Social Development and Planning

The 20th session of the Commission for Social Development was held at U.N. Headquarters in New York, February 17–March 5. The major items on the agenda were (1) long-term policies and programs for youth in national development; (2) the report by the special rapporteurs appointed to undertake a review of technical cooperation activities in social development; and (3) the report of the International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare. ECOSOC reviewed the Commission's work at its 46th session in May and June.

YOUTH IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Commission based its discussions of this topic on a preliminary

report—prepared by the Secretary-General in consultation with ILO, FAO, UNESCO, and WHO—which dealt with the rights, roles, and responsibilities of young people between the ages of 12 and 25. The emphasis was on youth in the developing countries where, the report said, young people are striving for greater economic opportunity and fulfillment in terms of influence, achievement, and wealth. Some are already in strategic political and administrative posts or other positions of prestige and importance. Their problem is a composite of inadequate resources for national growth, an educational system expanding faster than the job-producing capacity of the economy, unemployment, and productivity which is rendered ineffectual by the increasing rate of population growth.

In the developed countries, on the other hand, a considerable number of young people demand greater participation, responsibility, and toleration. They seek, according to the report, to give more meaning to the conventions, the technological conditions, and the relatively comfortable way of life which surrounds them. They aspire to a society able to accord them scope for greater self-realization and an assured personal identity in a machine age marked by increased technocracy and computerization.

Mrs. Jean Picker, the newly appointed U.S. Representative to the Commission, pointed to the insistence of young people that they be given the opportunity for fuller participation in society as one of the challenges of our age.

Young people in many regions of the world are expressing dissatisfaction with the societies in which they live. The specific causes of unrest may differ from one country to another, but much of

the restlessness derives from real or fancied lack of participation.

Mrs. Picker agreed with the preliminary report that it is essential that young people be given the opportunity to participate according to their abilities. She added that:

. . . in order for this participation to be meaningful, emphasis must be placed upon the development of human beings in a world which is becoming increasingly youthful. . . . it is necessary that we provide political, social, and economic opportunities for youth so that they can share with us the maintenance and development of society and its institutions.

Mrs. Picker spoke of the various government programs and methods used in the United States to provide opportunities for youth to become involved in and to acquire the dignity that comes with the acquisition of skills. She also described the extensive and active role played by voluntary organizations. In conclusion, she proposed that ways and means be considered to bring together in one place the information about the programs in use by member states, national and international agencies, and private and public institutions, so that each member state could have access to information about the successes and failures of others—to decide which program or policy might be of best use to their own needs.

Representatives to the Commission generally agreed that there need be no separate plans for youth, but within a national plan for development there should be a cross-sectoral youth policy with clear priorities. There should be channels for youth to express their views on national development and machinery for coordinating the work of governments and nongovernmental organizations for and with youth.

The Commission adopted unanimously a resolution recommending that ECOSOC *inter alia* request the Secretary-General to (1) prepare an analytical study in depth of the world

social situation of youth, describing the needs and aspirations of youth and the most effective methods of meeting those needs; and (2) include in the agenda for the 24th General Assembly an item entitled "The problems and needs of youth and its participation in national development." ECOSOC approved the resolution on June 5.

General Assembly Consideration

On September 30 Mrs. Shirley Temple Black spoke for the first time as a Delegate to the United Nations during the Third Committee's consideration of the agenda item on youth. She called for a greater degree of coordination among the U.N. bodies dealing with youth. In response to a U.A.R. suggestion that an intersessional group be created to study youth's role in today's society, she said that the time for study was past, and there had been "enough words, enough consideration, and enough analysis of the role of young people in modern life." Instead, she said, it was time for concrete proposals, and she mentioned six that had been put forward: an International Voluntary Service Corps, the convening of an International Youth Assembly as part of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, appointment of youth to the delegations at the 25th General Assembly, recruitment and placement of youth as U.N. staff members in the United Nations, participation of young people in the 1971 U.N. conference in Geneva on the role of youth in the Second Development Decade, and creation of a U.N. Information Center on youth programs.

Mrs. Black called attention to the fact that half the children of the world are out of school.

These children, without education, are deprived by their ignorance of a role in modern society. . . . President Nixon, in his General Assembly address, mentioned the enormous po-

tential of space technology to benefit man here on earth [see p. 11]. One such benefit might be the widespread use of space satellites to assist in mass education similar to the arrangement just finalized between my country and India.

On behalf of 18 cosponsors Cyprus introduced a resolution which was adopted, after some amendment, on October 8 by a vote of 92 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention. Part I of the resolution dealt, *inter alia*, with the education of youth in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and recommended the greater involvement of youth in the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations and the observance of the International Education Year. Part II of the resolution recommended to governments a more coordinated approach in meeting the needs and aspirations of youth, particularly during the Second Development Decade; requested the U.N. Secretary-General and the specialized agencies to identify separately the problems and needs of youth in the developed and developing countries and suggest possible solutions accordingly; and requested the Secretary-General to consider measures to establish channels of communication with youth and international youth organizations; and to report on them to the General Assembly as early as possible. The Assembly in plenary session adopted this resolution by acclamation on October 28.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

On the recommendation of the Commission at its 18th session, ECO-SOC in 1967 had approved the appointment of five special rapporteurs to review technical cooperation activities in social development. The rapporteurs presented their findings to the Commission in 1969 and made 14 recommendations concerning issues and problems confronting the U.N. technical cooperation programs as they affect social development.

The rapporteurs confirmed that there was a certain degree of fragmentation and isolation of some of the U.N. technical assistance projects in the social field, that there was limited application of an integrated or intersectoral approach to programs involving social components, and that there were difficulties in attempting to assess priorities for action in the social field in the developing countries.

The United States agreed in principle with many of the rapporteurs' recommendations and proposals, although in some instances it differed with the method or means suggested to achieve the desired end. The U.S. Representative commended the rapporteurs "for drawing our attention to the striking contrast between the United Nations affirmations of principles and support of social development, and the low priority and inadequate resources given to social development by governments and the United Nations."

There was unanimous agreement in the Commission on the need for making more effective use of development assistance in the social sphere available in the U.N. family, although there were reservations on certain of the proposals made in the report. The Commission also stressed that action on some of the recommendations would better await the findings of the team studying the capacity of the U.N. system to carry out an expanded development program.

Some of the more important recommendations in the report which the United States endorsed included support for an integrated approach to planning and development; training and orientation of U.N. officials, and particularly the UNDP resident representatives, in the social aspects of development; and a reallocation of available financial resources to provide for the inclusion of social advisers at the levels of U.N. administration where planning is done. As

the United States has repeatedly urged that a greater share of U.N. funds should be made available for social development, it also supported the recommendations calling for (1) the fuller utilization of existing international funds in the social aspects of development; (2) the maintenance of at least the same level of funds for social development and public administration as had earlier been allocated under the U.N. Regular Program of Technical Assistance (see p. 72); (3) more extensive cooperation with UNIDO to ensure that social development is considered in the preparation and implementation of industrialization projects; and (4) greater awareness by governments that UNDP funds are available for social development.

The United States cosponsored (with Cyprus, France, Greece, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, and Venezuela) a resolution on the report that the Commission unanimously recommended to ECOSOC for adoption. *Inter alia* the resolution (1) recommended that the report together with the comments made on it in the Commission and the Council be forwarded to governments for their views; (2) recommended that the report should be fully taken into account by the UNDP in preparing its capacity study (see p. 71) and should also be available to the Enlarged Committee for Program and Coordination; and (3) requested the Secretary-General to arrange for an interagency study of the report to ensure that its recommendations, with the Commission's and Council's views, were considered in detail in strengthening the operational programs of the U.N. system. ECOSOC adopted the proposed resolution on June 5.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

At its 1969 session the Commission considered the report of the International Conference of Ministers Re-

sponsible for Social Welfare, which had been held in New York in September 1968.

Delegates expressed general agreement with the findings, conclusions, and 29 recommendations of the Conference which pointed to ways of achieving progress in social welfare at the national level and through international cooperation activities. The Commission endorsed, in particular, the emphasis given by the Conference to the preventive and developmental roles of social welfare programs within the broader framework of integrated development policies although it was understood that the remedial aspects remained important.

Miss Dorothy Lally of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare highlighted the U.S. position on the major issues. She supported sending the Conference recommendations to governments and advocated the use of the report for training purposes. She said:

We believe these recommendations will set a new perspective for social welfare in the general framework of the Second Development Decade. Social welfare is now seen as an essential component in national planning and development and should progressively achieve a higher priority in allocation of national and international resources. We anticipate practical benefits will be measured in higher levels of living, greater social justice, and enhancement of the quality of life for the individual and families.

Here in the United States we are already sharing the findings of the Conference with program bureaus in our national government, with colleagues in the professional associations, or colleagues in voluntary organizations and schools of social work. The recommendations taken as a whole portray exciting new responsibilities for social welfare—a role of leadership in innovative approaches in community services, in training of indigenous personnel, and above all, in making its full impact felt on national development.

As the result of a U.S. initiative, the Conference had pointed out the need for a standing advisory committee to provide guidance to the Sec-

retary-General in developing the U.N. program in the social welfare field. During the Commission's session the United States continued to advocate establishing such an advisory committee to be selected by governments in consultation with the Secretary-General, but opinion varied widely among the delegations. Many supported the idea of such an advisory committee, although some preferred that it be composed of experts serving in their private capacity rather than as representatives of governments. Still other delegations opposed any advisory committee.

The resolution that was eventually adopted on the Conference report made no provision for an advisory committee of any kind although it would have the Commission "obtain, whenever it is useful, and for those matters designated by the Commission, the advice of qualified experts in the field of social welfare." In other paragraphs it (1) recommended that governments give due attention to the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report; (2) requested the Secretary-General to circulate the report widely to U.N. policy-making bodies in the economic and social fields so they could give due consideration to it in preparing the international development strategy for the Second Development Decade; (3) requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the ways and means to further strengthen social development and welfare activities at the regional level; and (4) requested the Secretary-General to review existing methods of international cooperation with a view to giving due attention to social welfare activities. The resolution was unanimously approved by the Commission on February 28 and adopted by ECOSOC on June 5.

The Eastern European countries have generally maintained that developing strong programs of social security obviated programs of social welfare. In 1969, however, in the course of the Commission's discussion

of the Conference report and in contrast to their position in earlier sessions, the Eastern Europeans took a moderate position on social welfare. The Byelorussian S.S.R. submitted a draft resolution on social security, unanimously adopted, which recognized that social security has a significant relationship to social welfare and is an integral part of the overall measures taken by the State to achieve higher living standards. The resolution encouraged governments to extend social security to all segments of the population. It also recommended that the Commission include questions relating to social security in its long-term work program and that it consult with the ILO on its comprehensive studies in this field.

DECLARATION ON SOCIAL PROGRESS AND DEVELOPMENT

The Third Committee of the 23d General Assembly in 1968 adopted the Preamble and Principles sections of a draft declaration on social progress and development. At the 24th Assembly in 1969, after weeks of debate in which the Third Committee considered over 50 amendments on Objectives and on Means and Methods, the Declaration as a whole was adopted.

The Objectives section consists of 4 articles listing 18 goals for social progress and development. These include, *inter alia*, the elimination of hunger, malnutrition, poverty, and illiteracy; the achievement of the highest standards of health; provision for all of adequate housing and community services; assurance to all of the right to work; provision of social security and social welfare services; protection of the rights of mother and child; education of youth in ideals of justice and peace; full participation of youth in national development; full knowledge without discrimination of individual rights and obligations; provision of social defense measures; creation of conditions for rapid and sustained social and

economic development; protection and improvement of the environment; and elimination of all forms of foreign economic exploitation.

After a long series of separate votes on each of the elements in the section, the Objectives as a whole were adopted unanimously in the Third Committee on November 28.

The Means and Methods section has 46 paragraphs dealing with ways to mobilize the necessary resources by national and international action to achieve the objectives of social development. Some of the specified traditional methods and means, which the United States supported, are: training of national personnel and cadres; extension and improvement of vocational education and training; cooperation among family, school, and institutions; extension of public health services; establishment of programs in the field of population; and popular participation in development. Other paragraphs supported by the United States deal with land reform; mobilization and utilization of national resources for the equitable distribution of income; social aspects of industrialization; urbanization; and rural development.

There were, however, a number of paragraphs in this section that the United States did not support. In numerous statements to the Commission for Social Development, ECOSOC, and the Third Committee, the United States had emphasized its hope that the Declaration would be well-formulated, directed to the main purpose, free of extraneous concepts, and phrased in a noncontroversial manner. The Declaration fell short of these expectations. Too many of the more than 40 amendments submitted to the Means and Methods section were, in the U.S. view, vague and poorly worded. Others, particularly those dealing with international assistance and trade, were irrelevant to the Declaration.

One paragraph, which had been added on Soviet initiative during the

1968 meeting of the Commission for Social Development, called for "compensation for damages, be they social or economic in nature, including restitution and reparations, caused as a result of aggression and of illegal occupation of territory by the aggressor." It was adopted in the Third Committee by a vote of 58 to 0, with 51 abstentions (U.S.). The U.S. Representative said, in explaining the vote:

. . . my delegation regrets that paragraph 27¹ has been adopted in its present form. The large number of abstentions on the paragraph—almost equal to the number of affirmative votes—shows clearly that it does not command the widespread support which is necessary if the paragraph and the Declaration as a whole are to be commended to the member states of this body. . . . we do not feel that a subject with such far-reaching political and legal ramifications appropriately belong in a Declaration on Social Progress and Development.

The United States voted against a U.S.S.R. amendment on disarmament which called for, *inter alia*, the complete prohibition of nuclear tests. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 27 to 17, with 54 abstentions. The U.S. Representative explained during the debate that the United States "does not believe that paragraph 23² should refer to specific disarmament measures We are well aware of the complexities of negotiating disarmament agreements. Such negotiations are best left to those bodies directly concerned." After the vote the U.S. Representative explained again that "We strongly favor general and complete disarmament under effective international control and we are taking all steps possible to further this objective."

Because of its dissatisfaction with these and other paragraphs the United States asked for a separate roll-call vote on the Means and Methods section, which was adopted in

¹ 26 in final version.

² 27(b) in final version.

the Third Committee by a vote of 77 to 0, with 14 abstentions (U.S.). The draft declaration as a whole, was then adopted unanimously.

In a statement after the vote, the U.S. Representative said that although most of the provisions of the Declaration were consistent, for the most part, with the basic aims and purposes of a free society to which the American people are committed, the United States must reserve its position on the Means and Methods portion. "Even though the Declaration has no legal force, we wish the record to reflect that the articles of the Declaration, particularly in the critical areas of economic cooperation and development, disarmament, and security, are not precisely worded and that we do not consider this document to be necessarily indicative of our policies."

In addition to approving the Declaration, the Third Committee also considered a draft resolution on implementation of the Declaration which was cosponsored by India, Kenya, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Uganda, and Upper Volta. In its first operative paragraph the draft resolution recommended that "all governments progressively incorporate in their policies, plans, and programs, the principles, objectives, and means and methods of the Declaration." A U.S.-sponsored amendment to change the words "progressively incorporate" to read "take into consideration" was adopted by a vote of 46 to 21, with 21 abstentions.

In other paragraphs the resolution, in its final form, decided that the Declaration should be taken into account in the formulation of the strategy for the Second Development Decade and urged all governments to take it into account in their bilateral and multilateral relations in the field of development.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 87 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions. On December 11 the As-

sembly in plenary session adopted the Declaration on Social Progress and Development by a vote of 119 (U.S.) to 0, with 2 abstentions, and adopted the resolution on its implementation by 117 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention.

Social Defense Activities

U.N. activities in the field of social defense were focused largely on preparations for the Fourth U.N. Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders which will be convened in Kyoto, Japan, in 1970. At its third meeting (Rome, June 24-30), a major part of the work of the Advisory Committee of Experts in this field was concerned with plans for the Congress. H. G. Moeller, Deputy Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, attended the meeting as the personal representative of Director Myrl E. Alexander, who was unable to attend.

The Committee reached agreement on the agenda for the Congress and recommended four topics:

(1) Social defense policies and national development planning.

(2) Participation of the public in the prevention and control of crime and delinquency.

(3) Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, in the light of recent developments in the correctional field.

(4) Organization of research for policy development in social defense.

The Committee urged that the U.N. Secretary-General invite governments which take part in the Congress to make available to participants reports highlighting national progress in social defense activity during the past 5 years.

The Committee also considered a report by the Director of the U.N. Social Defense Research Institute in Rome. The Institute, which had been established in 1967, had undertaken its first field study in Uganda in 1968. This project involved the col-

lection and analysis of data on the major services responsible for programs of crime and delinquency prevention and control. Its central purpose was to determine how a country can make most effective use of all available manpower to carry forward a unified policy of social defense. Early in 1969 the Institute began a similar study in Tunisia, and steps have been taken toward launching a third study in Venezuela.

The Institute also engaged in a survey and analysis of criminological research trends. The initial phase of this project was undertaken with respect to countries of Latin America. Finally, the Institute is planning an international meeting of research specialists to be held within the framework of the Fourth U.N. Congress.

During the year the United States continued to cooperate with the U.N. Social Defense Research Institute by contributing publications on crime prevention and control to the Institute's international documentation service.

The Committee expressed concern over the relatively low priority assigned to social defense planning and social defense programs by countries that request technical assistance. As in prior meetings, the Committee reaffirmed its strong support for plans to develop regional training institutes and for the addition of interregional advisers to the U.N. social defense staff. The representatives of the United Nations made it clear, however, that expansion of the social defense program was almost entirely dependent upon the success of the Social Defense Trust Fund and they expressed the hope that more contributions to the Fund would enable the United Nations to move in directions which the Committee had outlined.

In August Mr. Alexander convened a meeting of the seven U.S. correspondents to the United Nations on social defense activities and invited representatives from public and

voluntary agencies as well in order to start preparations for U.S. participation in the Fourth Congress. The participants discussed at some length the preparations to be undertaken by the United States and volunteered their assistance in the development of a national paper.

In response to a request of the U.N. Secretariat the U.S. correspondents compiled a survey report on public participation in social defense activities in the United States. This report will be used in the preparation of the working papers for the Congress.

Dr. Peter Lejins, Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland and one of the U.S. correspondents, took part in a meeting of a seven-man *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts on Social Defense Planning in Relation to Development Planning, convened in Rome, June 17-23. The report of this *Ad Hoc* Committee was subsequently approved by the Advisory Committee of Experts and will provide resource material for the working paper on the first item on the Congress agenda.

Advisory Social Welfare Services

The U.N. program of Advisory Social Welfare Services provides technical advisers, fellowships, professional literature, and assistance to demonstration projects in every region of the world. The services are in the fields of social welfare, social defense, rehabilitation, population problems, housing, and community development. The United States continued in 1969 to participate in all phases of this program.

Major attention was directed to follow up on the 1968 International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare. The Conference had recommended, *inter alia*, exploring the feasibility of regional centers for advanced training and compara-

tive studies in social welfare research, and the first such center has been proposed for the Far East, to be located in Manila. Consideration is also being given to establishing a second center in the Middle East where two countries have offered to host a center. U.N. members, particularly in Africa and Asia, have given extensive consideration to the findings of the Conference and have made use of U.N. advisory services to assess and redirect their welfare services in line with its recommendations.

More than 40 U.N. Fellows from all parts of the world studied in the United States during the year. Those from the developing countries were for the most part officials in new ministries or university professors in recently established schools of social work. Although they specialized in such fields as juvenile delinquency, rural community development, or social work education, they had broader responsibilities and commitments at home and therefore wanted to learn, in addition, about new trends in public welfare, the training of social work manpower at different levels, the social aspects of family planning, and developments in housing for low-income groups. Fellows from the more advanced countries—such as Japan and the Netherlands—requested opportunities to observe U.S. income maintenance programs, to analyze administration, and to study social services and retraining related to disadvantaged families.

Among the Fellows from Africa coming to the United States for training were a number of outstanding women. Three from Ghana wanted particularly to examine the role of women in government, public affairs, and volunteer work. They commented on the efficiency with which American women at varying levels from the clerical to the administrative and professional performed their work and on the quantity and quality of voluntary activities in which they were involved.

Most of the U.S. training facilities used for U.N. Fellows now have staff members who have had overseas experience. Schools of social work at the University of North Carolina, Tulane University, Washington University, and Fresno State College arranged for U.N. Fellows to be included in seminars and meetings where users of community services were participating in the evaluation and planning of community projects. Because of their knowledge of the programs in the homelands of the Fellows, the professors were better able to be helpful to them in relating the material to their special concerns.

Interest in social work administration remained high among the U.N. Fellows. At Syracuse University the resources of the Public Administration Division in the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs as well as the Graduate School of Social Work were used in an interdisciplinary program for several participants. This permitted the use of a full range of academic resources for participants with broad and varied responsibilities in the administration of social and community services at home.

Another important interest of U.N. Fellows was community development in both urban and rural areas. This coincided with a growing U.S. interest in placing greater emphasis on improving life in rural areas. Fellows in this field had the opportunity to observe new rural programs such as those in West Virginia. These overseas visitors also contributed from their own experience to U.S. understanding of methods of working in rural areas.

Some U.N. Fellows took part in special courses and institutes held at universities and rehabilitation facilities under the sponsorship of HEW's Social and Rehabilitation Service. Fellows from Guatemala and Peru participated in such courses for physical and occupational therapists at the University of Puerto Rico and gained

practical experience in the rehabilitation facilities there. A U.N. Fellow from Pakistan attended a combined course in rehabilitation counseling and special education at the University of Tennessee, receiving both academic and practical training.

In addition to government and academic facilities, national and local offices of a number of private agencies such as the Child Welfare League, National Urban League, National Federation of Settlements, and the Family Service Association of America continued to provide field experiences and offer staff development seminars and other training courses for Fellows.

Eight U.S. social workers and one day-care specialist served as U.N. advisers to governments in Africa, the Middle East, and the Far East, and another U.S. social worker served as a short-term consultant to an African country.

The Advisory Services have been well coordinated with UNICEF. Technical advisers have provided essential guidance to UNICEF social service projects concerned with family and child welfare, community development, day-care and pre-school services, and home management. U.S. social experts helped plan projects on rural development, urban centers for community services, and in-service training. They also participated in the program of the School of Social Work at Haile Selassie University in Ethiopia.

In Asia experts were on assignment during the year in the Republic of China, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Korea, the Republic of Vietnam, and Thailand. The emphasis was on training, on establishing a national structure for social services, and on initiating local units to provide and serve as training centers for local and regional staff. U.S. social workers aided in new developments in welfare in Indonesia by advising on social planning, training, and delivery of

services. This work was complemented by the awarding of U.N. and AID fellowship grants to six Indonesian social workers for graduate training in the United States.

A number of U.N. advisers also served in Latin America. A professional training program aided by the United Nations and UNICEF in a number of countries was designed to improve the social work training and to develop new content for training in interdisciplinary teamwork.

The various U.N. regional offices participate in the Advisory Social Welfare Services program by using advisers and by sponsoring regional seminars of expert groups. For example, administrators and researchers from 20 countries attended a symposium in Israel sponsored by the European office in cooperation with the Israeli Ministry of Social Welfare. The purpose of the symposium was to review the findings of four studies on research and welfare policies for the elderly. One of the studies was carried out jointly by Denmark, the United Kingdom, and the United States; the other three—in Israel, Poland, and Yugoslavia—were all financed with U.S.-owned foreign currency.

Housing, Building, and Planning

Although for the third consecutive year the General Assembly in 1969 postponed a full-scale discussion of the world housing problem, it unanimously adopted a resolution on December 16 in which it decided to take up the subject as a matter of high priority at its 25th session. The resolution also urged that the strategy for the Second Development Decade give due attention to the problems in the field of housing, building, and planning and requested the Secretary-General to prepare as soon as possible a comprehensive housing survey.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, BUILDING, AND PLANNING

The Committee on Housing, Building, and Planning held its sixth biennial session in New York in September. The first important item on its agenda was the determination of the strategy that should be adopted on housing and urban development for the Second U.N. Development Decade. Because of the failure of developing countries to achieve the production target of 10 new houses per 1,000 population during the First Development Decade, the Committee decided that it was not particularly desirable to establish new quantitative targets.

The U.S. Representative, George Snowdon of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, suggested three broad programs for the Second Development Decade: (1) institution building, particularly the establishment of national housing agencies and financial institutions, to permit more effective and greater domestic efforts; (2) the development of an appropriate strategy, both regionally and nationally, to promote desirable population settlement patterns and to discourage undesirable concentrations; and (3) urban land reform, to remove obstacles posed by inadequate procedures with respect to tenure, transfer, or taxation of urban property.

There was wide Committee participation in the discussion of the proposed agenda for the World Conference on Problems of the Human Environment to be held in Sweden in 1972 (see also p. 107). Developed and developing countries alike expressed concern over the alarming deterioration of the physical environment, especially air, water, and soil pollution, noise, traffic congestion, overcrowding, and in general, the low quality of life.

The U.S. Representative expressed the view that a few carefully selected subject areas could be effectively covered by the conference. Human settle-

ments would clearly be one of the major topics. He envisaged the 1972 conference as one stressing action, particularly possible solutions and the identification and development of tools to manage environmental problems.

There was some difference of opinion among Committee members concerning the usefulness of a campaign to focus world attention on housing and of an international housing year. The Committee decided to make the date of a possible international housing year contingent on the success of the campaign and events in the Second Development Decade.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

The United States is a member of the ECE Committee on Housing, Building, and Planning, which held its 30th meeting in May 1969. Representatives from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development also attended the meetings of the Committee's working parties on Building Industry and on Urban Renewal and Planning. The Working Party on Building Industry is engaged in several projects of special interest to the United States, including the development of methods of estimating and programing, application of computers in the building industry, and economic and technical trends in the building industry.

The Working Party on Urban Renewal and Planning concentrates its program in four high priority areas: land use policies, planning and development of recreational areas, regional planning, and physical planning aspects of environmental quality.

In May 1969 ECE convened a Seminar on Recreational Areas, Green Spaces, and National Environment at which a U.S. paper on "Establishment of Recreational Areas in and Near Towns," was presented although the United States was not represented at the meeting. ECE is also undertaking a housing finance project, in which an American expert

is acting as one of the rapporteurs.

ECAFE decided to elevate its former Working Party to the status of a Subcommittee on Housing, Building, and Planning. The Subcommittee held its ninth session in July, its first meeting since 1966.

During the discussions there was widespread agreement on the necessity of raising the priority of housing in economic development programs and in international capital investment programs. One of the major items on the agenda was the proposed work program. The new orientation of the ECAFE work program places emphasis on comprehensive planning, regional planning, and productivity improvement in the construction industry.

ECA held a meeting early in the year on the Technical and Social Problems of Urbanization with Emphasis on Financing of Housing. A number of useful background papers were prepared for the meeting, and the United States was represented by an observer in the discussions.

Narcotic Drugs

The United States is one of the principal victims of the illegal traffic in narcotic drugs, and for this reason continues to be a strong leader in international efforts to control all narcotic and dangerous drugs. It is a member of the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, composed of 24 nations which are drug producers and/or major victims of illicit trafficking. The Commission held its 23d session in Geneva, January 13-31. In addition to the 24 members, the session was attended by official observers from 22 other nations and 9 international organizations.

At the opening sessions the U.S. Representative, Harry J. Anslinger, moved that the regular agenda be postponed to permit discussion of the emergency situation brought about by the decision of the Government of

Iran to repeal its 1955 ban on opium production. The U.S. Representative stated that although not a party to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, Iran had a moral responsibility under the treaty to seek approval of the International Narcotics Control Board prior to starting or increasing opium production in order to avoid increasing existing levels. He added that not only Iran but the whole world would suffer from the decision. Representatives of France, Canada, the U.A.R., and Sweden also spoke against the Iranian decision, and the Chairman of the International Narcotics Control Board said that the Board had recommended that all governments refrain from starting or increasing opium production. The Representative of the International Criminal Police Organization (ICPO/INTERPOL) described the action as "retrogressive."

The Iranian Representative stated that his government had decided in 1955 to prohibit opium production in the hope that the example would be followed by others. However, in his government's view, illicit traffic from neighboring states since then had gravely affected Iran which had no alternative but to resume production. He stated that production would be accompanied by strict controls as well as an intensification of efforts to prevent illicit trafficking.

Although the Commission adopted no resolution on this problem its report suggested that it might be useful for the U.N. Division of Narcotic Drugs (which serves as the Commission's secretariat) to contact the governments concerned with a view to preparing a report on the problem of opium production and its illicit traffic for the consideration of the Commission at its next regular session. Acting upon this recommendation both the Division Director and a team of experts visited Iran and other states in the area during the year.

The 23d session of the Commission continued its examination, begun in

1967, of a draft protocol to control psychotropic substances which are not now under international control. The initial issue concerned whether psychotropic substances could be handled under the 1961 Single Convention. The Swedish Representative proposed that six amphetamine substances should be placed under the complete ban of Schedule I of the Single Convention, a position supported by 10 other members. The United States took the position that psychotropic substances should not be included under the Single Convention. This position, supported by 11 other nations, was based on both legal grounds and the fact that the Single Convention does not have sufficient flexibility to control these substances. The Commission resolved the issue through a resolution proposed by the United States and eight other nations to the effect that pending the entry into force of a suitable protocol governments should apply national control measures to certain amphetamines and related products. Further, governments should cooperate to regulate the movement of these substances in order to provide adequate safeguards against their abuse. The resolution was unanimously adopted and subsequently approved by ECOSOC on June 5.

The Commission then continued to work on the text of a draft protocol. Although agreement on some issues was reached, a number of questions could not be resolved. In general there was a division between the drug manufacturing countries (such as the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, France, and Germany), which advocated a system of controls different from those under the Single Convention (except for a very limited class of highly dangerous substances), and the opium producing countries (notably India), which favored very strict and rigid controls following those in the Single Convention (except for a limited class of less dangerous drugs). After the Commis-

sion's session the Division of Narcotic Drugs prepared a new draft which included the various alternatives and circulated it to governments for comment. Although the Commission will not hold its next regular session until 1971, ECOSOC on June 5 authorized a special session early in 1970 to consider the draft protocol further.

During the discussion of trafficking the alternate U.S. Representative, John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, said that the most dramatic increase in illicit trafficking had been in cannabis (marihuana and hashish); the heroin problem in the United States had not been solved; and an increase in the traffic in cocaine had also been observed. Stringent national legislation and rigorous internal enforcement were not enough to solve the problem. The need, he said, had never been clearer for the elimination of illicit production of raw materials and clandestine manufacture by all countries, for the constant exchange of intelligence information concerning international trafficking, and for increased effort by national enforcement officers. Governments should ensure that their legislation imposed severe and deterrent penalties for international drug trafficking. Declaring that close cooperation between countries is essential to eliminate the drug peril, he cited examples of cooperation between U.S. authorities and those of many other countries throughout the world.

The Representative of ICPO/INTERPOL informed the Commission that the seizures of narcotic drugs reported to his organization in 1968 had been 30% higher than in 1967. He described as spectacular seizures of heroin made in Canada, France, and the United States during the past 18 months and said that they were indicative of the volume of the traffic. He paid tribute to the excellent cooperation among the police of the countries concerned.

On other matters: the Commission adopted a resolution urging all governments not yet parties to the 1961 Single Convention to ratify or accede to it; it again reviewed the decision of the Lebanese Government to pursue its cannabis replacement program with a sunflower and other substitute crop scheme; and it adopted a resolution congratulating the Government of Lebanon for its activities.

U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees

The primary function of the UNHCR is to provide legal and political protection to refugees within the UNHCR mandate, i.e., within the scope of the statute of the Office. In collaboration with governments and private organizations, the UNHCR also conducts assistance programs promoting solutions to problems of needy refugees within his mandate through voluntary repatriation or their assimilation within new national communities. The UNHCR also uses his good offices (under authority contained in several General Assembly resolutions) in similarly assisting refugees who have not been determined to be within the UNHCR mandate. The UNHCR has interpreted these resolutions as precluding UNHCR assistance to refugees displaced within their own countries or having the right of nationality within their countries of asylum.

The UNHCR Executive Committee, composed of representatives of 31 governments including the United States, reviews and supervises the High Commissioner's activities. In October 1969 the Executive Committee held its 20th regular session in Geneva. The U.S. Representative on the Committee was Clement J. Sobotka, Director of the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs in the Department of State.

A principal responsibility of the High Commissioner is to use the prestige and authority of his Office and of the United Nations to secure necessary, effective arrangements with governmental authorities for the legal and political protection of refugees within the concern of the UNHCR. A primary tool of the UNHCR in his discharge of this responsibility is the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, which prohibits the forcible return of refugees to territories where their life or freedom would be threatened. The Convention also sets forth numerous guarantees designed to improve the legal, political, economic, and social status of refugees in their countries of residence, thus facilitating their reestablishment on a basis of self-support and individual dignity. The High Commissioner is charged with encouraging further accessions to the Convention, supervising its application in states that have acceded to it, and promoting the constructive development or implementation of pertinent national legislative and administrative measures. By the end of 1969 a total of 58 nations had acceded to the Convention.

However, the 1951 Convention is applicable only to persons who become refugees as a result of events occurring before January 1, 1951. While in practice it has thus far been possible consistently to link new refugee problems with pre-1951 events, it was recognized that this process might become more tenuous with the passage of time. Accordingly, in 1967 the United Nations promulgated the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, which removed the Convention's 1951 dateline while also binding states acceding to the Protocol to apply all of the substantive articles of the Convention. Thus parties to the Protocol (a separate instrument) are bound to extend to refugees the benefits of the Convention without the limitation on eligibility

imposed by the Convention's deadline. The United States and 19 other nations acceded to the Protocol during 1968, and by the end of 1969 total signatories reached 37.

The United States, together with a majority of the Executive Committee, has consistently held that the protection function is of paramount importance among the High Commissioner's responsibilities, and that effective performance in this field is essential to valid achievements in UNHCR material assistance programs.

The UNHCR maintains a Legal Assistance Program which is related both to international protection efforts and to the assistance program. In 1969 thousands of refugees received specialized legal assistance through this program, chiefly on individual problems connected with efforts to secure their reestablishment.

The High Commissioner had completed, by the end of 1964, his administration of an \$11 million indemnification fund provided in 1960 by the Federal Republic of Germany for the benefit of refugees who were persecuted for reasons of nationality under Hitler's National Socialist regime. A further grant from the German Government in December 1966 allowed the establishment of a new fund in the amount of approximately \$875,000, to benefit national persecutees who were ineligible under the earlier fund. Administration of this second fund was almost completed in 1969, as \$845,000 had been granted to 696 approved applicants.

THE CURRENT PROGRAM

The Current Program emphasizes material assistance and represents the UNHCR effort to establish the refugees' economic and social position thus putting them on the road to self-support and integration into the life of their adopted country.

Since the primary responsibility for assistance to refugees rests with the

host country, the urgency and extent of refugee problems and the capacity of the host country to deal with them are criteria that the UNHCR must consider in relating material assistance programs to available resources. In Europe, therefore, despite an influx of more than 50,000 new refugees into various European countries during 1969, the UNHCR felt that the resources of local governments supplemented by contributions provided on an increasing scale by other governments and voluntary agencies were essentially adequate. Thus, the Current Program for Europe was not expanded and continued as in prior years to provide modest assistance toward the local integration of refugees who did not wish or were unable to emigrate. However, toward the end of the year the UNHCR announced its intention of substantially increasing in 1970 the allocation for Austria, in view of the continued heavy flow into that country of refugees from Eastern Europe. The UNHCR also continued to provide supplementary assistance, in collaboration with voluntary agencies and the Government of Spain, for newly arriving Cuban refugees in that country.

In East Asia UNHCR assistance in the reestablishment of European refugees arriving in Hong Kong was virtually unchanged in 1969 because very few such refugees reached Hong Kong from the Chinese mainland. UNHCR funds were used for emergency assistance to refugees in transit and for maintaining an office in Hong Kong. The UNHCR also carried out assistance projects for the local integration of Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal, and for Chinese refugees in Macau.

In Latin America the UNHCR program continued to concentrate on working out permanent solutions for aged and otherwise handicapped refugees of European origin who had been resettled from Europe in earlier years. Such assistance included the

placement of refugees in homes for the aged, and participation in the establishment or extension of such institutions. The ultimate goal in Latin America is to consolidate the program to the point where local governments and voluntary agencies would assume most of the burden in aiding these refugees.

As in the previous 3 years, a preponderant part (over 65%) of the program resources of the UNHCR Current Program was allocated for use in Africa. UNHCR projects in Africa were designed to reestablish the refugees within the asylum countries, usually in agricultural settlements. The final goal of this plan has been approached in Burundi, where refugee settlements are being included in an integrated rural development project for the benefit of both refugees and the local population. This project was planned by UNDP and FAO in collaboration with the Government of Burundi, and it is being implemented by FAO. Comparable projects are under study in Uganda, Tanzania, and the Central African Republic.

Victims of the Nigerian conflict, displaced within their own country, are *ipso facto* outside the responsibility of the UNHCR. However, in 1969 the Office continued to be concerned with the small but growing accumulation of Nigerian refugees in neighboring countries. In response to requests from concerned governments, the UNHCR made allocations of funds from the Current Program and from the Emergency Fund for assistance to Nigerians in several of these countries. Such allocations, which were relatively modest in scope, were used primarily to strengthen ongoing governmental or private agency relief and resettlement programs.

Seventy-four nations contributed \$4,299,094 toward the funding of the 1969 UNHCR Current Program. The U.S. contribution was \$800,000, an increase of \$200,000 over 1968. In

addition, U.S. contributions to assist refugees of concern to the UNHCR but not covered in its regular budget included over \$1.3 million in food for refugees in sub-Saharan Africa, approximately \$2.4 million for educational assistance to African refugee students, about \$725,000 in food and \$500,000 in other assistance for Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macau, \$270,000 in food for Tibetan refugees in India, and \$5,400,000 for refugees from Eastern European countries. Also, about two-thirds of the \$3,550,000 contributed to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration was for assistance to refugees. The United States also expended over \$70 million during fiscal 1969 for the care and resettlement of Cuban refugees in the United States.

At its annual meeting the Executive Committee of the UNHCR approved a 1970 program of \$5,604,900, covering assistance to refugees in more than 40 countries throughout the world.

During the past year, 134 nongovernmental organizations and social welfare agencies participated in or contributed to UNHCR programs.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER U.N. BODIES

In 1969 relations between the UNHCR and other elements of the U.N. system were strengthened in a number of fields, particularly economic and social development, human rights, assistance to refugees from non-self-governing territories in Africa, rural settlement, employment, and education and training.

UNESCO cooperated in the field of refugee education by providing personnel, funds, and expertise. The World Food Program provided large quantities of food supplies to refugees in Africa. The ILO, FAO, WHO, and UNICEF made available personnel, consultative services, equipment, supplies, and training facilities for the rural settlement of refugees. The UNDP helped in the planning,

financing, and implementation of local zonal development plans in Africa.

The U.S. Representative to the Executive Committee again urged the closest possible coordination between the UNHCR and other multilateral or private organizations in order to develop larger resources and greater flexibility in meeting refugee problems, stimulate broader development programs, and avoid duplication of effort.

THE EMERGENCY FUND

The \$500,000 UNHCR Emergency Fund established by the General Assembly in 1958 is an indispensable instrument of the High Commissioner which is regularly replenished through repayment of refugee housing loans made under previous UNHCR programs. The United States has consistently urged the UNHCR to draw upon the Fund for emergencies that arise between Executive Committee sessions. During 1969 the High Commissioner allocated to governments a total of \$387,365 from the Fund for such purposes, all of it for assistance projects in Africa.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

On December 16 the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution expressing appreciation of the High Commissioner's accomplishments in different aspects of his humanitarian task and requesting him to continue to provide protection and assistance to refugees, particularly the new refugees in Africa. The resolution noted with satisfaction recent increases in the number and amounts of contributions from member governments and called on governments for continued support of the UNHCR.

Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan continued to serve as the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, having been reelected by acclamation at the

1968 General Assembly for a 5-year term which expires December 31, 1973.

UNICEF

VOLUME AND SCOPE OF AID

Since inception of the Fund 136 countries and territories have received UNICEF aid. During 1969 this assistance went to 115 countries and territories, in such fields as health, education, nutrition, and social welfare. A large part of UNICEF aid takes the form of equipment and supplies, but in recent years other types of aid have been increasingly important. At the present time training stipends constitute about 30% of all program assistance, and UNICEF also provides engineering and technical services for food conservation, and advice on transport maintenance to ministries receiving vehicles from UNICEF.

In 1969 about \$38 million was committed worldwide for program aid. Some 60% of this went for projects in health, with an additional 8.5% for the closely related field of nutrition. Aid to education, the second most important program category, involved 18% of the resources.

EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

UNICEF's Executive Board followed its established pattern of reviewing thoroughly each year one or more of the program categories to which UNICEF gives assistance. In 1969 it considered two major assessments. The first, "Assessment of Environmental Sanitation and Rural Water Supply Programmes Assisted by the United Nations Children's Fund and the World Health Organization (1959-1968)," reviewed the programs in the 80 countries assisted and studied intensively those in 7 countries. The report, prepared by WHO in consultation with UNICEF,

appraised the assets and deficits of the program and included recommendations for future UNICEF policy in this field.

The second assessment, prepared by ILO in consultation with UNICEF and UNESCO, was on pre-vocational training projects assisted by UNICEF and ILO. UNICEF's program in this area has been small and uneven in character. From this review the Board got an understanding of the magnitude of the problem of out-of-school youth with little or no training or education, and was able to consider how UNICEF might more effectively serve such youth.

Recommendations in both these assessments were accepted by the Board and new lines of program policy laid down.

FAMILY PLANNING

This program is gaining momentum, both in interest and in action. The Board, which in 1967 accepted UNICEF's role in family planning with reservations on the part of some members, has become increasingly positive in its approach. Countries originally disinterested or even opposed now support the program, and more countries are requesting aid in this field within their programs of basic maternal and child health; UNICEF will supply this aid within the limits of its resources. Through 1969 more than \$3.3 million had been allocated specifically for this purpose.

YOUTH

Within UNICEF, as in most organizations today, the frustrations and activism of youth are of concern to the older generation. It is the U.S. position, however, that despite the urgency of the problems of older youth and young adults, UNICEF, as a children's agency, should concentrate on children under 15 years. Departure from this focus on children would not only blur UNICEF's image, but absorb funds that have

been contributed specifically to aid children and which are all too small for this designated purpose.

VIET-NAM

UNICEF's considerable aid to the Republic of Viet-Nam has been effectively utilized in such areas as tuberculosis and leprosy control, environmental sanitation, health education, basic maternal and child health, primary education, and social services. An additional \$300,000 was committed in 1969. The United States offered \$750,000 under a funds-in-trust arrangement to UNICEF to build a Social Welfare Training Center in Saigon, and negotiations for carrying out this offer were well advanced by the end of the year. Such a center is badly needed to train welfare workers to care for the vast number of homeless children and broken families that have resulted from the war.

EMERGENCY AID

UNICEF's aid to Nigeria constituted about 40% of all aid going into that country. Prior to the 1969 Board meeting the Executive Board had approved allocations of some \$2.4 million for emergency relief to Nigeria of which \$1.9 million came from private sources, largely through various National Committees. In addition, donated supplies from governments amounted to about \$16.3 million. In the course of the year the United States pledged nearly \$18 million worth of foodstuffs (including shipping) for Nigerian relief. At its 1969 meeting the Board made additional commitments of \$1 million for continued emergency aid—largely drugs and medical supplies—and \$353,000 to start rehabilitation of health and education services.

In line with its nonpolitical character and its basic philosophy to assist children in need without regard to race, religion, or national origin, the Board directed the Executive Direc-

tor to continue to explore the idea of extending emergency aid to children in North Viet-Nam, using as appropriate the good offices of the International Red Cross. During 1969 an exploratory visit to North Viet-Nam was made for UNICEF by the Polish Representative on the Executive Board to determine what form such aid might take. It was eventually decided to propose a program to supply cloth for children's clothing. Negotiations continued with the Red Cross to determine its role. Some of the funds which would support any aid for the North would come from a special grant by the Government of the Netherlands for aid to both South and North Viet-Nam.

Emergency aid was also provided, on a small scale, to Burma (cyclone disaster), Iran and Sicily (earthquake relief), and Syria (flood relief).

FINANCIAL SITUATION

UNICEF's income in 1969 was approximately \$46.3 million, about \$3.3 million more than in 1968. There were 28 governments which gave more than in the preceding year, including the United States which gave an additional \$1 million beyond the \$12 million contributed annually in

recent years. Twelve governments made their first contributions to UNICEF in 1969. If this rising trend continues, UNICEF may reach its stated goal of \$50 million annually by 1970. Private funds and income from greeting cards continued to account for a significant proportion of the total income.

Concrete evidence of the need for additional resources is found in the series of "noted" projects—the backlog of requests for aid totaling \$15,960,000—which would have been recommended for support had funds been available.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

On December 15 the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by Turkey on behalf of 38 cosponsors (including the United States) which *inter alia* recognized UNICEF's important role in helping achieve the objectives of the Second U.N. Development Decade, endorsed UNICEF's policies and programs, recognized that UNICEF could do more if more resources were available to it, and appealed to U.N. members and other donors to make every effort to increase their contributions to UNICEF.

Scientific Cooperation

International cooperation in scientific fields occurs in many parts of the U.N. system. This section presents a brief review of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (ACASTD), the U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR), and those scientific interests and activities of

ECOSOC and the General Assembly that are not dealt with elsewhere in this report.

Other sections containing extensive material on scientific cooperation are those on Outer Space (p. 11), Seabed and Ocean Floor (p. 16), FAO (p. 131), UNESCO (p. 138), WHO (p. 143), ITU (p. 150), WMO (p. 153), and IAEA (p. 155).

Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development

The ACASTD is composed of 18 experts serving in their personal capacities. Dr. Carroll L. Wilson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been a member since the Committee was created by ECOSOC in 1963 to keep under review the progress made in the application of science and technology to development.

The ACASTD held two sessions in 1969: its 11th, in New York, March 31–April 4, and its 12th, in Addis Ababa, November 24–December 5.

At its 11th session the ACASTD continued its work on a number of topics. As requested by the General Assembly in 1968 it made a number of recommendations on the U.N. Conference on Human Environment which it transmitted to the Secretary-General for use in preparing his report on the scope of the Conference and the arrangements required for holding it (see p. 107). It also approved proposals for further work on the World Plan of Action—a major study of the role of science and technology within the framework of the Second Development Decade; the use of computers in developing countries; and human rights problems arising from scientific and technological developments.

It reviewed a working paper prepared by the U.N. Secretariat on the machinery available in the U.N. system for dealing with science and technology, and established a working group to recommend specific issues and problems in this area to which it should give special attention. It also appointed an *ad hoc* Working Group on Science and Industrial Development to consider whether it should undertake an intensive study of selected aspects of research and

design for industrial development. It also continued—at both sessions—its consideration of the problems of population, science education, and protein deficiency.

At its 12th session, in Africa, the ACASTD decided, upon the suggestion of ECA, to attach to the World Plan of Action an annex listing specific projects agreed to by governments and prepared with the full collaboration of the regional economic commissions and the specialized agencies. It also welcomed ECA's emphasis on identifying crucial areas for concentrated research and called for a concerted attack by the world community on the tsetse fly, as a necessary step for the expansion of crop and livestock output in the African countries.

On August 8 the 47th ECOSOC adopted a resolution that, *inter alia*, recognized ACASTD's "outstanding contribution to the general recognition of the role of science and technology in the development process" and decided (1) to review future arrangements relating to the ACASTD, including its terms of reference, in 2 years; (2) to extend its present term until the end of 1971; and (3) to enlarge its membership from 18 to 24. The resolution also asked the U.N. Secretary-General to seek the views of member states on future institutional arrangements for science and technology and to submit a comprehensive report on this subject to ECOSOC at its 49th session in 1970.

U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

Established by the General Assembly in 1955 to foster and maintain continuing scientific evaluation of data concerning the effects of ionizing radiation upon man and his en-

vironment, UNSCEAR¹ held its 19th session in New York May 5-16. At that time it adopted a report to the General Assembly concerning radioactive contamination of the environment by nuclear tests, radiation-induced chromosome aberrations in human cells, and the effect of ionizing radiation on the nervous system. It also discussed and formulated plans for its future activities. It decided that it would continue to keep under review and assess the levels of radiation to which the world population is or may become exposed, including those from (1) radioactive contamination of the environment by both military and peaceful applications of nuclear energy, (2) increasing industrial and medical uses of radiation and radio-nuclides, and (3) natural sources present in the environment. UNSCEAR further decided that it would evaluate the significance of any new radiation effects that came to its attention, and that it would continue to provide the General Assembly with assessments of the risks entailed by exposure to radiation and of the mechanisms involved.

On October 17 the Special Political Committee of the 24th General Assembly considered UNSCEAR's report and approved unanimously a resolution sponsored by the United States and 15 other countries. This resolution commended UNSCEAR for the valuable contributions it has made to man's knowledge and understanding of the effects and levels of atomic radiation; requested UNSCEAR to continue its work, including its coordinating activities, to increase knowledge of levels and effects of atomic radiation from all sources; and noted the intention of UNSCEAR to hold its next session in September 1970 and to report further to the General Assembly. The General Assembly unanimously adopted the resolution on October 28.

¹Members are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States.

Marine Resources

INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION

During 1969 UNESCO's IOC greatly increased its activities in cooperation with other U.N. agencies in order to fulfill its role as the focal point for planning and coordinating the long-term and expanded program of oceanographic research that had been called for by the 23d General Assembly. An important element in this program is the International Decade of Ocean Exploration, a U.S. initiative which was welcomed by the 23d Assembly.

A Joint Working Party composed of representatives of WMO, the Scientific Committee for Oceanic Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions, and the FAO Advisory Committee on Marine Resources Research met in April and May to draft a comprehensive scientific report entitled "Global Ocean Research." This report served as the basis for the IOC's preparation of the long-term and expanded program of oceanic research and exploration.

To better equip itself to handle its expanded activities and responsibilities, the IOC at its sixth session adopted revised statutes and recommended increases in its level of support from all sources. It also decided to accept an appropriate WMO scientific advisory body and to establish a group of scientific experts to assist in implementing the long-term program.

The IOC adopted resolutions concerning ocean surveys and programs already underway or being planned. It approved a general plan and implementation program for an Integrated Global Ocean Station System (IGOSS) and called for continued support of IGOSS by the U.N. specialized agencies. It reviewed reports from various regional coordination groups and endorsed (1) the recommendation of the Coordination

Group for the Cooperative Study of the Kuroshio and Adjacent Regions that a South China Sea Survey be carried out, and (2) the recommendation of the Coordination Group for Cooperative Investigations of the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions that there should be established a sorting center in Mexico, a data center in the United States, and an operations center in Curaçao. The IOC also supported further work by the International Coordination Group for the Southern Ocean, the Joint Coordination Group on Cooperative Systematic Studies in the North Atlantic, and the Planning Group for Cooperative Investigations of the Northern Part of the Eastern Central Atlantic.

ECOSOC

ECOSOC considered several reports relating to marine science at its 47th session in the summer of 1969. It unanimously approved and decided to publish a report by the Secretary-General entitled "Mineral Resources of the Sea," a survey of mineral resources on and beyond the continental shelf. This report was a revised version of one issued in 1968 that had been undertaken in response to a U.S. initiative. At the request of the 23d General Assembly ECOSOC continued its consideration of another 1968 Secretariat report, "Marine Science and Technology," together with the views of member states on the subject.

ECOSOC discussed at length a report by the IOC on the long-term program of oceanographic research. The IOC report also described the efforts by various U.N. agencies and nongovernmental scientific organizations to develop scientific recommendations and to assist the IOC in the preparation of the comprehensive outline for the long-term program.

During ECOSOC's consideration of these documents the U.N. Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs announced that the United

Nations was joining with UNESCO, WMO, IMCO, and FAO to create an Intersecretariat Committee on Scientific Programs Relating to Oceanography. Many delegations endorsed IOC's role in the field of oceanography, and on August 5 ECOSOC decided that the Secretary-General, in cooperation with the specialized agencies and organizations concerned, should report regularly to the Council on progress in the field of marine science.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 24th General Assembly adopted three resolutions concerning marine science. The most significant of these, introduced by the United States and cosponsored by Belgium, Iceland, Norway, and Uruguay, expressed appreciation for the IOC's comprehensive outline of the long-term and expanded program of oceanic research and requested UNESCO and IOC to keep the program up-to-date and to consider its implementation in appropriate stages in cooperation with the United Nations and other organizations. The resolution also commended the close working relations that had developed among U.N. organizations in regard to the long-term program and urged member states and all interested organizations to continue cooperating with IOC in carrying out the program. This resolution was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee on November 25 and without objection by the Assembly in plenary session on December 13.

The Assembly adopted unanimously in both the Second Committee (on December 5) and plenary (on December 13) a 17-nation draft resolution introduced by Iceland that requested the Secretary-General to supplement reports and studies already being prepared with additional information. Specifically, the resolution asked for (1) "a review of harmful chemical substances, radioactive materials and other noxious

agents and waste . . . in the marine environment and coastal areas"; (2) a review of national and international activities to prevent and control marine pollution, including suggestions for more comprehensive action and improved coordination in the field; and (3) a survey of the views of member states on the feasibility and desirability of an international treaty or treaties on marine pollution. The Secretary-General was requested to report to both ECOSOC and the Preparatory Committee of the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment.

After some debate and considerable amendment, a resolution on marine coordination, introduced by Malta and cosponsored by Jamaica and the Philippines, was approved by the Second Committee on December 9 by a vote of 79 (U.S.) to 0, with 9 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly in plenary session on December 15 by a vote of 100 to 0, with 11 abstentions. This resolution requested ECOSOC to consider instructing its Committee for Program and Coordination "to examine the need for a comprehensive review of existing activities of the United Nations system relating to the seas and oceans in the light of present and emerging needs of member states."

Problems of Human Environment

SECRETARY-GENERAL'S REPORT

At the request of the 23d General Assembly in 1968 and in preparation for the 1972 U.N. Conference on the Human Environment, the Secretary-General prepared a report entitled "Problems of the Human Environment." This report identified the main categories of environmental problems, in terms of their geographic dimensions, as (1) human settlement problems, (2) territorial problems,

and (3) global problems. It defined human settlement problems as those affecting local areas of human concentration, for which action is primarily the responsibility of national governments and city and local authorities. Territorial problems are those of land areas, including non-oceanic and coastal waters, for which action is primarily the responsibility of national governments, but which also have regional aspects. Global problems are those of worldwide dimensions which potentially affect all countries and are amenable to solution only by international agreement and a willingness of countries to act in concert for their common betterment.

The Secretary-General said that the purposes and objectives of the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment should be:

(1) To focus the attention of governments and public opinion on the importance and urgency of environmental problems so that increased attention will be given them in policies and programs of economic and social development;

(2) To provide a forum for exchange of views among governments on the ways and means of handling environmental problems, including machinery required for administrative and legislative action;

(3) To identify those aspects of such problems which can only, or best, be solved through international or regional cooperation and agreement;

(4) To consider methods for intensifying action at the national, regional, and international level; and, in particular, to consider how developing countries can benefit from this mobilization of knowledge and experience and thus be able, among other things, to prevent many environmental problems from arising; and

(5) To focus attention on and encourage wider participation in and support for the activities of U.N. and other organizations relating to the

human environment, and to give these activities a common outlook and direction.

The report also proposed a work program for the Conference that would provide eight commissions on substantive and strategic problems to consider such matters as (1) problems of human settlements and industrial development; (2) the rational use and development of natural resources; (3) environmental pollution; (4) maintenance of values of the human environment; (5) environmental aspects of economic and social planning; (6) financial, fiscal, and pricing policies; (7) public administration and legislation; and (8) regional and international cooperation.

ECOSOC

The 47th ECOSOC on August 6 adopted a resolution expressing its appreciation for the Secretary-General's report and recommending, *inter alia*, that the General Assembly establish a Preparatory Committee to advise the Secretary-General on the Conference and request the Secretary-General to set up immediately a small secretariat for the Conference.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

At the opening of the 24th General Assembly President Nixon referred to the 1972 U.N. Conference on the Human Environment and pledged the strongest support of the United States for this U.N. effort.

On November 10 Sweden introduced in the Second Committee a draft resolution on the Conference that was ultimately sponsored by 57 states and unanimously adopted on November 12. The resolution, *inter alia*, accepted the invitation of the Government of Sweden to hold the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in June 1972; endorsed in general the proposals in the Secretary-General's report regarding the objectives and purposes of the Conference; entrusted

to the Secretary-General overall responsibility for organizing and preparing for the Conference; established a 27-member Preparatory Committee consisting of highly qualified representatives nominated by the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Singapore, Sweden, Togo, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia, and Zambia; requested the Secretary-General to set up a small Conference secretariat; and invited the specialized agencies, IAEA, ACASTD, intergovernmental organizations, and nongovernmental organizations to assist in preparations for the Conference.

On December 12 the Committee also recommended that the Assembly decide that any member state not on the Preparatory Committee be allowed to designate highly qualified representatives to act as accredited observers at the sessions of the Preparatory Committee with the right to participate in its discussions.

On December 15 the General Assembly in plenary session unanimously adopted the recommended resolution and without objection adopted the recommended decision.

(See also section on UNESCO p. 141.)

Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

On August 29 the U.N. Scientific Advisory Committee¹ decided that further study would be necessary be-

¹ Brazil, Canada, France, India, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

fore a final agenda for the 1971 Conference could be decided upon. It recognized the need for proposing financial guidelines, but found it impossible to make precise estimates until the question of the agenda had been settled. The Committee expressed the hope that it could agree on an agenda and cost estimates when it reconvened in 1970.

In December the Secretary-General submitted for the General Assembly's consideration preliminary cost estimates based on the assumption that there would be the same number of agenda items (42) as for the Third Conference in 1964, that the IAEA's contribution to the Fourth Conference would be provided in the same proportion as for the Third Conference, and that there would be a major reduction in the requirements for documentation and printing. His preliminary estimates of costs to be borne by the United Nations amounted to \$932,800 over 3 years: \$116,600 in 1970; \$561,200 in 1971; and \$255,000 in 1972.

After examining the Secretary-General's report, the ACABQ expressed the view that it might be possible to limit the cost of the Confer-

ence to the United Nations to about \$750,000. While concurring in the Secretary-General's preliminary estimate for 1970, the ACABQ expressed the hope that expenditures in that year would be kept under \$100,000. The Fifth Committee of the General Assembly expressed similar views.

On December 15 the Assembly in plenary session adopted without objection a resolution cosponsored by Canada, France, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States which approved the Secretary-General's estimated expenditures for 1970, noted his estimates for 1971 and 1972, and asked him to advise the Assembly at its 25th session of any changes in those estimates. The resolution requested the Secretary-General to continue preparations for the Conference, which will be held in Geneva for 8 or 9 working days in 1971. It also requested him to transmit the draft agenda proposed by the U.N. Scientific Advisory Committee to the General Assembly at its 25th session, including whatever suggestions and comments he might deem appropriate, and to report to the General Assembly at its 25th session on the preparation for the Conference.

Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

The 25th session of the Commission on Human Rights met in Geneva February 17–March 21. As in recent years the Commission's emphasis continued to shift gradually from the drafting of human rights instruments and the discussion of special studies and abstract principles to the consideration of allegations of specific human rights abuses in the world. Concurrent with this new emphasis is a renewed interest in the development of more efficient procedures and

in the creation of new bodies or techniques to improve the U.N. ability to function in this area. This has presented a challenge to all U.N. members to find paths of accommodation that will enable the United Nations to perform its Charter role of promoting respect for human rights in the most practical and efficient manner, taking full account of the powers for, and limitations on, action of the various U.N. organs.

Violations of Human Rights

SOUTHERN AFRICA

The Human Rights Commission continued to devote major attention to the problems of apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa and received a second report on this subject by its Special Rapporteur, Manouchehr Ganji of Iran. In addition to bringing up to date his findings concerning legislation and practices in South Africa, Namibia, and Southern Rhodesia, the Special Rapporteur discussed the possibility of establishing a grand jury of legal experts for Namibia. He also included a special section on measures for disseminating to the people of southern Africa information on the evils of apartheid and racial discrimination and suggested that consideration be given to the establishment in Africa of a U.N. Radio unit.

The Commission adopted two resolutions on this report. One, adopted unanimously, was a general denunciation of the policy of apartheid that appealed for the support of world public opinion for efforts to eliminate apartheid practices. A second resolution, lengthy and much more detailed, *inter alia* repeated calls upon governments to terminate all diplomatic, commercial, military, cultural, and other relations with the Government of the Republic of South Africa and the regime in Southern Rhodesia. The task of the Special Rapporteur was continued and Hortencio J. Brillantes of the Philippines was appointed to succeed Mr. Ganji. The resolution further proposed that the General Assembly adopt a resolution in which it would (1) join in the condemnations and calls for cessation of relations, (2) authorize the setting up of a unit of the U.N. Radio in Africa, and (3) request the Secretary-General to secure the views of member states on the establishment of a Judicial Committee for Namibia. This resolution was adopted by the Commission by a

vote of 19 to 0, with 9 abstentions (U.S.).

The United States abstained primarily because it opposed the proposal to establish a unit of U.N. Radio in Africa and because it disagreed with the call for a total cessation of relations with the governments or regimes concerned. The United States does not agree that a complete break in relations would assist in moving South Africa to alter its policies. Regarding the U.N. Radio unit in Africa, the U.S. position is that this would constitute a bad precedent in addition to being an unduly expensive operation. The United Nations already broadcasts news to all parts of the world, including Africa. A special unit for broadcasting to southern Africa would not be designed for information purposes as in other parts of the world but rather to influence or incite the population.

The portion of the resolution proposed for the attention of the General Assembly was forwarded to the Assembly by the 46th ECOSOC. At the 24th General Assembly it was approved in the Third Committee on November 24 by a vote of 79 to 1, with 20 abstentions (U.S.), and on December 15 the Assembly adopted it in plenary session by a vote of 86 to 2, with 21 abstentions (U.S.).

With respect to continuing the task of the Special Rapporteur, ECOSOC decided on June 6 to request the Human Rights Commission to reconsider the matter in the light of two alternatives: (1) either abolishing the Special Rapporteur's mandate, or (2) entrusting the mandate to the *ad hoc* Working Group of Experts that the Commission had established in 1967 to investigate charges of torture and ill treatment of prisoners in South Africa. The mandate of the *ad hoc* Working Group was enlarged in 1968 to include investigation of prison conditions in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, and the Portuguese territories.

The *ad hoc* Working Group, made up of experts from Senegal, Austria,

Yugoslavia, India, Peru, and Tanzania, had conducted extensive hearings throughout 1968 in New York, London, Geneva, and several African capitals. Its report appeared late and was submitted to the Commission in sections which were circulated sporadically throughout the 5-week session. The Commission was consequently unable to consider the report in detail. Nevertheless, on March 19 by a vote of 23 to 0, with 5 abstentions (U.S.), it adopted a resolution extending the life of the *ad hoc* Working Group and calling for further investigation of certain grave conditions in southern Africa.

The U.S. abstention was due to serious doubts about the utility of continuing the life of the group in view of the existence of other special U.N. committees regularly concerned with the problems of southern Africa. The *ad hoc* Working Group had already completed a thorough investigation of conditions in southern Africa and had submitted two extensive reports, the last of which had not yet received even cursory attention by the Commission.

Although the Commission did not present the General Assembly with a draft resolution based upon the findings of the *ad hoc* Working Group, the Assembly's Third Committee did consider a wide-ranging draft based in part upon the first report of the Working Group issued in 1968. This draft resolution, put forward late in the Third Committee debate by Yugoslavia and 21 African and Asian cosponsors, contained 18 operative paragraphs directed at the Governments of the United Kingdom, the Republic of South Africa, and Portugal and called for a variety of actions to support U.N. efforts to assist the peoples of Namibia and other parts of southern Africa. Because much of the substance of this resolution had been covered in resolutions already adopted on southern African problems by the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Commit-

tee (Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) (see pp. 22 and 185) the United States and the United Kingdom took the position that it was out of place for the Third Committee to give its attention to the draft resolution. The resolution, nevertheless, after only brief debate, was approved on November 24 by a vote of 87 to 1, with 23 abstentions, with the United States and United Kingdom not participating. The Assembly adopted the resolution in plenary session on December 11 by a vote of 87 to 1, with 23 abstentions. The United States did not participate.

MIDDLE EAST

The subject of alleged human rights violations in the occupied territories of the Middle East was one of the major items considered by the Human Rights Commission. The debate focused upon a draft resolution proposed by India, Mauritania, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia, which assumed the existence of human rights violations in the Israeli-occupied territories and established a special Working Group of Experts with a mandate to investigate these allegations as they might constitute violations of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. The Working Group was asked to report to the 26th session of the Commission. The composition of the Working Group was the same as the one to investigate prison conditions in South Africa. The resolution was adopted on March 4 by a vote of 13 to 1 (Israel), with 16 abstentions (U.S.). The U.S. abstention was due to the fact that the discussion of the Middle East situation in a human rights context centered only upon one aspect, that of the Israeli-occupied territories, and did not cover all aspects of human rights violations as a result of the Middle East hostilities. Moreover, since the Geneva Convention provides means for dealing with complaints of Convention violations, a

new working group was unnecessary.

On the same day the Commission also adopted a resolution of a generally hortatory nature that made an appeal to all governments to spare no efforts to ensure a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East and to ensure respect for fundamental human rights in that region. This resolution, which by its terms applied to the region as a whole, was adopted unanimously. Neither of these resolutions required further action by ECOSOC or the General Assembly.

However, the question of the Middle East in a human rights context did receive further discussion at the 24th General Assembly. During the Third Committee's consideration of the item on violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Congo (Brazzaville), India, Guinea, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia on November 20 proposed a resolution intended to carry forward a resolution relating to human rights in territories occupied by Israel that had been adopted at the previous Assembly session. The earlier resolution had established a committee of three member states to be appointed by the Assembly President to investigate Israeli practices affecting human rights in occupied territories. The President of the General Assembly had been unable until late September 1969 to find three states to serve on the committee, in part because of Israel's position that the group would not be admitted to Israeli-held territory, so that the committee had not been able to carry out its mandate.¹

The five-power resolution proposed at the 24th Assembly drew attention to fresh reports alleging human rights violations in the occupied territories, condemned certain policies and practices in the territories, called on Israel to "desist forthwith from its reported repressive practices," and

¹ The three states finally appointed were Ceylon, Yugoslavia, and Somalia.

requested the three-member committee to take cognizance of the provisions of the resolution. This resolution was approved in committee on November 20 by a vote of 51 to 11, with 50 abstentions (U.S.), and adopted in plenary on December 11 by a vote of 52 to 13, with 49 abstentions (U.S.). Again the U.S. abstention was based upon its position that resolutions regarding human rights in the Middle East should be evenhanded and apply to the human rights of all those affected by the hostilities.

U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR

At the 24th Assembly the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Rita E. Hauser, on November 11 made a major statement principally devoted to the plight of U.S. prisoners of war being held by the North Vietnamese. She emphasized that the matter constituted a serious human rights problem which should receive the attention of the United Nations. The United States did not put forward a resolution for adoption by the General Assembly, but it appealed for the moral support of other governments in securing full compliance by the North Vietnamese authorities with the provisions of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. The U.S. Representative referred to the appeal made by the International Conference of the Red Cross in September that full compliance with the obligations of the Geneva Convention be ensured by all parties and authorities involved in the armed conflict, and she said:

We hope this committee will take note at this session of the resolution passed without dissent by the International Red Cross Conference in Istanbul and that it will in a similar fashion reaffirm the obligations of all parties to the Geneva convention. We especially hope that North Viet-Nam, which has frequently expressed its abiding regard for humane principles, will heed this unequivocal and specific call reflecting the conscience of the international community.

The U.S. statement received encouraging support from a number of U.N. members who spoke during the debate.

PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS

The United Nations regularly receives a large number of petitions or communications from private individuals containing allegations of violations of human rights. The basic procedure for handling these petitions was laid down in a 1959 resolution and was highly restrictive. Under that resolution the Commission on Human Rights had no power to take any action with regard to private complaints, which are merely submitted to the members of the Commission for their information and are kept confidential. There is no discussion of them and they are annually noted by the Commission at a brief closed meeting.

In 1967 ECOSOC relaxed these restrictions and granted authority to the Human Rights Commission, as well as to its Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, to examine information relative to "gross violations" of human rights and fundamental freedoms contained in the communications. The Commission was specifically authorized to make a thorough study of situations that revealed a consistent pattern of violations of human rights and to report with recommendations thereon to ECOSOC.

Pursuant to this new authority the Subcommittee proposed a new and comprehensive procedure for dealing with human rights communications. This proposal served as the basis for the extensive and thorough discussion of the matter held by the Commission at its 25th session.

Briefly, the proposed procedure would provide for a screening committee made up of five Subcommittee members to identify those communications that appeared to reveal a consistent pattern of gross violations. The Subcommittee, in turn, would

consider these communications and decide which if any to refer for the consideration of the Commission. The Commission would examine any situation referred to it and decide either to study and report on it to ECOSOC or, with the consent of the state concerned, to investigate the situation through a special *ad hoc* committee.

On March 17 the Commission adopted by a vote of 15 (U.S.) to 4, with 12 abstentions, a resolution incorporating this procedure. Those who opposed the resolution did so chiefly on the ground that it violated the principle of state sovereignty. They regarded any attempt to attribute evidential value to private communications relating to the internal conduct of any member state as an infringement of the sovereign rights of the member state and they insisted that in the U.N. field of human rights only governments should be permitted to institute complaints about the conduct of other governments.

The draft resolution adopted by the Human Rights Commission required ECOSOC's approval for the institution of the new procedure. On June 6 the 46th ECOSOC unanimously adopted a resolution noting the particularly important nature of the new procedure and deciding to transmit the draft resolution to member states for comment. ECOSOC also invited the Human Rights Commission to study the question again at its 26th session as a matter of priority in the light of replies received from member states and to report to the Council at its 48th session in 1970.

MODEL RULES OF PROCEDURE

One final matter relating to human rights violations was the discussion by the Human Rights Commission of a proposal to frame a set of special rules of procedure for U.N. bodies dealing with human rights violations. Acting upon a draft resolution put forward by Austria and Finland, the Commission requested the Secretary-

General to submit a draft of model rules of procedure to its next session. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 0, with 6 abstentions. Doubts about the idea of framing a set of model rules were voiced chiefly by Communist states who appeared reluctant to formalize to such an extent the procedures for dealing with specific human rights violations.

Nazism and Racial Intolerance

Discussion of this subject at the 25th session of the Commission centered upon a draft resolution proposed by Poland and the Ukrainian S.S.R. This draft sought to elevate the question of nazism to the level of a major, current human rights problem. It would have instituted a special study on the subject, proclaimed a special day, and called for the institution of a worldwide campaign to combat nazism. As a result of extensive amendments proposed by the Latin American members of the Commission and subsequently adopted by the Commission in their entirety, the draft resolution was transformed into a widely acceptable text. The provisions for a special day and campaign were appropriately modified and instead of a separate special study the Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was requested to give the matter of the revival of nazism special attention in its study of racial discrimination in the political, social, economic, and cultural spheres. A call for the prohibition of nazi and racist organizations was amended to take account of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which include guarantees of free speech and peaceful assembly.

The final amended text was adopted by a vote of 29 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention. A part of the resolution contained a recommended text for

adoption by the General Assembly. This text was forwarded to the Assembly by ECOSOC and adopted unanimously by the Third Committee on November 24 and by the Assembly in plenary session on December 1. The Assembly's resolution contained a series of exhortations to states to guard against and to take all appropriate measures to combat the revival of nazism and racial intolerance.

War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity

The Commission had before it a study prepared by the Secretary-General dealing with measures to ensure the arrest, extradition, and punishment of persons responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity. The study also contained a special section dealing with criteria for determining compensation for victims of such crimes. The Commission's debate related principally to a draft resolution proposed by Poland and the U.S.S.R., which retained the question on the agenda for the following session of the Commission, called for further comments from governments in the interim, and proposed that the General Assembly adopt a resolution emphasizing the necessity for wide adherence to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity. This Convention, adopted at the 23d General Assembly in 1968, had been opposed by the United States because of its very broad and vague definition of crimes against humanity. In the Human Rights Commission the United States joined with Italy, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay in proposing amendments to remove the emphasis upon this Convention thus making the resolution acceptable. The key amendment failed of adoption by a vote of 11 in favor (U.S.)

to 12 opposed, with 8 abstentions. Consequently, in the vote on the resolution as a whole, the United States and United Kingdom voted negatively. The resolution was adopted by the Commission by a vote of 16 to 2 (U.S., U.K.), with 12 abstentions. The resolution proposed for the General Assembly by the Commission was briefly considered at the Assembly's 24th session. It was approved by the Third Committee on December 4 by a vote of 63 to 4 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions, and adopted by the Assembly in plenary session on December 15 by a vote of 74 to 5 (U.S.), with 32 abstentions.

Realization of Economic and Social Rights

In 1968 the Commission had begun a consideration of measures for the realization of economic and social rights as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. The Commission had requested the Secretary-General to prepare a study of the issues relating to the preliminary implementation of these rights, and had further decided to consider the question of the appointment of a Special Rapporteur to prepare a comprehensive report on the subject.

At its 25th session the Commission adopted a draft resolution on the matter put forward by 16 members. Under this resolution the Commission decided to appoint Manouchehr Ganji of Iran, its former Rapporteur on apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa, as Special Rapporteur, and requested him to submit a comprehensive report at the Commission's 27th session in 1971. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 30 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention. Although it was the U.S. view that a special study in this broad area was premature in light of all the other un-

finished work still confronting the Commission, and especially in light of the many other special studies that were completed but had still to be acted upon, the United States agreed to support the resolution in view of the very heavy sentiment in favor of it within the Commission. On June 6 the 46th ECOSOC confirmed the designation of Mr. Ganji as Special Rapporteur.

High Commissioner for Human Rights

For the first time since Costa Rica in 1965 proposed establishing a High Commissioner for Human Rights in the U.N. Secretariat, the General Assembly engaged in a substantive debate on the matter. In 1965 the proposal had been referred to the Commission on Human Rights, which in 1967 referred it back to the Assembly with the recommendation that the new post of High Commissioner be established. Wide and encouraging support for the proposal was revealed during the discussion at the 24th General Assembly. Because there was not time to complete full consideration of the item in the Third Committee, the discussion terminated on December 9 with the adoption, by a vote of 55 (U.S.) to 24, with 15 abstentions, of a resolution cosponsored by the United States and 11 others recommending that the highest priority be given to the item at the 25th Assembly. The plenary vote on December 16 indicated even stronger support, the vote for the Committee's recommendation being 73 (U.S.) to 23, with 20 abstentions. The principal opposition to the proposal came from the Communist and Arab delegations.

In a statement in the Third Committee on December 6 Mrs. Hauser explained the U.S. understanding of the High Commissioner's role:

The High Commissioner's functions would be essentially advisory and basically at the invitation of states and United Nations bodies. His reporting functions are predicated on an obligation to consult. Cooperation, not condemnation, will be his approach. The High Commissioner, as conceived by ECOSOC and as distinct from a number of proposals advanced by various states at other times, would not be an attorney general or ombudsman representing individuals against member states. Rather, his function is to facilitate the cooperative compliance by the member states with their Charter commitment to human rights. Without that cooperation the High Commissioner will not be able to accomplish a great deal; for the source of his contribution must lie not in power but in respect of his office and his important aims.

Human Rights in Armed Conflicts

On the initiative of the International Conference on Human Rights, held in Teheran in 1968, the 23d General Assembly adopted a resolution on the subject of human rights in armed conflicts. The resolution invited the Secretary-General to undertake a study of (1) the application of existing humanitarian international conventions and rules in armed conflicts, and (2) the need for additional instruments or the possible revision of existing conventions to ensure (a) the better protection of civilians, prisoners, and combatants in all armed conflicts, and (b) the prohibition and limitation of the use of certain methods and means of warfare.

The Secretary-General issued a preliminary report in 1969 which the 24th Assembly was unable to consider because of the pressure of other business. The brief discussion of the item centered on a procedural resolution calling for the highest priority attention to the item at the 25th General Assembly. This resolution was adopted by the Third Committee on December 11 by a vote of 75 to 0, with 17 abstentions (U.S.), and by the plenary Assembly on December 16

by a vote of 91 to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.). Although the United States attributed particular importance to this item because of its concern for encouraging full compliance with the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention, it abstained because of an amendment to the resolution calling for special attention in the study to the liberation struggles of peoples under colonial and foreign rule. The United States and other members did not agree that this particular aspect of the question should have special attention as compared with the other equally serious aspects to be covered in the Secretary-General's study.

Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

The Subcommission is made up of experts who serve in their private capacities and not as governmental representatives. In 1968 at its 24th session the Human Rights Commission had proposed and ECOSOC at its 44th session had agreed to increase the membership of the Subcommission from 18 to 26, with the new membership to be chosen according to a precise geographic distribution. The 26 new expert members were elected by the Commission at its 25th session from a list of candidates submitted by member governments. The U.S. member of the Subcommission, Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., was reelected.

The Commission also reviewed the reports of the Subcommission on both its 20th (1967) and 21st (1968) sessions. It endorsed the Subcommission's proposals to embark upon three new studies: (1) protection of minorities; (2) measures to implement conventions and recommendations relating to slavery and the slave trade and institutions and practices similar to slavery, "including the slavery-like

practices of apartheid and colonialism"; and (3) the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Regarding the slavery study the Commission made clear its desire that the study be carried out by Mohammed Awad of the U.A.R. even though he would no longer be on the Subcommittee. Mr. Awad, a recognized expert in the field, completed an earlier study on slavery in 1965.

Acting upon a U.S. proposal the Commission also decided to allot specific periods of time at future sessions to the consideration of several completed Subcommittee studies which have been awaiting the Commission's attention. At its next session the Commission will conclude its consideration of the study of discrimination in the matter of political rights, and at succeeding sessions will give priority to the study of discrimination in respect of the right of everyone to leave and return to any country and the study of discrimination against persons born out of wedlock.

The Subcommittee held its 22d session in New York, August 25–September 12. This was its first meeting with its enlarged membership. As in past years the Subcommittee's work focused on studies undertaken by its individual members on various aspects of human rights. It considered an interim report submitted by Hernán Santa Cruz of Chile, the Special Rapporteur who is conducting a study of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres. The final draft of the study is expected in 1970. The Subcommittee received the final draft of a study on equality in administration of justice, prepared by Mohammed Abu Rannat of Sudan. Accompanying the study were draft principles. The Subcommittee did not complete its consideration of these principles and they were held over for further study at the next session. The Subcommittee also considered a preliminary report submit-

ted by its Special Rapporteur for the study of measures to combat slavery.

Status of Women

The 22d session of the Commission on the Status of Women met in New York January 27–February 12.

ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN

Continuing its consideration of a long-term program that would achieve equal opportunity and treatment for women and would merit the confidence of governments, the Commission adopted four resolutions on this topic.

The first, adopted February 10, requested the Secretary-General to revise his reports on the role of women in economic and social development and on their participation in community development, and to issue the reports in a form appropriate for use by nongovernmental organizations and in U.N. seminars and related activities. The second resolution, adopted the same day, requested governments that have established a women's service as a means of promoting participation of women in national development to submit a report of their experiences to the next Commission session. The third resolution, adopted February 11, recommended that a series of seminars be held on the role of women in community development as a technique for integrating women in the national development process and for advancing their status. The last resolution, also adopted February 11, asked the Secretary-General, in cooperation with appropriate U.N. bodies, to prepare a 5-year program of action for the advancement of women within the framework of the U.N. technical cooperation programs and to submit the program to the next Commission session. This resolution also expressed the hope that during the Second Development

Decade member states would stress the importance of the full participation of women as well as men in various national development plans.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DECLARATION ON ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

In 1967 the 22d General Assembly had unanimously adopted a Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, and in 1968 the 44th ECOSOC requested member states and the specialized agencies and nongovernmental organizations concerned to inform the Secretary-General of the publicity given the Declaration and the action taken by them in compliance with its principles. The Commission had before it the Secretary-General's report containing an analysis of the replies received so far as a result of this resolution. The report indicated that despite general *de jure* acceptance of the principles of the Declaration the *de facto* elimination of discrimination is far from a reality.

The Commission unanimously adopted a resolution that (1) invited governments to continue considering the revision of national legislation in the light of the principles of the Declaration; (2) requested the Secretary-General to devote more of the available resources to publicizing the Declaration and promoting the increased participation of women in the political, economic, and social life of their countries through effective information campaigns utilizing both the written word and audiovisual materials; (3) invited governments who had not yet done so to furnish information on the implementation of the Declaration; and (4) asked the Secretary-General to report again at the Commission's next session.

ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

During the general debate on this item, which focused on two ILO reports, it was pointed out that the

situation varies from country to country. In some countries women are still fighting to obtain equal pay for equal work; in others, where a basic degree of equality in the economic field has been achieved, women sometimes want special benefits on the grounds of family responsibilities. In this connection, the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, emphasized that in the economic field equality should be strictly applied. That meant the elimination of preferential treatment for women, and acceptance of the view that any special benefits extended to women could only be justified on the basis of maternity. It was the consensus of the debate that in general women predominate in the less skilled and lower paid jobs, rarely attaining the most responsible positions in industry, banking, or scientific professions.

On February 6 the Commission adopted a lengthy resolution that called on member states to ratify the four ILO conventions on equal remuneration, discrimination (employment and occupation), maternity protection, and employment policy, and to apply them in law and in practice. It expressed the hope that the ILO would (1) continue to work for the progress of women workers and the protection of their rights, (2) review protection standards for women with a view to placing them on an equal footing with men, and (3) take the needs of adult workers of both sexes into consideration in its research and standard-setting work, disassociating those activities from its work on behalf of certain categories, e.g. children or handicapped workers, requiring special consideration.

STATUS IN PRIVATE LAW

In 1965 the 20th General Assembly had adopted a Recommendation on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage, and Registration of Marriages as a supplement to the convention on the same subject adopted in 1962. The 20th Assembly also re-

quested that governments report to the Secretary-General at the end of 3 years and every 5 years thereafter on their law and practice with regard to the principles of the recommendation.

The Commission had before it in 1969 the first report by the Secretary-General based on this information from governments. The report indicated that a number of governments had taken measures to change legislation not in accordance with the principles of the recommendation. Noting that there were only 18 parties to the 1962 convention, the Commission urged additional governments to adhere and suggested that there should be more publicity for the small number of states that are parties in order to encourage more ratifications.

The Commission unanimously proposed on February 10, and ECOSOC later adopted on June 6, a resolution inviting member states to review their laws and practices in accordance with the principles of the convention and recommendation, and recommending that all member states sign, ratify, or accede to the convention.

ACCESS TO EDUCATION

On February 11 the Commission unanimously approved a resolution recommended for adoption by ECOSOC that, *inter alia*, (1) recognized the essential role of education, science, and culture in the advancement of women and commended UNESCO's long-term program in that field; (2) recommended that member states apply to the UNDP for technical assistance to develop opportunities for women and girls in the fields of literacy, technical and vocational training, scientific studies, teacher training, and educational planning and administration; (3) recommended that the UNDP give priority consideration to such requests; and (4) urged UNESCO to seek means for furthering its program for equal access of girls and women to education, science, and culture, in

cooperation with other concerned agencies and in coordination with the U.N. long-term program for the advancement of women.

ECOSOC approved the proposed resolution on June 5.

INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS

The Committee of 24 has been considering for several years the topic "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 all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid, and racial discrimination in southern Africa." (See Part III, page 174.)

In 1969 the Commission considered a resolution (proposed by the Byelorussian S.S.R., Guinea, and Iran) that was related to this Committee of 24 study. The resolution requested that the Committee of 24 devote part of its report on this topic to the specific question of the "influence of foreign economic and other interests on the living conditions of women in dependent territories" so that the study might be submitted to the next session of the Commission.

The U.S. Representative opposed the resolution because she doubted the relevance of the item to the Commission's agenda and questioned the Commission's competence to discuss it since it had no information concerning the status of women in dependent territories. Moreover, the United States and some other Commission members felt that the item could be more appropriately discussed in other U.N. bodies, particularly in the Committee of 24, since it related not to women as such, but to women as part of the general citizenry. The sponsors of the resolution maintained, however, that it was of great impor-

tance for the fuller participation of women in economic and social development and therefore came within the Commission's scope. On February 3 the resolution was adopted by a vote of 17 to 2 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions.

PROTECTION IN EMERGENCY OR WARTIME

In the general debate on the item, "Protection of women and children in emergency or war time, fighting for peace, national liberation, and independence," a number of representatives expressed the view that the Commission, which until then had been primarily concerned with the status of women under normal peaceful conditions, should also be concerned with the protection of the rights of women in emergency or war time situations. Some gave examples of the situation in the Middle East to illustrate the importance of the protection of women and children. Other representatives asked that the item be considered in general terms rather than in terms of specific events. These representatives felt that the Commission should avoid discussing the political implications and encourage discussions on a general humanitarian basis in order to get the agreement that would promote the protection of women everywhere without discrimination.

Guinea and Malaysia proposed a resolution that in its five operative paragraphs (1) noted previous resolutions of the General Assembly and the 1968 International Conference on Human Rights concerning respect for and implementation of human rights in occupied territories (specifically referring to the occupied Arab territories) and in armed conflicts; (2) expressed the hope that women in increasing numbers would be consulted or sent on missions by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to occupied territories and territories ravaged by war or struck by natural disasters; (3)

appealed to women throughout the world to contribute to the establishment of peace and justice and to finding a just solution to armed conflicts; (4) recommended that the protection of women and children against inhuman practices in time of armed conflict or occupation should receive more attention from the United Nations, the ICRC, and UNICEF, which should also render greater assistance to women and children in territories struck by natural disasters; and (5) requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Commission's next session a report based on official documents of these organizations on the conditions of women and children in the territories mentioned in the first paragraph.

The United States voted against the first operative paragraph and abstained on the resolution as a whole, which was adopted by a vote of 19 to 0, with 11 abstentions. The U.S. Representative explained that the United States had always upheld respect for human rights throughout the world and would continue to do so. It had repeatedly expressed its concern for humanitarian problems in the Middle East and had, for example, encouraged observance of the Geneva Convention. However, the United States was convinced that this resolution would not further the cause of respect for human rights since the political aspects of the problem were inseparable from the humanitarian aspects, and the former were not within the competence of the Commission.

Advisory Services

Under the U.N. program of advisory services in the field of human rights the Secretary-General provides at the request of governments certain forms of assistance, namely, advisory services of experts, fellowships, and seminars. The emphasis of the program is on seminars and there are usually three each year.

In 1969 a worldwide seminar on special problems relating to human rights in developing countries was held in Cyprus June 26–July 9. The U.S. participant was Mrs. Rita E. Hauser, the Representative on the Human Rights Commission. A second seminar, for participants from European countries, on the effects of scientific and technological developments on the status of women, took place in Iasi, Romania, August 5–18. The

United States was officially represented at that seminar by an observer delegation led by Mrs. Elizabeth D. Koontz, U.S. Representative on the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women. The third seminar, for participants from African countries, was held in Cairo September 2–15 to consider the question of the establishment of regional commissions on human rights. The United States was not represented at this seminar.

Programing, Coordination, and Organizational Issues

In 1969 two studies were produced which are likely to have far-reaching consequences for the U.N. system as a whole. The first, which bears most directly on the future of the United Nations, is the "Review of the Capacity of the U.N. Development System" by Sir Robert Jackson, issued in December 1969 (see p. 71). The other is the report of the Pearson Commission, "Partners in Development," issued in October 1969 (see p. 128).

In anticipation of these studies 1969 was a year for stocktaking and completing unfinished business. In the latter category, the Enlarged Committee for Program and Coordination (ECPC) completed its 3-year mandate.

ECPC

The ECPC was set up by the General Assembly in 1966 to undertake a general review of the operational and research activities of the U.N. system in the economic, social, and technical cooperation fields and, on the basis of that review, to make recommenda-

tions for improvements. In 1969 the ECPC submitted to ECOSOC, and through it to the General Assembly, two useful documents. The first, a two-volume account of the operational and research activities of the U.N. system in the field of economic and social development, gives a clear and comprehensive picture of what is being done by the organizations that comprise the U.N. system. The second document, a handbook of criteria and procedures for requesting technical assistance, is designed to assist developing countries by providing information on what assistance is available from the U.N. system, how it can be sought, and what it may involve in terms of local costs and counterpart contributions. It is intended to serve both as a guide for officials in developing countries and a reference book for international civil servants in order to ensure effective coordination and the most effective use of available resources.

Before the expiration of its mandate the ECPC recommended and ECOSOC and the General Assembly approved (1) the establishment of a reconstituted Committee for Pro-

gram and Coordination (CPC), enlarged from 16 to 21 members, to assist ECOSOC in the discharge of its coordination functions; (2) the preparation by the Secretary-General of a report describing the existing and planned computer facilities in the U.N. system, their adequacy, the methods adopted for their rational use, and the problems involved in coordinating their operations; and (3) the examination by the Secretary-General of Secretariat machinery for providing scientific and technical advice in the U.N. system, and the preparation of suggestions to reorganize that machinery so it could contribute most effectively to the selection of priorities and the planning and programming of U.N. activities. The ECPC also made recommendations for continued meetings of the U.N. top echelon in the economic and social fields; on strengthening arrangements for coordination of agencies' work programs; on coordination at the national level; and on a framework for classification of substantive programs and activities. The ECPC identified for special consideration 29 general problem areas which have been referred to the reconstituted CPC.

Review of U.N. Programs

The comprehensive review of the work program of the United Nations itself, which the CPC had undertaken in previous years, was not repeated in 1969 due to time limitations. However, the Committee did consider the work of the Secretariat's Center for Development Planning and accorded it high priority, particularly with regard to planning for the Second Development Decade. The U.N. work in the field of natural resources was criticized because many of the projects being carried out were based on legislative authority that was more than 5 years old. Comments made by the CPC on programs and

activities in the fields of population, statistics, science and technology, trade and development, and the like were all transmitted by ECOSOC to the appropriate operational body for action as required.

Both in the CPC and in ECOSOC the United States stressed the need for greater efforts to establish program priorities within sectors rather than between large "areas of concentration." There was agreement that the program of work and the consequent budget proposals should reflect a rational system of such priorities. Some subsidiary bodies of ECOSOC had already adopted the system of priority rating recommended by the CPC in 1968.

In the future, the CPC will review the U.N. work program over a period of 4 years rather than 3 and will propose to ECOSOC a reorganization of the schedule of meetings of its subsidiary bodies and other organizations, so that the CPC will be able to review their work programs more fully and prepare appropriate recommendations well in advance of ECOSOC sessions.

It is hoped that the reconstituted CPC will thus be able to develop a timetable permitting a more thorough review of priorities and programs.

Strengthening of ECOSOC

ECOSOC took a series of actions designed to improve its own work and to streamline its documentation. On the basis of a report by the Secretary-General, and urged on by the U.S. delegation, ECOSOC approved 18 recommendations to cut down on documentation; delete certain recurrent items from its own agenda, such as the annual report of UNITAR (see p. 83); minimize requests for progress reports and omit such reports from agendas when no action is required; and dispense with the

circulation of the full reports of the specialized agencies.

The Secretary-General also recommended biennial meetings for all functional commissions and annual rather than semiannual meetings for the ACASTD and the Committee for Development Planning. The United States took the lead in supporting biennial meetings for the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Social Development. ECOSOC accepted these proposals by votes of 24 (U.S.) to 2, with 1 abstention, and 25 (U.S.) to 2, with no abstentions, respectively.

As a result of this action all functional commissions and committees are now on a biennial schedule except the Commission on Human Rights and its Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. However, in response to pressures on behalf of the Commission on the Status of Women, the General Assembly on December 15 by a vote of 48 to 30 (U.S.), with 31 abstentions, asked ECOSOC to reconsider its decision for a biennial schedule for that Commission. With respect to the expert groups, the Committee for Development Planning will henceforth meet annually, but the ACASTD will continue to have semiannual sessions.

ECOSOC adopted a substantially revised schedule for its own work to begin in 1970. Under the new schedule it will have an organizational meeting of 2 to 3 days in January to elect its officers (thus avoiding a 5-months' lame duck period) and to plan its work program for the entire year. ECOSOC's first full session will be held at the end of March for 2 weeks to deal with reports from subsidiary bodies which met the previous fall as well as reports prepared by the Secretary-General on subjects that do not come under the jurisdiction of a subsidiary body (such as tax reform, land reform, and tourism). In mid-May there will be a resumed session to deal exclusively with human rights and social items. This

plan was adopted on the insistence of those members who do not want social and human rights matters to be taken up at the summer session, since that would require the establishment of three sessional committees and require larger delegations. The summer session of ECOSOC will be held, as now, during July and early August. Its agenda will be limited to the Second Development Decade and matters of coordination. The resumed part of this session during the following General Assembly will last only 2 days and will deal exclusively with the reports of the Trade and Development Board, the IBRD, and the IMF.

The CPC will hold its first session at the end of January for 2 weeks to consider the program items to be submitted to the March session of ECOSOC. It will hold a second session the end of April in anticipation of the resumed ECOSOC at the end of May. A third session at the end of May will deal exclusively with coordination matters.

One of the purposes of the rescheduling is to avoid the lengthy series of resumed sessions during the General Assembly which have proved unsatisfactory for both the Assembly and the Council. Furthermore, it is hoped that the CPC will be better able to act more as a preparatory committee for ECOSOC and will submit its reports well ahead of ECOSOC meetings.

Coordination Within the U.N. System

Discussion of coordination within the U.N. system reached a critical point when ECOSOC received the annual report of the Administrative Committee on Coordination.¹ All

¹ Composed of the U.N. Secretary-General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies and IAEA. The heads of other U.N. bodies are invited to attend as appropriate.

delegations seemed united in opposition to the proposed restructuring and apparent extension of the scope of the ACC which they considered an attempt to take over the leadership in coordination and policy formulation that rightly belonged to governments and ECOSOC. Most of the October Joint Meeting between the CPC and the ACC was devoted to clarifying the situation and reaffirming the key role of governments through ECOSOC in matters of policy formulation and decisions.

Another topic on which there was extended debate in the 47th ECOSOC was the question of computers and their rational use. The United States pointed out that special attention needed to be given to the development of common computer facilities, including the establishment of a central data bank, and urged that the problem be viewed in the perspective of overall needs of the U.N. system. These needs will sharply increase as the Second Development Decade gets underway. The United States and other members criticized what appeared to be the continuing lack of cooperation and coordination among the agencies. On August 8 ECOSOC approved a U.K.-sponsored resolution which, *inter alia*, (1) reaffirmed that member organizations' plans for computer facilities should be fully discussed in the Computer Users' Committee of the ACC before being submitted to governing bodies; (2) considered that, pending eventual decisions on establishing common computer facilities, individual organizations should refrain from committing themselves to establishing or extending their own computer facilities; and (3) considered that the ACABQ should be given the opportunity to comment on any new plans.

In the same resolution ECOSOC endorsed the work of the Computer Users' Committee of the ACC and urged it, with such expert assistance as may be required, to pursue actively its work in the field of standardiza-

tion, classification, and coding, and to seek general acceptance of such classification and codes as are essential for a more effective interchange of information and programs. It also asked the ACC to develop a framework for the creation of system-wide computer arrangements.

The 24th General Assembly also took action in the field of coordination. On December 11 it unanimously adopted a resolution proposed by its Fifth Committee which noted the need to avoid a duplication of effort and waste of resources in the activities of control and investigative bodies and organs concerned with administrative and coordination questions. The resolution requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the 25th Assembly a report setting forth (1) the bodies established for purposes of administration and budgetary control, investigation, and coordination, with the dates of inception for each; (2) the terms of reference of each such body; (3) the annual expenditures of each body concerned for the years 1965 through 1969, both in absolute terms and as an aggregate percentage of the total budget for the year; and (4) the estimated outlay of manpower for the preparation of data for the testimony before or consultation with each such body. The Secretary-General was also requested to invite, in his capacity as the Chairman of the ACC, the same information from the executive heads of the specialized agencies for inclusion in the report.

Evaluation

The U.N. system of organizations is increasingly interested in evaluating the effectiveness of its activities, in large part as a result of concern on the part of the major contributors that funds be used as efficiently as possible and be channeled to projects of highest priority. The UNDP, one of the more active organizations in

this field, has established an evaluation unit at its headquarters, has provided for the built-in analysis of projects from the earliest planning stages through completion, and has also undertaken country and sectoral evaluations. The specialized agencies are also beginning to attach more importance both to built-in control and assessment of projects executed with UNDP funds or financed from their own budgets. In general, the U.N. organizations have developed procedures for evaluating technical assistance programs, but have not yet devised adequate methods for evaluating research-oriented activities.

ECOSOC is also concerned with program evaluation. At its 47th session it received two studies aimed at developing an evaluation methodology, one prepared by UNITAR and the other by the Secretary-General with comments from the ACC. In addition it considered two reports of the U.N. Joint Inspection Unit (see below) and two reports of evaluation missions that had investigated the overall impact of U.N. assistance programs in Iran and Ecuador. The latter reports were referred to the Secretary-General, the UNDP Administrator, the specialized agencies, and other U.N. institutions concerned for study and appropriate action. Since these evaluation teams and earlier ones to Tunisia, Thailand, and Chile had stimulated both governments and U.N. system officials to undertake evaluations of technical assistance, ECOSOC decided that for the time being it would be unnecessary for it to send further missions.

Joint Inspection Unit

Although the U.N. Joint Inspection Unit came into existence on January 1, 1968, it was only in 1969 that the flow of reports prepared by the inspectors focused attention on their activities.

Created for an initial period of 4

years by the 21st General Assembly upon a recommendation of the Committee of 14,¹ the eight inspectors² have a broad mandate to investigate all matters bearing on the efficiency of the U.N. system of organizations and to propose reforms.

The inspectors have directed their investigations so far to the field activities of the U.N. system, to the headquarters of some organizations, and to the examination of some broad problems affecting most, if not all, organizations. The following list of reports considered by various intergovernmental bodies in 1969 indicates the broad scope of the inspectors' work: "Report on U.N. activities in Turkey"; "Report on coordination and cooperation at the country level"; "Report on documentation"; "Report on WHO assistance to developing countries"; "Report on overhead costs of extra-budgetary programs and on methods of measuring performance and costs"; "Report on a rationalization of the proceedings and documentation of the UNESCO General Conference"; "Selected ideas for improving U.N. field activities"; "Some aspects of technical assistance activities of the United Nations"; and "Programing and budgets in the U.N. family."

ECOSOC considered those reports concerning more than one agency or involving system-wide problems. The governing bodies of specialized agencies considered the reports that dealt with the activities of their respective organizations. The executive directors of the agencies have reviewed a number of their activities and procedures as a direct result of recommendations in the reports.

¹ Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

² Maurice Bertrand (France), Lucio Garcia del Solar (Argentina), Streten Ilic (Yugoslavia), C. S. Jha (India), Robert Macey (U.S.), Joseph Adolf Sawe (Tanzania), Sir Leonard Scopes (U.K.), Aleksei Fedorovich Sokirkin (U.S.S.R.).

When the ACC and CPC held their joint meetings in July 1969, they considered procedures for the handling of the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit and reached a consensus designed to avoid delays, particularly with respect to reports that involved more than one agency. At the 47th ECOSOC the United Kingdom introduced a resolution co-sponsored with Argentina, France, India, Pakistan, Tanzania, U.S.S.R., and the United States that endorsed this consensus and specifically requested that the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit concerning more than one agency or involving system-wide problems be submitted to ECOSOC through the CPC within 3 months of the original submission of the reports to the executive heads. The resolution further requested the Secretary-General to arrange with the ACABQ that, in the case of reports concerning the activities of the United Nations itself, (1) all reports concerning activities within the responsibility of ECOSOC be submitted without delay through the CPC, (2) reports concerning the activities of other U.N. programs (UNCTAD, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, and UNIDO) be submitted similarly without delay, and (3) the comments of the ACABQ be transmitted to ECOSOC and the governing organs of the U.S. programs in time for them to be taken into account before final consideration by them. These provisions reflected ECOSOC's view that timely action must be taken on the inspectors' reports to assure an effective followup.

Nongovernmental Organizations

Between September 1968 and March 1969 ECOSOC's Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) reviewed the consultative status of 168 such organizations for

the purpose of recommending their placement in the new consultative categories established by the revised arrangements for consultation approved at ECOSOC's 44th session in 1968.

At its 46th session in May, ECOSOC considered the recommendations of its NGO Committee and approved new status for 167 of the 168 organizations. One, the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (CBJO), on which the NGO Committee had not reached agreement because of Soviet and Arab objections, was referred back for further study and recommendation. Acting on a U.S. motion, ECOSOC agreed that the CBJO would remain in consultative status pending final action.

A number of other organizations that had been proposed for new status by the NGO Committee came under attack by the Soviets and Arabs during ECOSOC's 46th session. These included four major Jewish organizations (World Jewish Congress, Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, Women's International Zionist Organization, Agudas Israel); three organizations with outstanding records in the promotion of human rights (International Commission of Jurists, International Federation of the Rights of Man, International League for the Rights of Man); and such organizations as CARE, the International Recreation Association (because of its work in South Vietnam), and INTERPOL. None of the attempts to withdraw consultative status from these organizations was successful, although the vote in some cases was close. By its positive action on these organizations ECOSOC reaffirmed the right of nongovernmental organizations to freedom of expression.

Tourism

The growing importance of international travel and tourism, particu-

larly its effect on the economies of the developing countries, has contributed to the interest in expanding and coordinating the tourism activities undertaken by the United Nations and its related organizations.

This interest has also resulted in a move to transform the International Union of Official Travel Organizations (IUOTO) from a nongovernmental organization into an intergovernmental organization. An Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism, called by the President of the IUOTO, was held in Sofia, Bulgaria, May 15-28 and adopted a resolution sponsored by the developing countries that invited the 47th session of ECOSOC (1) to approve and adopt guidelines for the creation of an intergovernmental tourism organization, and (2) to recommend that the General Assembly establish such an organization.

In August the 47th ECOSOC requested the U.N. Secretary-General to prepare a report on the constitutional, organizational, and financial implications of the establishment of a new intergovernmental tourism organization and on any other effective

measures for the development of tourism. ECOSOC considered this report at its resumed 47th session and on November 18, by a vote of 19 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions, recommended that the General Assembly adopt a resolution favoring the transformation of the IUOTO into an international organization of intergovernmental character by means of revising its statutes. The proposed resolution also called for the transformed IUOTO to function as an executing agency of the UNDP and for the conclusion of an agreement between the IUOTO and the United Nations to ensure effective cooperation. This compromise solution was influenced in part by the Secretary-General's report and in part by the action of the 21st General Assembly of the IUOTO which met in Dublin, Ireland, October 28-November 5, and adopted a resolution opening the way for the IUOTO to revise its statutes.

The 24th U.N. General Assembly adopted the ECOSOC-proposed resolution on December 5 by a vote of 96 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions.

Specialized Agencies and the IAEA

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

The IBRD was established by the United States and over 40 other nations in 1944. Since that time it has grown to a membership of 112¹ nations with authorized capital of \$24 billion, making it the largest multi-

¹ Swaziland and Southern Yemen joined in 1969.

lateral source of financial assistance in the world. The United States has subscribed \$6,350 million or 27.6% of the total subscribed capital of \$23 billion.

The IBRD's primary functions are to provide loans where private capital is not available on reasonable terms to finance development projects and programs designed to raise the level of productivity, and to stimulate economic growth in its member countries. It also furnishes a wide variety of technical assistance. Apart from subscriptions, the IBRD obtains

its lending resources principally from borrowings in private capital markets. Its outstanding funded debt as of June 30, 1969, was \$4,081.2 million. The IBRD also receives substantial funds from the sales of parts of its loans, repayments of principal, and interest.

The IBRD had made 636 loans for a total of \$13 billion by June 30. It made 84 loans during the year for a total of \$1,399 million, compared with 44 loans totaling \$847 million in fiscal year 1968. At the same time, more IBRD bonds were successfully placed on world markets than in any previous year, enabling the Bank to undertake an expanded lending program and to add substantially to its liquidity position. Nearly three-fourths of the IBRD loans have been made to developing countries, primarily for projects in the fields of electric power, transportation, industry, and agriculture. During the year, there was a rapid growth of IBRD/IDA loans for education projects.

In addition to its direct development assistance efforts, the IBRD promotes coordination between developed and developing countries. It has established close working relationships with other organizations in the U.N. system by cooperating with the FAO and UNESCO to promote agricultural and educational development through IBRD lending. It also acts as executing agency for certain preinvestment projects financed by the UNDP.

Pursuant to IBRD President McNamara's statement at the 1968 meeting of the Board of Governors on the impact of the rapid growth of population on economic development, a Population Projects Department and a Population Studies Division were set up during the year. The IBRD's first population mission visited Jamaica to assist the government in its family planning program. Investment in tourism has also been recognized as a potentially important area of IBRD activity and 14 tourism

missions visited 16 countries during fiscal 1969.

The demand for technical assistance has been great during recent years and during the year provision was made in IBRD or IDA project loans for technical assistance activities having a total value of \$39.5 million. These activities include feasibility studies for future projects, consultants or outside experts to help in setting up projects, and provision of training and overseas fellowships to enable countries to become self-supporting in management and other essential project skills.

The IBRD continued its leadership role in aid coordination during the year and chaired or participated in meetings held for nine coordinating groups: Ceylon, Colombia, East Africa, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Korea, and Pakistan. During the course of the year the Executive Directors approved a report on ways in which the World Bank Group might assist in finding feasible solutions to the problem of the stabilization of prices of primary products (see p. 78) and adopted a number of decisions aimed at improving the role of the World Bank Group in assisting member countries to diversify their production in primary products, to strengthen the competitiveness of primary products in world trade, and to assist international commodity arrangements.

PEARSON COMMISSION REPORT

In February 1969 a Commission on International Development was established, independent of but financed by the IBRD. On October 1 the Commission issued its report, *Partners in Development*, which reviewed the recent history of economic development and development aid and offered recommendations which could guide the aid effort over the next two decades. The Commission was headed by former Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson and

included former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon.

The report addressed its recommendations to the developing countries, the industrialized countries, and international organizations and set forth a strategy based on the need for much more effective international cooperation for development.

The report found that considerable economic progress had been achieved:

The record of development is mixed, but it is far better than generally realized. The average rate of increase in the GNP of the developing countries has reached 5 per cent per annum in the 1960's. The high rate of population growth has held down the rate of increase in income per head to about 2.5 per cent per year, but even this represents, by any historical standard of comparison, a remarkable acceleration.

The Commission's report stated, however, that while the scale and style of the development assistance effort has served well in the past, neither can match up adequately to the demands of the future. New policies, the Commission found, must be based on a more fully integrated working partnership in development between those who assist and those who are assisted and on a clear recognition of the real interrelationship of aid, trade, and investment. The Commission also found that these factors rightly shifted the emphasis toward a much greater degree of multilateralism.

International Finance Corporation

The IFC was established in 1956 as an affiliate of the IBRD to assist the industrial development of its less advanced member countries. The IFC furthers investment in productive private enterprises through subscriptions to capital stock, combinations of stock subscriptions and loans, and loans with equity or other special features. Investments by the IFC are undertaken without government

guarantee and in association with private capital when sufficient private capital is not available on reasonable terms. In addition, the IFC acts for the World Bank group in the technical and financial appraisal, preparation, and supervision of industrial and mining projects.

The IFC has 92 members¹ and an authorized capital of \$110 million, of which \$106.6 million has been subscribed and paid in. The United States has subscribed 34.7% of the total capital stock. In addition to capital subscriptions, the IFC also obtains funds from repayments of investments, sales of equity and loan investments, and net income.

During 1969 the IFC made 24 development investments in 16 countries. These commitments helped mobilize approximately \$368 million for private business enterprises to assist the economic growth of developing member countries. IFC commitments to the projects amounted to \$88.2 million. This compares with commitments of approximately \$47.9 million in 17 projects during 1968. IFC commitments in 1969 were in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, India, Iran, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. The commitment for economic development in Yugoslavia—a \$2 million investment in the \$12 million International Investment Corporation for Yugoslavia—was IFC's first commitment in that country, widening IFC's sphere of operations to 40 countries.

IFC continued to revolve its funds for re-use by the sale of portions of its commitments to other investors. Total sales and participations in 1969 came to almost \$35 million, revolving back to IFC an amount equal to approximately 40% of commitments. During the year the IBRD agreed to lend an additional \$100 million to IFC, bringing to \$200 million the

¹ Republic of China and Swaziland joined during 1969.

amount of funds the Bank has made available to IFC for use in its operations.

International Development Association

The IDA was established in 1960 as an affiliate of the IBRD to provide development credits on concessional terms. The IDA has the same management and staff as the IBRD, operates on similar principles, and provides financing for the same general range of projects. The favorable terms on which the IDA lends permit the extension of credits to certain countries that could not prudently assume the burden of payment for an IBRD loan. Others are able to receive a blend of IDA and IBRD types of financing.

The IDA has a membership of 104 countries¹ which have provided subscriptions and supplementary resources totaling the equivalent of \$2,066.3 million. Eighteen members, comprising the more economically advanced (Part I) countries, make their entire contributions in gold or convertible currencies, all of which may be used for lending. The less economically advanced (Part II) members pay only one-tenth of their contributions in gold or convertible currencies usable for lending. The United States has contributed \$632.3 million to IDA resources, or about 42% of total Part I contributions, as of June 30, 1969.

By the end of fiscal 1969, the IDA had made 165 credits, totaling \$2,170.3 million, to 50 developing countries. Commitments totaled \$385 million, and disbursements were \$255.8 million. Project credits have been principally for the fields of transportation, agriculture, telecommunications, and education.

In July the second general re-

¹ Guinea and Swaziland joined in 1969.

plenishment of IDA resources came into force when the United States deposited its formal notification of acceptance. The second replenishment provides for expanding IDA resources by \$1,200 million equivalent payable in three annual installments of \$400 million each. The annual U.S. share will be \$160 million or 40%.

Annual transfers from net income have been made by the IBRD to IDA every year since 1964, the 5-year total as of June 30 coming to \$285 million. These transfers have been of amounts which would otherwise have been available for disbursements as dividends to the Bank's member countries. At the 1969 annual meeting in Washington, the Board of Governors approved a further transfer to IDA in the amount of \$100 million.

International Monetary Fund

The basic objectives of the International Monetary Fund are to promote exchange and monetary stability and to provide, under adequate safeguards, medium-term financial assistance to member countries in temporary balance-of-payments difficulties. As of December 31, 1969, the IMF had 115 members¹ with quotas totaling \$21,347 million, of which the U.S. quota was \$5,160 million.

At the end of the year the IMF Executive Directors submitted proposals in a report to the Board of Governors providing for increases in members' quotas, following the 5th general review of IMF quotas. Total quotas would amount to approximately \$28,900 million if all members were to increase their quotas to the maximum proposed. A member may consent to a smaller increase in his quota than the amount contained in the pro-

¹ Cambodia, Southern Yemen, Swaziland, and Equatorial Guinea joined during 1969.

posals. The increase in a member's quota will take effect, after October 30, 1970, when the member has consented to and paid the increase in its subscription. The proposed maximum quota for the United States is \$6,700 million. The report of the Executive Directors stated that the period of the general review of quotas required by the IMF Articles of Agreement facilitates an adjustment of the size of the Fund to the growth of the world economy. The review also offers an opportunity to adjust individual quotas so as to reflect changes in the position of members in the world economy and help maintain a balanced distribution of quotas within the membership.

IMF resources are supplemented by the General Arrangements to Borrow, which became effective in 1962 and were renewed in 1966 and again in 1969 for a 5-year period beginning in October 1970. Under these Arrangements, the main industrial countries undertook to lend the IMF specified amounts of their currencies up to the equivalent of \$6 billion in the event that the stability of the international monetary system is endangered. The U.S. commitment under the Arrangements is \$2 billion.

The United States first made use of the IMF facilities in 1964, and since that time has made total drawings of \$1,840 million. Of this amount \$1,090 million were considered technical drawings since the foreign currencies received were sold by the United States to other IMF members for their use in making repayments to the Fund. All U.S. drawings had been fully repaid by the end of 1968, largely as a result of drawings of U.S. dollars by other countries.

On July 28, 1969, the Amendment to the IMF Articles of Agreement for the establishment of a facility based on special drawing rights (SDR) entered into force, following its acceptance by the required 60% of the Fund's members having 80% of the total voting power. In accordance

with a resolution adopted by the Board of Governors at its 1969 annual meeting, the IMF made an initial SDR allocation equivalent to \$3,414 million, effective January 1, 1970, to 104 participants in the Fund's special drawing account. The allocation was made for the first year and will be followed by annual allocations of approximately \$3 billion each, on January 1, 1971, and January 1, 1972. Allocations are made at a rate expressed as a percentage of the quotas of participants on the day before the allocation in question. The SDR allocation received by the United States for the first year was \$866,880,000.

Food and Agriculture Organization

Czechoslovakia and Southern Yemen were elected to membership by the 15th FAO Conference in 1969, bringing FAO's membership to 119 full and 2 associate members.

A careful study of FAO's structure aimed at better fitting it to carry out the tasks ahead, especially the expanding field program of technical assistance, was brought to completion in November 1969 when the Conference approved a program of work and budget for 1970-71 that was based on the agreed reorganization. As the result of decisions by an earlier Conference many of the proposed organizational changes were already being implemented by the Director General.

FAO's field program continued to grow. Expenditures on UNDP-financed projects amounted to about \$68 million, and FAO also carried out a number of projects financed from other sources, including over 100 under its Freedom-from-Hunger Campaign. Approximately 2,200 technical experts—over two-thirds of FAO's professional staff—served in 104 countries and dependent terri-

ories during the year to assist in implementing these projects.

THE WORLD SITUATION

There has been much talk of a "green revolution" and new grain varieties—particularly of wheat and rice—gave evidence of considerable potential when used in proper combination with fertilizer, pesticides, improved irrigation, and drying equipment. Nevertheless, world agricultural, fishery, and forestry production kept ahead of world population growth by only about 2% in 1969. For the fourth year in a row the value of the world's agricultural exports remained virtually unchanged. As a result, there was little improvement in the overall situation in which about half the world's people are under-nourished or ill-nourished. It was in this setting that FAO continued its efforts to improve agricultural, fishery, and forestry production and distribution and to raise the standards of nutrition and rural living.

FAO completed the Indicative World Plan, begun in 1965, which is based on projections of need, trade, and possible levels of development up to 1985. Although the Plan makes no attempt to answer all the questions in a complex international situation, it does provide assistance to governments in the formulation and implementation of their agricultural policies.

AGRICULTURE

FAO's Agriculture Department began reorienting its major activities to give greater impact to (1) work on high-yield varieties, (2) closing the protein gap, (3) war on waste, (4) development of human resources, and (5) increasing foreign exchange earnings and savings. Although the member governments had requested that FAO concentrate both its regular and field programs on these five areas,

work will also continue in many other agriculture areas.

As an example of how the United States and FAO continue to seek closer, mutually beneficial relationships, a joint project was started in India on dairy animal crossbreeding. This involved the FAO, the Government of India, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The latter's contribution was through its Public Law 480 research grant program.

During 1969, by coordinating survey and control operations, the FAO assisted governments and regional organizations in successfully controlling a desert locust plague situation in the Arabian Peninsula and several African countries. Later, the 15th Conference approved the provision of funds for emergency use whenever outbreaks of desert locusts occur. To do this the Conference extended and augmented an earlier allocation of working capital funds for the control of livestock diseases and changed its name to "Emergency Fund for the Control of Livestock Diseases and to Carry Out Initial Control Activities Against the Desert Locust in Emergencies." The Conference took this action on the premise that FAO would receive requests for financial assistance to initiate control measures on an emergency basis only.

FORESTRY

In 1969 the Division of Forestry and Forest Industries was elevated to the status of a full Department with two Divisions: Forest Resources, and Forest Industries and Trade. The Department provided members with technical information and guidance on forest production and processing, forest economics, marketing, and statistics.

Forestry problems also received the attention of various other regional and worldwide bodies. The United States was host in August to FAO's Second Consultation on Forest Tree Breeding. The meeting was held in

Washington, D.C., and tours before and after the meeting attracted more than 200 participants. There was also a special study course on forest genetics at North Carolina State University, held in conjunction with the meeting.

The United States also took part in the eighth session of the Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission held in Korea, the fifth session of the North American Forestry Commission held in Canada, the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forestry, and the second session of the Committee on Forest Development in the Tropics, the latter two both held in Rome. All these meetings were concerned with the program of work to be carried out by the Forestry Department as well as with the promotion of better forestry through the activities of various technical working groups.

The United States supported FAO field activities by providing six staff members from the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service to work on projects such as forest insect control and silviculture in Colombia, training in watershed management in Costa Rica, range management in Zambia, forest range and watershed management in the Philippines, and silviculture in Paraguay. Other U.S. experts continued in earlier assignments and four U.S. foresters served at FAO's headquarters. Several other U.S. forest technicians conducted special studies in cooperation with the Forestry Department.

FISHERIES

The Department of Fisheries emphasized the development of fisheries resources in developing countries, including the methods of catching, handling, processing, and utilizing under-exploited fishery stocks. The Department stressed education and training which are underlying prerequisites to development. A Fisheries Industry Division was established at the end of the year.

Leading fisheries officials from all regions attended the fourth session of the 34-member Committee on Fisheries which was held in Rome in April. The Committee considered several areas of fishery stocks which need international cooperation for their conservation or development, and it decided that the inland waters of Africa were of particular importance. The Committee reviewed the establishment of sea-area commissions in the Indian Ocean and in the eastern central Atlantic, and it noted with satisfaction that international cooperation on the problems of marine pollution had resulted in the formation of the IMCO/FAO/UNESCO/WMO Joint Group of Experts on Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution.

Other fisheries meetings that the United States attended during 1969 were the second session of the Subcommittee on Development of Cooperation with International Organizations Concerned with Fisheries, in Rome; the first session of the FAO Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic, in Accra, Ghana; the first session of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, in Rome; and a Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Living Resources of the Southeast Atlantic, in Rome. The latter conference drafted a convention to establish an international commission for the ocean area of the southeast Atlantic.

Two technical fisheries conferences were well attended by both developing and developed countries. One was the Technical Conference on Fish Inspection and Quality Control, held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and the other was the Technical Conference on Investment in Fisheries, held in Rome. Both provided useful forums for technical discussions of (1) improvements in processing techniques to control the quality of fish products, and (2) preliminary steps to encourage foreign investments.

The work of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs covered a wide range of activities. For example, much of the work on the Indicative World Plan, including the provision of statistics, the conduct of commodity studies, and the carrying out of economic analyses, was performed by this Department. It also continued its studies of human nutrition and rural institutions (e.g., agricultural education, extension, co-operatives, credit, and land tenure).

Two developments are noteworthy. First, an evaluation service was set up in the Economic Analysis Division to analyze field project proposals and to evaluate the results of the FAO program as a whole. In 1969 the Division appraised some 160 UNDP projects and almost 100 requests for World Food Program aid. In addition, 9 evaluation field missions were completed during the year.

Second, the family living section, established in the Nutrition Division in 1968, greatly expanded its program of work, which is designed to aid countries on problems of family living, population control, and the effective use of family resources, and educational and social services. In this connection it gave special attention to promoting, through existing home economics and related services, educational programs for families. Such programs helped strengthen the economic basis of family life by such means as increased food production and the more efficient use of existing resources.

In general, the Nutrition Division reoriented its program to place less emphasis on small applied nutrition projects and to place more emphasis on the application of food and nutrition policies in government planning programs and on the training and education of the personnel required to carry out the programs. The Nutrition Division also took the lead in work aimed at closing the protein gap, one of the five areas being given

special emphasis by FAO. It made significant progress in identifying protein malnutrition as a factor affecting social and economic development as well as biological development. The organization recognized, however, that the secondary socio-economic effects of protein deficiency may be more difficult to correct than the primary biological effects.

DEVELOPMENT

A newly established Development Department was assigned a central role in the formulation of all FAO programs and projects. It was thus in a position to ensure that the regular and extra-budgetary programs were both complementary to each other and in support of FAO's overall objectives. At the 15th Conference the work of the Department was reviewed by a special Technical Committee on Field Programs which studied both FAO's field activities and the headquarters role in planning, implementing, and evaluation. The Technical Committee and the Conference concluded that the Development Department was proceeding along the correct lines and would in time be a major element in increasing FAO's effectiveness in the field.

UN/FAO WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

The World Food Program (WFP), a joint undertaking of the United Nations and the FAO, was established on an experimental basis in 1962 and placed on a continuing basis in 1965. Through the use of voluntary contributions of food commodities, services such as shipping, and cash, the multilateral program continued to promote economic and social development and provide emergency assistance on a worldwide basis.

At the 16th session of the UN/FAO Intergovernmental Committee in October the WFP Executive Director reported that since its beginning the WFP had received total pledges of \$559 million in commodi-

ties, services, and cash, including approximately \$33 million made available through the Food Aid Convention of the International Grains Arrangement. WFP had approved a total of 357 development projects and 89 emergency operations. On a regional basis, these projects were as follows: Latin America—50 development projects, 14 emergency operations; North Africa and Near East—93 development projects, 17 emergency operations; Western Africa—66 development projects, 20 emergency operations; Mediterranean Europe and Eastern Africa—57 development projects, 19 emergency operations; and Asia and the Far East—91 development projects, 19 emergency operations.

As the number of WFP projects continued to grow, WFP also increased its rate of disbursement to these operations. Total disbursements to projects amounted to \$24 million in 1967, \$46 million in 1968, and about \$75 million in 1969.

During the 1966-68 pledging period 81 countries pledged a total of \$188 million (\$128 million in commodities, \$25 million in shipping services, and \$35 million in cash) toward the 3-year target of \$275 million.

In January 1968, the United States made a further pledge to the WFP target of \$200 million for the 2-year period 1969-70. The U.S. pledge included: (1) commodities up to a maximum of \$70 million, subject to the condition that the U.S. contribution in commodities does not exceed 50% of the contributions in commodities and cash used for the purchase of commodities, (2) shipping services, currently estimated at \$27 million to transport the U.S. commodities, and (3) up to \$3 million cash toward administrative costs. For this same period other nations also pledged support. Added to the \$100 million U.S. pledge, the pledges of these 73 nations (\$112.4 million), plus a European Economic Community contribution of \$42.6 million and a Food Aid Con-

vention contribution of \$33 million resulted in a total of \$288 million in commodities, services, and cash which will be available to WFP during the 1969-70 period.

During 1969, the U.N. General Assembly and the FAO Conference reviewed the accomplishments of the WFP and approved an increased target of \$300 million for 1971-72. A pledging session for the new period was scheduled for January 1970.

International Labor Organization

50TH ANNIVERSARY

The 50th Anniversary of the founding of the International Labor Organization in 1919 was celebrated throughout the year. Highlights of these celebrations were special commemorative sittings of the 53d session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva in June at which Pope Paul VI, Emperor Haile Selassie, and the President of the Republic of Zambia spoke; a special commemorative sitting of the U.N. General Assembly at which U.S. Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz spoke; and the award of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1969 to the ILO in Oslo on December 10, 1969.

Secretary Shultz also spoke to the International Labor Conference, conveying a message from President Nixon which read in part:

On behalf of all my fellow Americans, I am happy to applaud the International Labor Organization on its half-century of dedicated service to humanity.

Since the founding conference in Washington in 1919, the basic guiding principle of ILO's membership has been to advance the dignity of man. And history attests that there is no finer way of achieving this goal than through meaningful and rewarding labor.

Heartened by the past and encouraged by the promise it offers, we rededicate ourselves to ILO as an instrument toward the realization of lasting

human peace through the attainment of economic and social justice for peoples everywhere.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

The International Labor Conference, which meets each year, is the standards-setting body of the ILO. Member states are represented by tripartite delegations: one worker, one employer, and two government delegates, each with a separate vote. The 53d session, June 4-26, was attended by delegations from 116 of the 121 ILO member states. Cambodia, Mauritius, and Southern Yemen joined during 1969.

The Conference adopted four new international instruments: a convention and a recommendation on labor inspection in agriculture, and a convention and a recommendation on sickness insurance. The two instruments on labor inspection in agriculture are concerned with the improvement of the conditions of agricultural workers by providing for regular inspection of their work places by adequately trained, independent labor inspectors. The new convention on sickness insurance revised two conventions adopted in 1927. One of the new concepts incorporated in the convention is a specific requirement that preventive as well as curative medical care should be included in sickness protection schemes. The convention also sets out standards to be attained by developing countries for the gradual extension and improvement of their social security schemes.

The Conference reached tentative conclusions on standards relating to holidays with pay, minimum wage-fixing machinery, and special youth employment and training schemes. Final action on these instruments will be taken in 1970. With respect to the proposed standard on special youth employment and training schemes, the U.S. Government took vigorous exception to the proposal that the standard endorse compulsory participation in employment schemes on the

grounds that: (1) this would contravene the prohibition against the use of forced labor for economic development purposes already contained in previous ILO conventions on forced labor, and (2) it was unnecessary as experience had demonstrated that volunteers for participation in such programs in almost all developing countries far exceeded the number of recruits such programs could utilize.

The Conference also considered the reports of the Governing Body's Working Party on the Program and Structure of the ILO, which for the past 6 years had been considering proposals to revise ILO's programs and organization. The Conference endorsed the Working Party's reports concerning the organization's programs, most of its conclusions already having been put into effect. The basic thrust of these changes was to group the activities into three principal program areas (human resources development, social institutions development, and conditions of work) and, through a system of long-range planning and evaluation to utilize those methods available to the ILO (i.e. standards-setting, technical assistance, research, tripartite meetings on regional and industry basis, and meetings of experts) that would most effectively serve particular program objectives at the particular time in question.

The Conference, however, took no action on the Working Party's conclusions that no radical changes should be made in the ILO structure. These questions of structure involve political issues, including proposals by Eastern European members to revise the structure in a way that would increase their influence and reduce the influence of employer and worker participants from the non-Communist world.

The Eastern European objectives included the institution of election procedures (e.g. proportional representation) that would assure the elec-

tion of Eastern European representatives as employer and worker members of the Governing Body; transferral from the Governing Body to the Conference of the authority to elect the Director General and to supervise the work of the International Labor Office (secretariat); further reduction or elimination of the autonomous authority of the two non-government groups to determine the representation of their respective employer and worker interests on committees of the ILO Conference; and establishment of rigid regional formulae which would guarantee larger Eastern European representation and share of Conference and Governing Body honors than they have been able to achieve by election.

Although some minor concessions on some of these points were included in the Working Party's conclusions on structure, they in no sense satisfied the objectives noted above. The Conference kept these issues alive by referring the whole question of structure back to the Governing Body for further consideration. It requested the Governing Body to report to the Conference in 1970 on its recommendations concerning certain issues, the following two of which are central:

(1) the composition of the Governing Body, including the relationship between elective and nonelective seats, and the relationship between the employers' group and socialized management not represented as such therein; and (2) whether the Conference should play some part in confirming the appointment of the Director General.

The Conference also dealt with the ILO budget, adopting for the first time a budget for a 2-year period rather than an annual budget. An annual net level of \$29,835,500 or \$59,671,000 for the 2 years 1970-71 was adopted. This was an increase of about \$3.2 million or 12.1% over the \$26,613,000 net budget for 1969. At the assessment rate of 25%, the U.S.

contribution comes to \$7,458,875 for each of the 2 years, compared with its contribution of \$6,653,184 for 1969.

GOVERNING BODY

The Governing Body consists of 24 government members—14 elected and 10 chosen automatically as states of chief industrial importance;¹ 12 employer members; and 12 worker members. Twelve deputy seats for each of the three groups are also elected.

The government, worker, and employer groups of the Conference form separate electoral colleges for the purpose of choosing the members of their respective groups on the Governing Body; the 10 states of chief industrial importance whose government seats are not elective are excluded from participation in the Government Electoral College.

The Governing Body serves for 3 years and was newly elected at the 53d Conference. The geographic distribution of government seats in the Governing Body that will serve from June 1969 to June 1972 is the same as in the previous Governing Body—7 European (4 from Western Europe, 3 from Eastern Europe), 6 Asian, 5 African, 4 Latin American, and 2 North American. The U.S. Government retained its seat as one of the 10 states of chief industrial importance; Rudolph Faupl and Edwin P. Neilan were reelected by their respective groups as worker and employer members. At its first sitting, June 26, the Governing Body elected Ambassador Hector Gros Espiell, the Representative of the Government of Uruguay on the Governing Body, to a 1-year term as Chairman of the Governing Body.

The Governing Body reviews the Director General's budget proposals and transmits the budget as revised by it to the Conference; supervises

¹ Canada, China, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy, Japan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

the International Labor Office; determines the agenda of the Conference; appoints, convenes, and reviews the work of various tripartite industrial committees, committees of experts, and other bodies; reviews complaints of alleged violations of freedom of association; and, generally, acts as the Board of Directors of the organization.

U.S. REPRESENTATION

George L-P Weaver, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Labor, served as Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the International Labor Conference; George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to the Secretary and Coordinator of International Labor Affairs, Department of State, was the other U.S. Government delegate. Rudolph Faupl, International Representative of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, was the Worker delegate; and Edwin P. Neilan, Chairman of the Board, Bank of Delaware, was the Employer delegate. Besides Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz, President George Meany of the AFL-CIO spoke to the Conference. Congressmen John M. Ashbrook, William H. Ayres, James G. O'Hara, and Frank Thompson, Jr., served as congressional advisers to the delegation.

Deputy Under Secretary of Labor George H. Hildebrand replaced Mr. Weaver as the U.S. Government Representative on the Governing Body later in June.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The cost of ILO technical assistance activities financed from all sources—UNDP, regular ILO budget, funds-in-trust—came to about \$24,500,000 in 1969, of which about \$21 million was funded by the UNDP. The geographic distribution of expenditures was: Africa 42%, Latin America 17%, Asia 21%, Europe 12% Middle East 6%, and interregional projects 2%. More

than 60% of the technical assistance was in the general field of human resources development, including manpower organization, vocational training, productivity, and management development. Work also continued in the fields of social security, occupational safety and health, vocational rehabilitation, labor conditions and administration, industrial relations, and workers' education.

As part of its 50th anniversary celebration, the ILO decided to give major emphasis in its technical assistance activities to the need for integrated manpower and economic development planning, training, and proper working conditions, which it considered the essential ingredients to the promotion of higher levels of economically and socially sound employment. This decision has been given the name of "World Employment Program," and it will provide the major thrust of the ILO's contribution to the Second Development Decade.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

During the year, the total number of UNESCO member states remained at 125, with 3 associate members. At its 83d session in September the Executive Board elected Miss Louise Gore, a Maryland State Senator, as the U.S. Member, replacing Mrs. Katie S. Louchheim who had resigned.

EDUCATION

International Education Year

In the field of education, a good part of UNESCO's activities during 1969 centered on preparations for 1970 as the International Education Year (IEY). UNESCO has the responsibility for coordinating a mul-

tidimensional approach to the educational problems of the world. Plans were made for commemorative events and activities within the U.N. family of organizations, and UNESCO provided guidance to member states and nongovernmental organizations in preparing for a critical reevaluation of national education goals and roles.

The major new aspect of the IEY was the unanimous adoption by the General Assembly on December 13 of a resolution inviting the Secretary-General, in cooperation with UNESCO and in consultation with other appropriate agencies, to study the feasibility of an international university. The Assembly expressed the hope that the feasibility study would be finished in time for consideration at the 25th Assembly in 1970. The idea for such a university is of long standing but was not seriously considered in the past. The United States did not cosponsor the resolution since sponsorship might imply financial support and the United States was not prepared to provide funds.

Other Activities

In the execution of its regular education program, UNESCO continued to convene an extensive series of expert meetings, training courses, symposia, and the like on all facets of the educational process.

In cooperation with the International Association of Universities (IAU), UNESCO convened a conference in Singapore to consider developing a Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development. The adoption of the proposal by the Southeast Asian states in attendance—Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Republic of Viet-Nam, Thailand—was the result of 8 years of preparatory work by UNESCO in cooperation with IAU, the Ford Foundation, a number of international and intergovernmental organizations, and the countries con-

cerned. The Institute will make a major contribution to the development of the region by associating the universities and governments of Southeast Asia in common action to adapt their national educational systems to the economic needs of the region and to further the practical application of science.

UNESCO released during the year a detailed survey of the illiteracy programs conducted in 92 countries during 1967–69. The survey covered the efforts of international agencies, national governments, and nongovernmental organizations to combat illiteracy by innovative educational techniques and tactics and by a greater utilization of evaluation and research. The survey noted, however, that the literacy programs now in being cannot keep pace with the growing population, and the number of illiterates has been increasing steadily. UNESCO estimated that by 1970 there would be 810 million illiterates compared to 740 million in 1960.

UNESCO's World Experimental Literacy Program continued to expand. Through 1969, 52 states had asked to participate in the program and exploratory missions had been sent to 38 of them. Thirteen had received substantial UNESCO-administered UNDP financial support for their work-oriented literacy projects.

Since 1964 UNESCO has cooperated with the IBRD and IDA to help strengthen the economic and social infrastructures of developing countries. One form of this cooperation is through identifying, preparing, and appraising suitable projects needed urgently for educational development. Examples of such UNESCO/IBRD/IDA aid include (1) in Malawi, the expansion of 12 existing secondary schools and the equipping of a new primary school teachers training college; and (2) in Ethiopia, the building and equipping of 54 secondary schools, 3 teacher training schools, and a technical institute; the

expansion of 24 secondary schools and technical institutes; the building and furnishing of 70 hostels for 2,500 students; and provision of teacher housing at 31 schools.

For the past 20 years UNESCO has cooperated with UNRWA to help Arab refugee children acquire an education under extraordinary hardships. As of 1969, some 205,000 children were enrolled in 466 primary and lower secondary schools operated jointly by the two agencies. In addition, a UNESCO team of 19 people from 9 nations organized and supervised the examination given to 7,176 candidates in the Gaza Strip for matriculation into Arab universities. The UNESCO team also delivered 5,109 school-leaving diplomas to Palestinian students living in the Israeli-controlled Gaza Strip.

In 1969 UNESCO started a new periodical, *Prospects in Education*, to provide readers with information on basic problems in educational planning and policy from worldwide sources and to provide insights into the primary educational experiments occurring in other lands. Other noteworthy educational publications during the year were two handbooks. The first, *Qualitative Aspects in Educational Planning*, was prepared in cooperation with the International Institute for Educational Planning and designed to clarify the conceptual ideas and terminology in educational planning. The second, *Out-of-School Science Activities for Young People*, was prepared at UNESCO's request by a Belgian nongovernmental organization,¹ and gives a broad, general picture of the scope and variety of similar scientific activities for young people throughout the world, including science clubs, exhibitions, and seminars.

¹ International Coordinating Committee for the Presentation of Science and the Development of Out-of-School Scientific Activities.

NATURAL SCIENCES

The International Conference on the Practical and Scientific Results of the International Hydrological Decade (IHD) and on International Cooperation in Hydrology was held in Paris December 8-16. This UNESCO-sponsored conference, which came at the midpoint of the IHD, was attended by representatives from 71 member states, and observers from 1 associate member state, 3 nonmember states, 7 intergovernmental agencies, and 18 nongovernmental organizations. The IHD, initiated by UNESCO in 1964 on U.S. initiative, is a concerted international effort to fulfill one of the dominant needs of the world—a better knowledge of the occurrence and distribution of water for the use of man.

The underlying themes of the conference were (1) the need to decrease the gap between have- and have-not nations by emphasizing practical rather than scientific aspects of the IHD program; and (2) the need to continue the program after 1974. The conference adopted resolutions affirming both needs, favoring the continuation of the various national hydrological committees beyond the Decade, and calling for a plenary conference in 1974 to discuss details of a long-term program to be launched in 1975.

The conference also adopted a resolution requesting the UNESCO Director General to plan, in cooperation with the intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations concerned, suitable machinery or procedures to implement a continuing coordinated, cooperative, international program in hydrology.

UNESCO published the final report on its biology teaching project in Cape Coast, Ghana. The project provided for an international working group which met for a year to produce student textbooks and a teacher's guide for a 2-year course in the fundamentals of biology, a series

of educational films, and an instructor's microbiology handbook. The project also provided for the organization of national study groups to serve as permanent centers for biology curriculum development and for ongoing revision of the teaching materials. The project emphasized the "inquiry" method of teaching, student observations and experiments, and the use of native flora and fauna to make the curriculum relevant to the African student.

During the year UNESCO issued the second volume of its *New Trends in Chemistry Teaching*. This book, designed as a teaching aid for professors in universities, teacher training colleges, and high schools, presents new approaches in the teaching of basic sciences and includes the description of curricula, syllabi, methods, and materials from 11 different countries.

UNESCO is increasingly concerned with the deterioration of man's global environment. In September 1968 it had convened an intergovernmental conference of experts from 62 countries (including the United States) on "The Scientific Basis for the Rational Use and Conservation of the Resources of the Biosphere." In November 1968 UNESCO's General Conference had adopted the theme "Man and His Environment—Design for Living" for its future activities concerned with both the physical and aesthetic aspects of the environment.

In March 1969 UNESCO organized an interagency consultation meeting on the long-term program envisaged as the outcome of the Biosphere Conference. Following this consultation, the UNESCO Advisory Committee on Natural Resources Research met in Paris June 25–30 and recommended that such a program should be global in scope, implemented by member states, and coordinated at the international level. In November UNESCO convened five working groups, which included five

American scholars, to study the elements of the future program. The Director General of UNESCO also sought the views of UNESCO's member states in order to clarify further the orientation, general content, and methods of implementation of the program. The U.S. reply to the Director General, on August 29, suggested that the UNESCO program should emphasize the human factor and that the study of the environment problems should involve social scientists as well as physical scientists. Among the specific topics suggested for study the United States stressed (1) man's perception of his environment, (2) social indicators in environmental research programs, (3) environmental management, and (4) education, training, and dissemination of information to bring about greater understanding of and participation in the maintenance of the environment.

In September UNESCO hosted a meeting on environmental changes and the origins of modern man. The purpose of the symposium was to define problems and outline a research program. Some 40 papers were presented on 4 themes: (1) man's physical evolution; (2) evolution of Stone Age industries and cultures; (3) dating of human remains; and (4) the influence of the natural environment on man's evolution. (See p. 107 for further U.N. action on the environment.)

(For the work of UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission see p. 105.)

SOCIAL SCIENCES

UNESCO's efforts in the field of social science have two goals: (1) to help improve man's knowledge of himself and his institutions, and (2) to contribute practical action on behalf of economic and social development. Unfortunately, these efforts have, in the past, been less than the United States would like.

To strengthen UNESCO's capability in pursuing these goals the Director General proposed, and the Executive Board approved at its 83d session, the establishment of two new organizational units: a Social Science Unit in the Division of Science Policy and an Office of Social Analysis in the Department of Social Sciences. Final approval for establishing the two groups is pending action by the next General Conference in 1970.

The new Social Science Unit will (1) insure that appropriate social science requirements are met in the field of science policy planning; (2) collect data on science and technology resources in developing countries; and (3) conduct studies on the status and working conditions of scientific workers.

The new Office of Social Analysis will have a research program of its own and also participate in appropriate studies and activities undertaken by other parts of UNESCO in the fields of education, science, culture, and communication.

The United States strongly favors the establishment of both units since it has for several years taken the lead in promoting the expansion and strengthening of UNESCO's program in the social sciences. Concern about the relatively low status accorded the social sciences by UNESCO in the past had also been expressed by American nongovernmental organizations interested in international intellectual exchange and economic and social development, notably the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, the Social Science Research Council, the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, and the American Sociological Association.

CULTURE

In 1969 the first two in a series of studies of cultural policies were published. The first was a preliminary study consisting of ideas and recommendations issuing from a UNESCO

roundtable, held in Monaco in December 1967 and attended by 32 experts (including 2 Americans) from 24 countries. The second, "A Study of Cultural Policy in the United States," was prepared for UNESCO by the Director of the Office of State and Community Operations of the U.S. National Endowment for the Arts. The booklet analyzes cultural activity in the United States and defines present American cultural policy as the "deliberate encouragement of multiple cultural forces in keeping with the pluralistic traditions of the nation."

In July UNESCO convened a committee of experts to begin planning for the first World Conference of Ministers of Culture to be held in September 1970. The U.S. member of the committee played an important role in focusing the agenda for the conference on useful, tangible objectives concerning the administration and financing of cultural activities.

During the year UNESCO continued its extensive program of activities related to the preservation of cultural property. International advisory committees for Florence and Venice were set up by the Italian Government, in cooperation with UNESCO, as part of the International Campaign for Florence and Venice. This campaign was started to counter the effects of the disastrous 1966 Arno River flood on Florence, and of subsidence and pollution on Venice. The committees met in July to draw up lists of priority needs and to make recommendations for international action. Following the recommendations of the committee for Venice, UNESCO began preparing a list of scientific, technical, and artistic projects which member states will be invited to pass on to their public and private bodies interested in providing assistance.

UNESCO also continued to play an important role in the preservation of cultural property as an adjunct to the development of tourism. For example, it participated in a recon-

naissance mission in connection with the restoration and preservation of the ruins of Borobudur, the great Buddhist sanctuary in Indonesia.

Several highly significant cultural publications were released during the year. A prestigious volume on *Himalayan Art* is the first in a series which will illustrate the artistic styles and evolution of various regions or periods. *The Arts and Man*, which deals with art and artists of 85 member states of UNESCO, is designed to appeal to the public at large as well as to students and teachers. The book includes 325 photographs by some of the world's most distinguished photographers. Authorities on the arts from different parts of the world wrote the text.

The 10-year project for preparing a general history of Africa neared its halfway point. At a meeting held in Paris in June experts sought to define the principles and broad outlines of works designed to give both specialist and layman a panoramic view of African history based on the latest research. In addition the experts laid plans for the publication of historical sources and an inventory of work already carried out.

COMMUNICATION AND COPYRIGHT

Representatives of 57 nations, including the United States, met at UNESCO headquarters in December to consider international arrangements in the space communications field. The discussions emphasized the educational, cultural, and legal problems which will arise from satellite broadcasts, and preliminary steps were taken to initiate a convention to protect broadcast signals from unauthorized use.

In September the United States also attended, as an observer, a UNESCO-convened meeting of experts in Bogota, Colombia, on book development in Latin America. The meeting examined the present situation in the region and drew up a pro-

gram of action to promote book production and distribution. One of the major recommendations, adopted unanimously, was that a Book Development Center be established at Bogota to serve as a focal point for efforts to foster the free flow of books and the growth of national book publishing and distribution.

In September 1969 UNESCO and the United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property combined to form a joint secretariat for a Study Group of 25 countries that met in Washington to examine various issues in the field of international copyright. In addition, as a member of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee, which is responsible for the administration of the Universal Copyright Convention, the United States took part in other meetings hosted by UNESCO in Paris in February, June, and December.

The meetings were generally concerned with seeking methods to improve the technical structure of international copyright while considering the special needs of the developing countries. Guidelines were drawn up for the establishment within UNESCO of an information center to assist developing countries in acquiring information on works protected by copyright. Preparatory work also began for the simultaneous revision of the two principal international copyright conventions.

World Health Organization

WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

The World Health Assembly, WHO's policymaking body, meets annually, usually in Geneva. In 1969, however, on the invitation of the governments of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, WHO held its 22d Assembly in Boston, July 8-25. The year 1969 was the centennial of the establishment,

in Massachusetts, of the first modern State Public Health Department, and Boston's selection for the site of the Assembly was thus particularly appropriate.

In a special welcoming message to the Assembly, President Nixon singled out WHO's smallpox eradication program to cite as an example of the type of cooperation directed toward the progressive, prospering society that all of mankind seeks.

Of WHO's 128 members and 3 associate members, 123 attended the 22d Assembly, as did representatives from the United Nations, other specialized agencies, nongovernmental health organizations having official relations with WHO, and observers from the Holy See. Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and Chief of the U.S. delegation, was unanimously elected president of the Assembly.

Budget

A major function of the Assembly is to approve a program and budget. In January 1969 the Director General had submitted to the Executive Board for its examination a 1970 budget of \$65,570,000. The Executive Board recommended that the Assembly accept this level, subject to a report from the Director General on where savings might be effected.

At the Assembly the Director General presented a revised program and budget of \$67,845,000, stating that the increase was caused by unforeseen additional requirements, such as the increases in salaries and educational allowances approved by the United Nations, increases in general services salaries in Geneva, continued emergency assistance to Equatorial Guinea, and certain inflationary costs. As requested by the Executive Board, the Director General cited program savings amounting to \$400,000 which might be effected, but recommended against making them.

Many of the larger contributors, including the United States, considered

the 1970 rate increases excessive. A U.S. proposal for a budget of \$65,500,000, which would have permitted a 9% general increase over 1969 plus the requested assistance to Equatorial Guinea, failed to receive the necessary two-thirds support, as did a proposal to adopt the Director General's recommended budget. After considerable discussion a compromise figure of \$67,650,000 was approved. The United States and almost one-third of those present and voting voted against the proposal.

By a simple majority vote the Assembly also approved a 1971 order of magnitude of 10%; i.e., the suggested planning increase over the 1970 budget. The order of magnitude, which only serves as a guide and does not bind the Director General, was opposed as excessive by the United States and other large contributors. They presented a proposal—which was defeated—recommending a 1971 order of magnitude of 7%.

Program Review

The Assembly reexamined the global strategy for malaria eradication and approved a resolution redefining the immediate targets in light of administrative and technical realities. The resolution urged governments to continue giving the necessary financial support to existing eradication programs, and recommended that governments with programs currently underway revise them to ensure that they achieve maximum results.

The Assembly also adopted a revised set of international sanitary regulations which will be known as International Health Regulations and will become effective January 1, 1971. They are the first major change in the Sanitary Regulations since 1951.

The health aspects of population dynamics were the subject of lively discussions at the Assembly with some 33 delegations participating in the debates, the majority stating that they hoped the program would be ex-

panded. By resolution the Assembly recognized the need for new methods in approaches to family planning and asked its secretariat to evaluate the merits of different approaches, "in the context of community, economic, and national development."

Other Actions

The 22d Assembly also took several significant nonprogram actions. It reelected the United States to the Executive Board after an absence of one year. (Dr. S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr., was subsequently named the U.S. Representative.) It also approved expanded use of Russian and Spanish as working languages in the Assembly. Finally, it moved a significant way toward biennial programing and long-term planning by authorizing its Director General to implement various proposals for strengthening and improving the long-term planning process and evaluation procedures. These are actions that the United States has long advocated.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

WHO has two major areas of activity: (1) technical assistance to governments; and (2) the establishment of international standards in health protection, such as the sanitary regulations approved by the 22d Assembly.

Most of the emphasis in 1969 continued to be on assistance to governments. Almost 900 projects were planned, the majority single country projects, but some intercountry or interregional. In addition to its regular budget, WHO administered funds made available by such organizations as UNICEF and UNDP, and special contributions earmarked for specific activities. The total funds administered in 1969 approached \$100 million.

Malaria

Malaria eradication remained WHO's largest single program. As

noted above, the basic strategy underwent redefinition, but the program remained divided into "attack," "consolidation," and "maintenance" phases. The country program in each case was designed to meet the local situation. A typical program in the "attack" phase was that in Togo where WHO assisted in evaluating work in a demonstration area and in a long-term development of the basic health services to provide support for a mass campaign against all communicable diseases. At a more advanced level, in Colombia the program continued in both the "attack" and "consolidation" phases. Intercountry programs for the Eastern Mediterranean provided consultants to assist in the assessment of and coordination of the eradication programs in Cyprus, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. In all, WHO assisted 68 country programs and 34 inter- or intraregional programs.

Smallpox

The decade-long campaign to eradicate smallpox began in 1967. There was significant progress, marked by the 100 millionth vaccination given in West Africa alone during the year. Typical program assistance was that for Brazil, where three WHO medical officers and a statistician assisted the government in intensifying its eradication campaign. In Kenya a technical officer assisted in implementing a vaccination program. WHO also helped develop epidemiological surveillance activities. Throughout the world it maintained 39 such country programs as well as 14 inter- or intraregional programs.

Other Communicable Diseases

WHO also assisted governments in fighting other communicable diseases. Each program was adapted to a nation's specific needs. For example, the one in Burma helped develop tuberculosis control services. In Pakistan leprologists helped to collect epidemi-

ological data on leprosy, to study methodology in a pilot area, to assess the results of the program already implemented, and to prepare a comprehensive plan of leprosy control integrated into the health services for the whole country.

Environmental Health

Major emphasis continued during the year on environmental health programs. Particular attention was given to the development of adequate safe water supplies and sanitary facilities. Environmental health activities scheduled in 1969 included 215 projects in 97 nations, and 57 inter-country projects. Typical was the provision of a sanitary engineer and a sanitarian to Cambodia to advise the Ministry of Public Health on sanitary engineering, to assist in setting up an environmental health service in the Ministry, and to plan a countrywide sanitation program that would include safe water supplies in rural areas. In India a project was underway to assist the city of Calcutta in implementing its master plan for water supply, sewerage, and drainage.

Health Promotion

The improvement of public health administration is a requisite for support of all other activities. WHO assisted 171 projects in 97 countries and 83 intercountry projects in this field. In Turkey, for example, WHO helped to implement national health legislation and to progressively integrate the work of the specialized projects, such as malaria eradication, into the public health services. In Mauritius a public health adviser was helping to reorganize all levels of the country's health services.

There were also programs in 46 countries for maternal and child health care, often including a large element for family planning. In addition some 24 countries requested WHO assistance specifically in rela-

tion to the health aspects of population dynamics.

Education and Training

WHO strongly emphasized the need for more and better trained health personnel, and many programs had a large component for training. For example, a dental health program in Thailand provided not only a dental technician for the government, but also two fellowships for training Thai personnel. During the year every member received assistance in education and training *per se*. Again programs varied with need. The United States, for example, received general fellowships to train staff for health services. In Laos lecturers were provided to help strengthen the Royal School of Medicine in a project closely coordinated with public health administration advisory services. In Viet-Nam personnel were provided to assist the government in establishing training programs for public health workers in the National Institute of Public Health.

Other Activities

WHO partially underwrites some 150 international reference centers, of which more than 40 are maintained in the United States. These centers collect and correlate data in various public health problem areas through research undertaken under different conditions throughout the world. WHO also continued its program to insure dissemination of information on public health by publishing materials designed not only for the public health administrator, but also for the layman.

Finally, there is the work of the Expert Committees, of which there are more than 50, each designated to study a specific topic. Many of the members, who act in an individual capacity, are U.S. citizens. The 15 Expert Committees which met in 1969 examined such diverse subjects

as malaria, organization of local and intermediate health administrations, and drug dependence.

International Civil Aviation Organization

Hungary became a member of ICAO in 1969 bringing the total membership to 117 governments.

UNLAWFUL INTERFERENCE WITH INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

As a result of a U.S. initiative, a special committee of the ICAO Council was established by an April 10 resolution to deal with future problems of hijacking and sabotage or armed attack directed against aircraft and ground facilities used in international civil aviation.¹ After hearing representatives of various organizations concerned with the safety of aircraft, the Committee on Unlawful Interference with Civil Aviation and its Facilities recommended and the Council adopted general and specific preventive measures against unlawful interference as well as recommended procedures for preserving safety of flight after an aircraft has been hijacked. These measures and procedures were sent to all ICAO member countries for use in dealing with unlawful interference with civil aviation.

In addition to the work done by the Committee on Unlawful Interference, an ICAO Legal Subcommittee on Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft held two sessions, February and September–October, in Montreal to develop a special draft treaty dealing solely with the problem of aircraft hijacking. The draft convention calls

¹ The Council members represented on the Committee during its first year were Australia, Colombia, France, Guatemala, Indonesia, Lebanon, Nigeria, Senegal, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

for each contracting government to make hijacking a criminal offense punishable in a manner commensurate with its gravity. The offense is made extraditable under existing or future extradition treaties. If a country does not extradite the alleged offender, it is obliged to submit the case to its competent authorities for a decision on initiating legal proceedings. After submission to the ICAO Legal Committee, the draft convention is expected to be opened for signature at a diplomatic conference in the latter part of 1970. (See also p. 212.)

REVISION OF THE WARSAW CONVENTION

The United States presented a "package" proposal to a second session of the ICAO Legal Subcommittee on Revision of the Warsaw Convention (1929) as amended by the Hague Protocol (1955) held September 2–19 in Montreal. Under the U.S. proposal, no single element of which was considered separable from the others, the limit of liability of the air carrier for death or serious injury to a passenger would be raised to \$100,000. The carrier would be liable without regard to fault except in the case of contributory negligence of the passenger, and provision would be made for an automatic annual increase of the limit by a fixed percentage. There would be a settlement inducement provision providing for award of attorney's costs and other legal fees when the carrier fails to make a timely offer of settlement or when proven damages exceed the settlement offer. These and other elements of the U.S. proposal will be considered by the ICAO Legal Committee in 1970.

SIXTH ICAO AIR NAVIGATION CONFERENCE

The Sixth ICAO Air Navigation Conference was held at ICAO headquarters in Montreal April 9–May 2.

The purpose of the Conference, which was held conjointly with an Extraordinary Session of the WMO Commission for Aeronautical Meteorology, was the further development of ICAO technical specifications to improve the safety and efficiency of international air transport operations in the en route phase of flight. On most agenda items consideration was given to the full range of aircraft operations in all kinds of traffic and weather conditions. Subjects which received particular attention were composite separation of aircraft, procedures for the use of secondary surveillance radar in air traffic control, use of self-contained navigational systems without reference to external means, and the reclassification of meteorological offices. The meteorological agenda, which related only to supersonic transport (SST) and general aviation operations, concerned the impact of data from computers and satellites, air reports from SST's and changes in air reporting procedures brought about by revised air traffic control procedures, and the impact of centralization of forecast procedures. The United States supported the technical recommendations made by the Conference which were approved almost without exception when they were submitted to the ICAO Air Navigation Commission and Council later in the year.

SPECIAL MEETING ON AIRCRAFT NOISE IN THE VICINITY OF AIRPORTS

Only 28 ICAO member governments and observers from the U.S.S.R. and 9 international organizations attended this worldwide ICAO meeting held in Montreal in late November and December. However, all the major aircraft manufacturing nations were represented, and the delegations were comprised of unusually well-qualified experts. The meeting agreed on international procedures, based primarily on U.S. views and concepts, for describing and measuring aircraft noise in and

in the vicinity of airports. It recommended that selected governments and international organizations, including WHO, be requested to conduct research on the effects on man of long-term exposure to aircraft noise in the vicinity of airports. In accordance with the U.S. position, the meeting agreed that noise certification specifications, aimed primarily at controlling noise of future subsonic aircraft, should take the form of a completely new set of ICAO Standards. The Standards will require strict compliance by all countries so that no one country can obtain an economic advantage by operating noisier aircraft. Both commercial air transports and general aviation aircraft are to carry a document attesting to noise certification in accordance with the ICAO Standards. Aircraft are to be operated within the weight limitations imposed by the noise standards, unless otherwise authorized for a certain airport by the competent authority of the government. The meeting also recommended that ICAO, as a matter of utmost urgency, examine all aspects of the problem of effectively reducing the noise of aircraft today. If approved by the ICAO Air Navigation Commission and Council in 1970, this recommendation will call for examination of the technical possibility of modifying existing aircraft, the effectiveness of such modifications, and the costs which may be involved.

FACILITATION OF AIR TRANSPORT ACROSS INTERNATIONAL BORDERS

An ICAO panel of experts composed of representatives of eight countries (including the United States), the International Air Transport Association, and the International Criminal Police Organization met at ICAO Headquarters June 16-20 to consider the feasibility of developing a card-type passport. If such a passport card can be developed from which information could be

recorded by electronic or mechanical means, it should speed up the flow of air travelers embarking on or disembarking from the new jumbo jet aircraft and the SST's which will be operating in the future. At its first meeting the ICAO Passport Card Panel discussed such basic issues as security; technical and human errors and language problems connected with use of computerized equipment; cost; and the type of document to be developed. It was agreed that the passport card would have to be visually as well as mechanically readable since not all countries will have electronic equipment available in the near future. Two working groups, one on alternative formats and one on security, were appointed to look further into these important aspects of a passport card and report back to the second meeting of the Panel, scheduled for May 1970.

Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization

The United States is a member of IMCO's Legal Committee which after 2 years of work had developed drafts for two proposed conventions on oil pollution. IMCO followed up on the Committee's work by convening an international conference at Brussels in November 1969 where final texts were agreed on for both conventions. The first dealt with the rights of coastal states to take prompt action to prevent pollution following a marine accident; the second established the liability of ship owners for marine pollution and the right of third parties, such as owners of shore property, to sue for damages. The United States signed both conventions on November 29. These conventions are two of the most important results of IMCO's activity in the field of oil pollution prevention,

which was particularly stimulated by the wreck of the tanker *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England in 1967.

Another significant accomplishment during the year was the adoption of a convention on a universal system of tonnage measurement. For nearly a decade the Subcommittee on Tonnage Measurement of the Maritime Safety Committee had addressed itself to the extraordinarily complex problems involved in developing recommendations for international adoption of such a system. The conference which adopted the convention met for 3 weeks in London in May and June under the auspices of IMCO and agreed upon a universal system which should greatly simplify the administration of tonnage measurement rules without working economic hardship upon shipowners. The United States, which had been a member of the Subcommittee concerned, signed the convention on June 23 along with 30 other states.

Following recommendations developed within the framework of the Maritime Safety Committee and its subcommittees, the biennial Assembly of IMCO, meeting in London in October, considered and adopted proposed amendments to the 1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention (SOLAS), which related, among other things, to requirements for firemen's outfits and personal equipment on cargo ships, to radio installations, and to shipborne navigational equipment. The Assembly also adopted proposed amendments to the 1954 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Seas by Oil. These proposed amendments, like those to the SOLAS Convention, have been circulated to national governments for ratification. When they become operative they will make more rigorous the regulations regarding the discharge of oil from vessels on the high seas.

The Assembly also adopted a num-

ber of recommendations dealing with other aspects of marine practice such as the positioning of navigation lights, dissemination of information on the charting and manning of drilling rigs and production platforms, fire safety measures for hydrofoil boats, regulations on the stowage of grain, and resolutions on establishing additional traffic separation schemes and areas to be avoided by ships of certain classes.

During the year the various subcommittees of the Maritime Safety Committee continued to work on such problems as the carriage of dangerous goods, safety of navigation, containers and cargoes, and the safety of fishing vessels.

During 1969 Saudi Arabia joined IMCO, bringing the total membership to 68 full members and 1 associate member.

International Telecommunication Union

Membership in the ITU increased from 135 to 137 in 1969 with the accession of Mauritius and Nauru to the International Telecommunication Convention. During the year the ITU continued to function effectively as the specialized organization 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 a UNDP executing agency in the telecommunications field.

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

The United States is a member of the Administrative Council which held its 24th session in Geneva, May 3-23. The most significant decision of the Council was the fixing of the agenda, date, and duration for the next World Administrative Radio

Conference for Space Telecommunications. This Conference will convene in Geneva, June 7, 1971, for 6 weeks to revise the Radio Regulations, including the Radio Frequency Allocation Table for services using space techniques.

The Council also made decisions on a number of staffing questions, organization of ITU's permanent organs, level of contributions to the ITU, and a major reorganization of its Technical Cooperation Department. The 1970 budget was reviewed in detail, modified, and approved by the Council. The assessment against members amounts to 22,657,200 Swiss francs, the U.S. share of which is 11.6% or 2,629,000 Swiss francs (\$615,728).

In general, the results of the Council session were consistent with U.S. interests. The changes made in the staffing pattern of the General Secretariat and the permanent organs of the ITU should improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization and permit the ITU to carry out its increasing responsibilities in the interest of all member administrations.

PERMANENT ORGANS

The permanent technical organs of the ITU, the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR), the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT), and the International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB) all met during the year. The United States is a member of the first two bodies.

The CCIR made considerable progress in developing recommended technical standards for international radio communications. Progress was particularly noteworthy with regard to the use of space radio communication techniques, an area in which the United States has been a major contributor and a major user. The Study Groups of the CCIR formulated many draft recommendations of im-

portance to U.S. and other member states' interests, particularly in light of the forthcoming 1971 World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications. CCIR activities both at the national and the international levels were directed towards preparation for its 12th plenary assembly, scheduled to meet in New Delhi in 1970 to improve the standards for broadcasting transmitters and receivers that are currently in effect.

The recommendations prepared in 1968 at the fourth plenary assembly of the CCITT were put in effect. These recommendations lay down international standards for telegraph and telephone operations and reflect significant advances in such fields as data transmission, and switching and signalling systems for the global telephone network, including satellite communications. In addition, substantive work began for the next plenary assembly, to be held in 1972, which will adopt new recommendations for international operations taking into account evolving technological developments.

The essential function of the IFRB is technical examination and registration of radio frequency notifications to insure interference-free radio operations throughout the world. The IFRB and its staff continued to carry out this function competently and effectively. During the year, the IFRB, in coordination with member states, updated the frequency allotment plan for the Aeronautical Mobile (OR) Service, which precluded the need for a special world radio conference. In addition, plans were formulated for a 1970 radio frequency management seminar, primarily for the benefit of developing countries. Such seminars are part of a continuing program that provides the developing countries with information necessary for proper administration of national and international telecommunications.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The ITU's role as a UNDP executing agency facilitates implementation of much needed technical assistance in the form of technical advisory services, fellowships, and seminars to aid the developing nations in increasing their capabilities in the management and operation of telecommunications systems. A major goal of this technical assistance is the establishment and staffing of telecommunications training institutes to provide expertise to the developing countries. Upon request of administrations in the developing countries, the ITU is planning to expand its program of technical telecommunications seminars. In addition, increasing numbers of technical experts from the developed countries, including the United States, have been recruited for advisory positions on specific telecommunications projects and for studies in developing countries.

Universal Postal Union

The quinquennial Congress of the UPU, which met in Tokyo October 1–November 14 to review the Acts of the Union governing the rates, classifications, and standards for the movement of international mail among member postal administrations, was attended by 133 of the UPU members. Bhutan, Mauritius, Nauru, and Swaziland joined the UPU during the year, raising the total membership to 142.

INTERNATIONAL POSTAL COMMUNICATIONS MATTERS

The Congress broke new ground in a number of areas. It decided to discontinue the traditional rate structure based on uniform weight steps and constant postage rate gradations beyond the initial rate, and adopted a new framework which introduces to the international service the use of expanding weight steps combined

with postage charges which increase by decreasing amounts. Postal administrations were also given more latitude to increase international postal charges commensurate with cost increases during the time span between Congresses. In an effort to simplify international rate structures a number of special mail categories were abolished and reply-paid cards were discontinued. These changes will take effect on July 1, 1971.

The developing countries, joined by a number of developed countries, successfully challenged the basic UPU principle that each postal administration retains its own revenues. This principle is based on the assumption that there is a rough balance in the flow of international mail as between one country and another. The developing countries challenged this assumption, especially with regard to printed matter, and the Congress adopted a new system under which countries that receive substantially more mail than they send out will have the right to demand reimbursement from those countries in which the excess mail originates.

The Congress also adopted a proposal to introduce an optional envelope standardization provision into the UPU Convention. The provision enables postal administrations that are so inclined to surcharge non-standard envelopes in their outgoing international mail.

Finally, the Congress also approved a proposal to reduce by 25% the air conveyance charges for letter class items.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

At the Executive Council meeting in Bern, March 14-21, it was reported that the UNDP had allocated approximately \$390,000 to technical assistance postal projects to be undertaken during 1969. In addition, the UNDP approved \$379,100 for the first postal project under its preinvestment component. This sum, to be

made available over a 5-year period, will provide for the establishment of a regional postal training school in Damascus, Syria.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

The proposal by the Executive Council to eliminate the Swiss supervisory authority and to make the UPU financially independent was overwhelmingly rejected by the Tokyo Congress. The Swiss Government agreed, therefore, to continue to exercise its supervisory powers over the budget and staff of the Union.

The Congress decided to expand the membership of the Executive Council, which is the principal organ of the Union between Congresses, from 27 to 31, and the United States was elected vice chairman and chairman of the Finance Committee of that body.

The Management Council was renamed the Consultative Council on Postal Studies (CCPS) and was charged with a heavy program of operational, technical, and economic postal research for the coming 5-year period. The Congress decided that the CCPS would meet at UPU headquarters in Bern from now on and would no longer move its annual meetings from country to country. Membership on this council was also enlarged, from 26 to 30, and the United States was reelected.

The Executive Council in March had approved a budget for 1969 of approximately \$1,805,000; the U.S. contribution was approximately \$76,500. In establishing budgetary ceilings for the 5-year period beginning 1971 the Congress in the fall decided to base itself on the 1969 expenditures and to permit annual increases of 5%. Provision was made for nonrecurring expenses in connection with the construction of a new headquarters building in Bern in the years in which they occur, thus raising the ceiling for those years by more than the standard 5%.

POLITICAL MATTERS

Although the United States and others attempted to exclude political matters from the UPU Congress in Tokyo, on the grounds that the UPU is a technical, nonpolitical organization, the effort was unsuccessful. After extended and sometimes heated debate, the Congress, against U.S. opposition, voted to exclude the South African delegation from participation in its deliberations, but a move to expel South Africa from the UPU was defeated. The Congress also rejected proposals that would have enabled all "sovereign states" on their own initiative either to join the UPU or to send official observers to its meetings. The United States voted against the proposal. The Congress decided to leave unchanged the provisions of the UPU Acts which enable any U.N. member to join the UPU automatically, but which require a two-thirds vote for the admission of nonmembers of the United Nations.

World Meteorological Organization

WORLD WEATHER WATCH

The principal goals to be achieved by the World Weather Watch (WWW) by 1971 are (1) substantial improvement in the global observing system, (2) implementation of the global data processing system, (3) improvement of the global telecommunication system, (4) acceleration of the program to educate and train meteorologists, and (5) development of a global atmospheric research program.

Adequate weather data is generally unavailable for over 80% of the earth's surface, primarily the oceans and developing countries. A successful implementation of the WWW plan should overcome part of this deficiency and improve weather forecasts for such end-users as farmers

and the construction, transportation, and fisheries industries.

Under the WWW each of the 132 WMO members is called upon to implement needed improvements in observations, data processing, and communications in their territories. To the extent that members lack the resources required for implementation in their own territories, the WMO Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP), established by the fifth WMO Congress in 1967, can assist them in procuring radiosonde ground equipment, observational balloons, radiosondes, communication equipment, and long-term training. The VAP assistance is provided only to the extent that assistance is not feasible under UNDP or other bilateral or multilateral arrangements. The assisted countries provide counterpart resources, usually local facilities and personnel.

At its annual meeting, May 29–June 13, the WMO Executive Committee, of which Dr. Robert M. White, Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) is a member, reviewed requests from developing countries for assistance from VAP to implement the WWW Plan, and reviewed the status of the 228 projects that have already been approved for circulation to members of the organization. Of these projects, 47 in 30 countries have been accepted by members for implementation. The United States contributed to projects in Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ghana, Honduras, India, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Nepal, Pakistan, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, and Zambia. The U.S. contribution to these projects during 1969 totaled \$1,500,000: (1) \$200,000 to the Voluntary Assistance Fund on the basis of matching at a 40% rate the total unrestricted cash contributions of all WMO members; and (2) \$1,300,000 for contributions-in-kind to the Equipment and Services Program. The contributions-in-kind

included U.S. equipment, experts, services, and the training in the United States of personnel from the developing countries in the field of meteorology. This program is administered by ESSA.

A key part of the WWW is research to improve the understanding of the basic structure of the atmosphere. For this purpose a vast research program entitled "Global Atmospheric Research Program (GARP)" is underway. To bring nongovernmental scientists fully into this program, the WMO planned GARP in cooperation with the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). The WMO and ICSU established a Joint Planning Staff to develop plans for the research. It has been tentatively agreed that the program on a hemispheric or global basis would be for the period 1974-75 with several interim experiments over a more limited geographical area. WMO's Executive Committee agreed to the holding of a Joint Planning Conference of ICSU and WMO in early 1970 to finalize the details of the program and to receive commitments from the governments concerned.

RELATED ACTIVITIES

In addition to its consideration of the WWW, the Executive Committee also discussed in detail the problems of man and his environment, in particular the economic benefits of meteorology and the problems of pollution. It considered the vital role of meteorological factors in dissipating atmospheric pollutants and emphasized cooperation with other international organizations.

The United States attended two regional WMO meetings during the year—the fifth session of the European Regional Association, held in Varna, Bulgaria, May 6-16, and the fifth session of the African Regional Association, held in Geneva, October 6-18. Both meetings developed plans for the WWW on a regional

basis with detailed arrangements for the regional networks of stations and communications getting the most attention.

The fifth session of the Commission for Instruments and Methods of Observation was held in Paris, September 15-30, under the direction of its acting President, V. D. Rockney of ESSA. The Commission developed procedures and regulations in the instrumental field and recommended improvements with particular emphasis on the problems before the WWW. Mr. Rockney was elected President for the next 4 years.

The fifth session of the Commission for Climatology met in Geneva, October 20-31, and considered steps to improve data processing and storage, also emphasizing problems related to the WWW. Other items discussed ranged from world climatic atlases to the role of climatology in studies of the biosphere and the human environment. Dr. H. Landsberg of the University of Maryland was elected President of the Commission for the next 4 years.

An American, Newton A. Lieurance of ESSA, is President of WMO's Commission for Aeronautical Meteorology, which met jointly with ICAO's Sixth Air Navigation Conference in Montreal, April 9-May 2 (see p. 147).

WMO worked closely during the year with FAO, IMCO, and IOC to develop the necessary cooperation for following up on the resolutions adopted at the 23d General Assembly on the oceans, marine resources, and the seabed (see pp. 16 and 150). Under discussion were such items as coordination of the use of frequencies, exchange of bathythermograph data, development of codes, programs in ocean and atmosphere interaction, life in the oceans, marine pollution, and dynamics of the ocean floor—all involving meteorology to varied degrees, either as a science, a service activity, or both.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

In addition to directing its own VAP Technical Assistance Program, the WMO serves as executing agency for UNDP projects pertaining to meteorology and hydrometeorology. Nearly 80 countries and territories received technical assistance during 1969, and 11 large-scale projects are now being carried out by the WMO. One preinvestment project was completed in the Congo (Kinshasa), and one began in Algeria for the establishment of a hydrometeorological institute for training technicians at all levels and for carrying out research in meteorology and hydrometeorology.

U.S. SATELLITES

During 1969 the United States launched two new operational satellites: ESSA 9 and Nimbus 3. The latter carried Automatic Picture Transmission System (APT) cameras, enabling users throughout the world to receive pictures on local inexpensive ground equipment. These satellites and three earlier weather satellites (ESSA 5, 6, and 8) that continue to perform satisfactorily enable the United States to make available data on weather conditions to all nations of the world.

International Atomic Energy Agency

During 1969, the IAEA continued to pursue its twin objectives of promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy throughout the world and ensuring, so far as it is able, 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.

SAFEGUARDS

Although the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) was not yet in force,

its assignment to the IAEA of the international safeguards responsibility under the Treaty was already engaging the Agency's attention. IAEA began examining the legal, technical, operational, and financial implications of the NPT for its safeguards program and began preparing for the negotiation of NPT safeguards agreements.

The regular safeguards activities increased in 1969 as a result of the entry into force of several previously approved agreements and the approval by the Board of Governors of a number of new agreements. By September 30 the Board had approved a total of 43 safeguards agreements with 31 countries, 21 of which concerned the safeguards under existing U.S. bilateral Agreements for Cooperation. The total number of principal nuclear facilities, research and development facilities, and other separate accountability areas where IAEA safeguards are applied is now 110.

In view of the likelihood that safeguards will soon be applied to conversion and fabrication plants, and in due course to comprehensive nuclear complexes, a vigorous research and development program has been initiated. The IAEA has developed close contacts with member states in order to coordinate efforts among national programs, and to some extent work in this field is being carried out by IAEA staff and under IAEA contracts.

The group of consultants from Canada, Denmark, Hungary, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States, appointed by the IAEA Director General to study the possible impact of the NPT on the Agency's safeguards work, submitted several reports containing various recommendations for a detailed program for further systems analysis work on the safeguarding of the complete fuel cycle. In addition, the Agency is conducting a series of expert panel meetings on the application of safe-

guards. Meetings have been held on procedures involving reactors and chemical processing plants, fuel fabrication facilities, systems analysis, and research and development.

NUCLEAR POWER AND REACTORS

The number and capacity of nuclear power plants on order or being built in almost all industrial countries and in a number of developing countries continued to grow rapidly. Therefore, the IAEA laid greater stress on practical service to member states during the early stages of a nuclear power project (including economic studies, siting, and safety); on problems and economics of fuel supply; and on improvements in the fuel cycle economy of existing systems. Looking to the future, IAEA began promoting the exchange of information on advance converter and breeder reactors and on new experimental means of power generation.

The Second International Survey Course on the Technical and Economic Aspects of Nuclear Power, in Vienna September 1-12, attracted 65 senior scientists and engineers from 33 countries including the United States. The course reviewed the latest information on various aspects of nuclear power which are useful in the planning and implementation of nuclear power programs, particularly in the developing countries.

The IAEA continued to participate and assist in a study undertaken in 1968 by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory on the potential application of nuclear-powered energy centers, or agro-industrial complexes, to provide large amounts of fresh water and electricity for the development of the arid regions of the Middle East. The study is to serve, in part, as a response to Senate Resolution 155, adopted in December 1967, calling on the President to consider the application of large-scale nuclear desalting plants as a means of supporting a

stable and durable peace in the Middle East.

Article V of the NPT provides that the benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions are to be obtainable through "an appropriate international body," and the IAEA has been conducting studies on the procedures it should employ in performing this role. All member states were invited to submit their views on this matter and a special *ad hoc* committee (of which the United States was a member) was established to prepare a report, subsequently endorsed by the Board of Governors and the 13th General Conference in September and forwarded to the U.N. General Assembly. The report concluded that performance of the functions of the international body referred to in the NPT is within IAEA's technical competence and the scope of its statutory functions. The report also noted that the IAEA should approach this subject on an evolutionary basis, devoting its attention initially to the exchange and dissemination of information. IAEA will continue its programs and studies in this field, taking into account the U.N. General Assembly resolution adopted December 16 by a vote of 80 (U.S.) to 1, with 37 abstentions, that supported this work and invited all member states to continue to make available to IAEA full and current information on the technology of peaceful nuclear explosions.

ISOTOPES AND RADIATION SOURCES

IAEA work in the fields of soil fertility and irrigation, radiation entomology, pesticide residues and food protection, plant breeding and genetics, animal production and disease control, and food irradiation continued. The program on nuclear medicine and radiation biology concentrated on the physical aspects of nuclear medicine and, in coordination with WHO, supported research on diseases such as parasitic infections, deficiency diseases, and tropical

anemias that affect, particularly, the tropical and subtropical areas. The Agency cooperated with UNESCO within the program of the International Hydrological Decade to measure the discharge of tritium from the continents to the oceans and to help developing countries use isotope hydrology on water development projects. The work of the Agency's Monaco Laboratory was reoriented toward standardizing research on the effects of radioactivity on marine life and the management of radioactive waste. Work related to industry concentrated on promoting the use of isotopic techniques and on prospecting and mining.

HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

The trend of IAEA's activities in health, safety, and waste management is towards assisting developing countries to apply the standards and techniques that have already been developed by the Agency and advanced countries. Extensive use has been made of international panels of experts to draft standards and manuals and to advise on programs and on the organization of regional study groups and training courses. The Agency's revised Regulations for Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials went into effect in 1969 and almost all international transport organizations brought their regulations into line with them. In cooperation with WHO and FAO, the Agency prepared a manual on plans that should be made to handle radiation accidents.

RESEARCH AND SERVICES IN PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Most of IAEA's work in the physical sciences is for the promotion of the exchange of information, including the convening of scientific meetings, and coordinating work on selected topics. IAEA's Nuclear Data Unit is now one of the four world-

wide compilation centers (along with centers in the United States, U.S.S.R., and France) and has made good progress towards its objective of ensuring international exchange in computerized form of all available neutron cross-section information. The operations of the International Center for Theoretical Physics at Trieste are proceeding under a new agreement between IAEA and UNESCO which will ensure continuation until 1974. The Agency's laboratories in Vienna and Seibersdorf, Austria, and its Marine Radioactivity Laboratory at Monaco continued both original research and providing services for member states.

INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

The Agency decided to launch the International Nuclear Information System (INIS) on a limited basis in 1970. Under INIS the Agency will receive reports of new nuclear literature from members, prepare bibliographic indexes and assign keywords, and make them available to members. The microfiche clearinghouse, which is one component of the INIS project, supplied microfiche copies of the reports the Agency's library receives.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

The work of the IAEA is supported by a regular or administrative budget—financed by assessments levied on member states—and by an operational budget—financed from voluntary contributions by member states and from other sources. The operational budget covers all technical assistance activities other than those carried out by the IAEA on behalf of the UNDP.

At its 13th General Conference, September 23–29, the IAEA adopted an administrative budget for 1970 of \$12,250,000, an increase of 8.9% over 1969, and a scale of assessments under which the United States would pay

31.50% compared to its 1969 rate of 31.57%. The General Conference further adopted an operational budget of \$2,587,000 of which \$2,000,000 was the target for voluntary contributions with the remainder to be funded from special contributions and other sources. In respect to the operational budget the United States announced that, subject to congress-

sional approval, it would increase the level of its contribution toward the \$2 million target above that of previous years (which had been 32.5% of all unrestricted cash contributions). The United States would also continue to provide contributions in kind in the form of cost-free experts, training opportunities in U.S. institutions, and items of equipment.

Part III

Trusteeship and Dependent Areas

Trusteeship Council

The 36th regular session of the Trusteeship Council met May 29–June 19. The Council was comprised of two administering states—Australia and the United States—and four nonadministering states—China, France, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R.—all of them automatically members under the U.N. Charter. At the opening meeting Paul H. Gaschignard of France and Patrick Shaw of Australia were elected President and Vice President, respectively.

The Council examined the conditions in the two territories remaining under the international trusteeship system: the Pacific Islands (administered by the United States) and New Guinea (administered by Australia).

In accordance with the Charter, the Council submitted its report on the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Security Council and its report on New Guinea to the General Assembly. The Security Council, which in 1949 had requested the Trusteeship Council to perform on its behalf the functions specified in the U.N. Charter relating to the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of strategic areas, did not discuss the report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The General Assembly adopted a resolution on the subject of New Guinea on December 16 (see below).

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is composed of over 2,000 islands and atolls, having a combined land area of approximately 700 square miles, scattered over an ocean area of some 3 million 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 98,009.

Prior to World War II, Japan administered the islands under a League of Nations mandate; during the war they passed under U.S. administration. On July 18, 1947, the U.S. Government and the Security Council concluded an agreement making the islands a strategic trust. 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 consideration of the Pacific Islands from June 6 to 13, Ambassador Phillips was the U.S. Representative and Edward E. Johnston, the High

Commissioner of the Trust Territory, was the Special Representative. Olympic T. Borja and Chutomu Nimwes, members of the territory's legislature, the Congress of Micronesia, were advisers.

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES

The U.S. Representative, participating in the Council's consideration of the Pacific Islands for the first time, said that he was impressed not only with the immense problems which the territory faces, but also by the serious effort of the United States to meet its obligations. He was pleased to report that an agreement had been signed in Tokyo on April 18 which would provide for the settlement of the longstanding Micronesian war claims. He also reported that although necessary legislation to create a U.S. status commission had not been enacted, the United States was still dedicated to providing the Micronesians the right of self-determination in the near future, and Secretary of the Interior Hickel had proposed that the Micronesians select a delegation to meet with representatives of the U.S. Government to devise a status consistent with the wishes of the majority of the people of the territory—a status presumably involving a lasting political partnership between the territory and the United States.

The Special Representative reported in detail the developments of the past year and the plans for the future. He said that considerable progress had been made in education with the new vocational school in Palau due to be opened in September. Health services had been expanded and improved service would result from the liaison established with the Regional Medical Program of Hawaii and the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Georgia. In the field of public finance, he reported that

two experts from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service were developing a program for a local tax structure. Although economic development remained behind schedule, he said that tourism had increased and that efforts to expand agriculture and fishing were continuing. He noted that the Peace Corps was providing valuable assistance in teaching English as a second language, and that it was using a smaller number of more highly skilled and qualified volunteers in place of the earlier recruits. In the political field, a District Legislature for Yap had been organized and needed reforms made in the structure of the Marshall Islands Legislature. The Congress of Micronesia's Political Status Commission had completed its studies and would soon be presenting its final report to the Congress.

The Special Representative drew attention to the program for the future which Secretary Hickel had introduced during his visit to the territory in May. The keynote to the program would be the ever-increasing involvement of the Micronesians in their own government. Greater emphasis would be placed on training; there would be a time-phased program for pay equalization; and the Congress of Micronesia would be more deeply involved in budget preparation. In order to strengthen the economy the U.S. Congress was being asked to increase the Economic Development Loan Fund from \$700,000 to \$5 million, and a major effort would be made to solve the land problem; i.e., establish and register title to land throughout the territory. In addition, the United States would work with the Congress of Micronesia in studying the question of government organization with the objective of increasing efficiency, improving the structure, and promoting decentralization.

Senator Borja said that he and his colleague, Congressman Nimwes,

were appearing before the Council with mixed feelings. They came to report significant progress in the past year, but they also came to convey the extent of their needs, hopes, and aspirations not yet fulfilled. The sustained increase in appropriations was making possible major improvements in infrastructure, but he felt that considering the resources made available progress should have been greater. Development in Micronesia must depend on the Micronesians and it must be guided with greater sensitivity to Micronesian life styles.

Senator Borja said that the Congress of Micronesia was pleased with the reforms which put the Congress on a full-time basis. It was taking steps to involve itself in problem areas and had created four interim committees to examine and recommend changes in key areas. He reported that the tentative recommendation of the Micronesian Future Political Status Commission was for a self-governing state which would enter into free association with the United States. The need now was to accelerate economic and social development so that it might catch up with the progress made in the political field. The Micronesians were ready to discuss their future and had expressed their tentative views. They now waited to hear not only the views of the United States, but also those of the Council itself.

Congressman Nimwes said that the Micronesians were pleased by the greater emphasis being placed on their problems as shown by Secretary Hickel's visit and the program he outlined. He hoped that real progress would be made and that the gap between expectation and reality would not simply be further widened. He then pointed out major deficiencies still existing in the territory's infrastructure, the confusion regarding land which was a major impediment to economic and social development,

and the shortcomings in the field of education. As for economic development, he said that positive and forward-looking steps to use the resources of the islands and the surrounding seas had not yet been taken, and he pointed out the trade imbalance in the territory. Noting the over-dependence on the Trust Territory Government for job opportunities, he felt that more emphasis had to be placed on strengthening the private sector and attracting people to it. In conclusion he expressed his confidence that there would be greater accomplishments in the future than had been possible in the past.

PETITIONS

The Trusteeship Council considered 13 petitions concerning the Pacific Islands. Six of these petitions—two from the Congress of Micronesia, one each from the District Legislatures of Palau, the Marshalls, and the Marianas, and one from a Micronesian student group in Honolulu—complained about various aspects of the U.S. administration and asked for suitable amendment or revision of the Trusteeship Agreement. The United States in its written observations on these petitions pointed out that they all reflected, in one way or another, the desire of the Micronesians to have a greater voice in their own affairs. The United States pointed out that it wished and intended to meet this desire, but felt that this could be done in more basic and permanent terms by seeking, together with the Micronesians, a more permanent solution to the territory's political future, than by trying to amend the existing Agreement. Replying to specific complaints, the U.S. observations pointed out with regard to land acquisition that compensation had always been paid in cases of expropriation and that inadequate agreements had been and would con-

tinue to be revised. Moreover, the Secretary of the Interior had pledged that no additional land would be taken without full discussion with all parties involved and the payment of adequate compensation. The United States also pointed out that the Secretary had acknowledged many past shortcomings and the purpose of his outlined program was to correct them.

A petition from the Mariana Islands Legislature raised the question of the outstanding war claims. Having concluded the agreement with Japan on this issue, the United States pointed out that the means for settlement were at hand and it was hoped the actual funds would have been appropriated by the time the claims had been evaluated and processed. Another petition from the Marianas Legislature described in detail the land problems in the District. The United States acknowledged the seriousness of this problem and said that after careful study definite steps would be taken, in consultation with the Micronesians, to achieve an equitable solution.

A third petition from the Marianas Legislature claimed that the administration was denying freedom of the press. In its observations, the United States pointed out that the incident in question had been the result of a misunderstanding which had been immediately rectified. The Council was assured that free speech and freedom of the press were carefully guarded rights throughout the territory. The Marianas Legislature also submitted a petition calling for the immediate reunification of the Marianas with Guam. Pointing out that the sentiment expressed was not a new one, the United States said that it had always administered the territory as an entity, but did not necessarily rule out any choice at the time of self-determination. It hoped that the discussions suggested by Secretary Hickel would provide further information on the desires of the

Micronesian people since any decision the United States might make would depend heavily on such views.

In its observations on a Marianas Legislature petition criticizing the opportunities provided for higher education and asking for information on U.N. scholarships, the United States pointed to the sharp increase in scholarships offered by the administration. It also cited its pledges to continue the expansion of this effort and stated that the offers of U.N. scholarships had been circulated to all districts, where they were available for the asking.

The former inhabitants of Eniwetok, now residing on Ujelang, submitted a petition asking to be returned to their home island and criticizing the agreement providing for the leasing of Eniwetok and the means by which it had been obtained. The petition was also critical of conditions on Ujelang. The U.S. observations stated that, while it was not possible to return the people to their home island at this time, should it become possible they would be offered the opportunity and provided with assistance in relocating. Moreover, the administration was actively engaged in improving conditions on Ujelang and hoped shortly to enter into an agreement with the people of the island which would remove their current causes of complaint.

Finally the Saipan Legislature submitted a petition asking that the Council include a representative of the Soviet Union on the next visiting mission to the territory in 1970. The United States said that it was up to the Council to decide on the composition of the mission, but that it could not accept the implication that previous missions had not done a thorough and objective job. Moreover, it had every expectation that the 1970 mission, regardless of its membership, would be equally diligent in its examination of conditions in the territory.

In all cases the Council agreed to take note of the petitions and the explanations offered and to draw the petitioners' attention to the proceedings.

COUNCIL REPORT

In its report to the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council welcomed the information that Bikini Atoll was being rehabilitated and that its former inhabitants would be resettled there. It hoped that similar steps would be taken as soon as feasible for other displaced communities. The Council noted with satisfaction the signature of the agreement between Japan and the United States relating to the war claims, hoped for its early implementation, and hoped that a definite solution to claims that arose after the taking of the islands by U.S. armed forces ("post-secure" claims) would be reached by the Council's next session. It noted that the United States planned to expedite its land title survey and registration program and hoped that there would be significant progress in all aspects of the land problem.

Political Advancement

The Council was glad to note the reported reforms of the Congress of Micronesia and welcomed formation of the four interim committees reflecting the increasing congressional involvement with the executive in governmental matters. It reaffirmed its view that the Congress of Micronesia must have full and clearly defined legislative powers, and, while welcoming its increased involvement in the budgetary planning process, nevertheless reaffirmed its hope that the powers of the Congress would be progressively extended to include appropriations of U.S. subsidies.

The Council reiterated its concern that there were still no Micronesians in the highest echelons of the central

executive and again urged that both the training and placement of Micronesians in public service positions be accelerated. It hoped that the reduction in the number of Peace Corps volunteers would not adversely affect its contribution, particularly to the educational and social programs.

Economic Advancement

The Council recommended that efforts to improve the economic prospects of the territory be intensified and pointed out the importance of improving the infrastructure if success were to be achieved. The Council noted with satisfaction the increase in appropriations planned by the United States and also commended the plans to increase the funds of the Economic Development Loan Fund, expressing the hope that Micronesians would be given an increasing role in its management. It hoped that the efforts to develop a tax program for the territory would make substantial progress in the coming year.

Noting that only limited progress had been made in diversifying and increasing agricultural production, the Council hoped the efforts in this direction would be intensified. It welcomed the efforts to expand and improve the fishing and related industries and noted the impressive progress made in the field of tourism. While noting the advances in the fields of transportation and communications, the Council nevertheless urged the administration to expand these services, with particular stress on links between the outer islands and the district centers and on road building and improvement.

Social and Educational Advancement

The Council urged the United States to give full weight not only to accelerating the pace of development, but also to insuring its suitability to Micronesian life styles. While noting the efforts to expand health

services and to fill vacant positions, the Council was still concerned about the limited availability of health facilities and personnel. It recalled its recommendation on the urgent need for low-cost housing and hoped that, with the implementation of the master plans in each district, there would be further progress in this field.

The Council was pleased to note, in view of the reported inadequacies of the educational system, that this sector had the highest priority in terms of the 1969-70 budgetary increases. It looked forward to a report on the resulting progress and particularly on the effort to make the educational system responsive to the social and skill needs of Micronesia. Despite the expansion of scholarships, the Council observed that with the increase in secondary school students the need may arise for the establishment of a junior college. It was gratified by the assurances that the administration is mindful of its duty to preserve the history and culture of Micronesia.

Timetable for Self-Government or Independence

The Council noted the development of democratic expression and the increasing readiness of the people of Micronesia to assume responsibility for deciding their own future. It urged the administration to facilitate this evolution and to ensure that the Micronesians were aware of the possibilities open to them. It welcomed the initiatives of both the Micronesians and the United States for a meeting to consider the future of the territory, and hoped the process now envisaged would in no way slow down the progress toward self-determination in accordance with the wishes of the Micronesian people. Finally, it welcomed the United States statement that U.N. representatives would be invited to observe the act of self-determination to be offered to the Micronesians.

VISITING MISSION

On June 19 the Trusteeship Council decided to send a regular visiting mission to the Pacific Islands in 1970. The Governments of Australia, China, France, and the United Kingdom were invited to submit nominations for membership on the visiting mission.

COMMITTEE OF 24

The Committee of 24 and its subcommittee concerned with Pacific territories considered the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands at seven meetings during the year. As usual the U.S. Representative pointed out that the territory had recently and properly, as defined by the Charter, been considered by the Trusteeship Council, and thus the United States entered a general reservation regarding the Committee's consideration of the item.

The initial draft of the Committee's conclusions and recommendations as circulated in the subcommittee said in part that ". . . the Special Committee notes further that the administering authority contemplates a future status 'presumably involving a lasting political partnership' between the trust territory and the United States of America. The Special Committee considers that such a partnership should not be construed so as to prejudice the right of the indigenous population to self-determination and should be in accordance with their wishes."

The U.S. Representative rejected the implication that the United States had any intention of prejudging the outcome or that it intended to act in a manner contrary to the wishes of the Micronesian people. He pointed out that the Micronesian Political Status Commission had already proposed that the territory enter into a free association with the United States and that Ambassador

Phillips, in addressing the Trusteeship Council, was only reflecting the confidence of the United States that a mutually acceptable status of partnership could be devised. Furthermore, Ambassador Phillips had made it clear that the status must be consistent with the wishes of the majority of the Micronesian people and must be offered to them in an act of self-determination, which, as the Special Representative had stated, would be held in the presence of U.N. observers.

Reflecting this intervention, the subcommittee dropped the reference to the partnership and changed that portion of its report to say that it "considers that any future that the inhabitants of the territory decide upon for themselves in an act of self-determination should not in any way be prejudged."

Other sections of the conclusions and recommendations as adopted by the subcommittee reaffirmed the rights of the people of the territory to self-determination and independence in conformity with the Colonialism Declaration; reiterated its view that the question of size, isolation, and limited resources should in no way delay the implementation of the Declaration; expressed concern that there were still no Micronesians in top executive positions and urged the administration to rectify this immediately; noted that the territory's economic dependence on the United States had not decreased and expressed the view that outside investment should be controlled so that the territory did not become dependent on outside capital; requested the administration to redouble its efforts toward education and to create, at an early date, facilities for higher education; and reiterated its view on the value of a visiting mission from the Committee, requesting the United States to reconsider its position on such missions.

In addition to the general reservations already expressed, the U.S. Representative reminded the subcommittee that the Trusteeship Council was already planning to send a visiting mission to the territory in 1970.

The full Committee of 24 adopted the Subcommittee's conclusions and recommendations except that, at the suggestion of the Soviet Delegate, the section relating to prejudgment of the future was revised to state that the Committee "considers that the administering authority should not in any way prejudge the future of the trust territory upon which the inhabitants are to express themselves." The U.S. Representative, in addition to reiterating the reservation made before the subcommittee, assured the Committee that the people of the territory were examining various possibilities for their future, that they would have full opportunity for self-determination, and that his government would fully carry out its Charter obligations with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Trust Territory of New Guinea

The Trust Territory of New Guinea comprises the northeastern part of the island 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.

In June 1968 the population was estimated to exceed 1,697,000 of which over 20,000 were nonindigenous inhabitants, mostly Australians and Chinese.

The trust territory, which Australia administered in union with the neighboring Australian non-self-governing territory of Papua, presents formidable problems of administration. More than 700 different dialects are spoken in the territory which includes some of the world's most primitive people.

The Australian Representative pointed out that the objective of his government was to prepare the people of the territory for self-determination. As for the policy of Australia toward the future, the Minister for External Territories had set forth four basic points: (1) the future form of government is a choice for the people to make, as are the pace and nature of political development; (2) no unwanted changes will be imposed; (3) the people of the territory have the right to choose independence, but should they prefer continued association with Australia, agreement with the Australian Government at the time will be required; and (4) while it is not clear whether a question of association will even arise, it is in any case impossible for Australia to say now what kind of association will be acceptable.

COUNCIL REPORT

The Council reiterated its concern that a sense of nationhood had not yet developed in Papua and New Guinea in any marked degree. It was pleased to note that the territorial House of Assembly was taking an interest in this problem and urged the administration to use every opportunity to inform the people of the advantages of keeping together in a single country.

Political Advancement

The Council noted that the new constitutional arrangements seemed to be working well and that the ministerial members appeared to be tak-

ing an active role and to be gaining valuable experience. It noted that the House of Assembly was considering establishing a committee to study further possible changes and hoped that the House would study carefully both the current arrangements and the other possibilities. It continued to believe that further steps must be taken to broaden the real financial responsibility of the House.

The Council commended Australia for establishing a comprehensive program of political education and for sponsoring a program of foreign travel for some elected representatives and officials of the territory. It was concerned that only one political party remained active a year after the last elections and reiterated its belief that political parties could play a significant role both in political education and in developing national cohesiveness.

The Council noted Australia's efforts to strengthen the local government system and was pleased to note the increased expenditures of the local government councils. It was concerned at the lack of progress in furthering local government in the major urban centers and again urged the administration to follow the recommendations of the visiting mission in this regard.

The Council noted with particular approval the introduction of a single salary structure for indigenous and nonindigenous personnel. It was encouraged by the creation of a Public Service Board designed to increase efficiency and accelerate localization, and noted the latter program would be aided by the emphasis placed on education and training in the new development plan.

Economic Advancement

The Council welcomed the Five-Year Economic Development Plan which, with its dual emphasis on increased production and on increasing

the role of the local population, should promote greater economic self-reliance in the territory and prepare the way for meaningful self-determination. It noted with approval the administration's continuing efforts to attract needed outside capital while at the same time protecting indigenous interests and consulting with them as appropriate.

The Council again welcomed the increase both in the administration's budgetary grant to the territory and in the capital of the Papua and New Guinea Development Bank. It urged the administration to continue to further agricultural production, particularly products for export, and noted with interest the New Britain palm oil project which appeared to combine a number of sound development principles. The Council renewed its recommendation that further efforts be made to exploit the territory's forestry resources. It again noted the importance of solving the land tenure problems if orderly development of the land was to take place. It noted with interest the proposed Bougainville copper project and believed that the project, with its combination of outside capital and local participation, would be of substantial benefit to the territory and its people.

Social and Educational Advancement

The Council again urged that steps be taken to encourage the labor union movement and welcomed the machinery created to settle disputes in the public service. It hoped that there would be steady expansion of health services, with increasing emphasis on public health education.

The Council noted the major efforts being placed on education and particularly the emphasis in the Five-Year Plan on various aspects of this problem. It noted the efforts to coordinate public and private school programs, to improve teacher train-

ing, and to institute vocational training at all levels; and it urged that these efforts be continued and expanded. The Council renewed its recommendation that the two separate school systems be abolished in favor of integrated schools and again pointed out its belief that local history, culture, and traditions needed to receive major emphasis in the curricula of both primary and secondary schools.

Timetable for Self-Government or Independence

The Council noted the success of the recently instituted constitutional reforms and the fact that attention was already being given to possible next steps in the evolution toward self-determination. It also noted the statement by a Special Advisor, the New Guinean Ministerial Member for Labor, that the majority of the members of the House favored a cautious approach toward changing the territory's status and felt strongly that the future is theirs to decide without interference or direction by others. The Council noted the administration's pledge to leave both the choice of their future and the pace toward this choice to the people.

Recalling its previous recommendations, the Council welcomed the administration's assurance that Australia will continue to provide financial and other assistance even after self-determination, but felt a more detailed and explicit commitment would be an important contribution to the ability of the people to exercise their rights. It again urged the administration to expand its program of political education to include discussions of the possibilities for the future.

COMMITTEE OF 24

The Committee of 24 considered New Guinea together with Papua and on October 29 adopted a report

which, in its conclusions and recommendations, reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the territory to self-determination and independence in conformance with the Colonialism Declaration. While noting the role of indigenous members resulting from the constitutional reforms of the House, the Committee still felt progress toward implementation of the Declaration was too slow; called on the administration to take all steps to allow the people to participate fully in their own affairs; and called for renewed efforts to localize the public service. It also called for renewed efforts, in view of the current dominance of agriculture, to diversify and industrialize the territory's economy while at the same time eliminating its dependence on Australia. The Committee asked for further reports on the progress of the Five-Year Plan and said steps should be taken to ensure that the territory did not become dependent on foreign interests for development capital. It called for steps to permit a higher percentage of students to attend school, to provide for fully integrated schooling, and to increase facilities for higher education and training. Finally, the Committee reiterated its view of the importance of sending a visiting mission to the territory and asked the administration to reconsider its position.

The U.S. Representative, in addition to a statement generally praising Australia's efforts to meet the difficult problems posed by New Guinea, specifically pointed out that the Trusteeship Council sent periodic visiting missions to the territory and thus such missions from the Committee inevitably meant a duplication of work and seemed unnecessary.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Assembly's Fourth Committee, after considering both the Trusteeship Council and the Committee of 24 reports, adopted a resolution which *inter alia* reaffirmed previous resolu-

tions on Papua and New Guinea, called on Australia to transfer full executive and legislative power to the people in accordance with their wishes; requested that the education and technical and administrative training of the people be accelerated; and requested the Trusteeship Council, in forming its periodic visiting missions to the territory, to include non-Council members in consultation with the Committee of 24 and the administering authority in accordance with the U.N. Charter. This last provision was a compromise agreed upon in lieu of earlier proposals that would have called on the General Assembly itself to send a visiting mission or have asked that the Trusteeship Council and Committee of 24 jointly appoint a visiting mission from the membership of the two bodies. The reference in the compromise to acting in accord with the U.N. Charter was adopted at the suggestion of the Soviet Representative. The draft resolution was adopted December 12 by a vote of 87 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions.

The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Finger, in an explanation of vote stated that, while the United States agreed that all procedures should be in keeping with the provisions of the U.N. Charter, the U.S. interpretation of the Charter did not agree with that of the Soviet delegation and certain others with respect to the draft resolution. Furthermore, the United States could not reaffirm past resolutions concerning which it had already expressed reservations. As for the references to the composition of the visiting mission, the United States considered they could only be considered as a recommendation to the Trusteeship Council. The final decision would rest with the Council and any action taken with regard to a visiting mission to New Guinea should not serve as a precedent for any visiting mission to other trust territories.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 16 without

debate by a vote of 112 (Australia and U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions.

Committee of 24

The General Assembly in 1961 established a 17-member Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In 1962 the Committee was enlarged to 24 members.¹

In 1969 the Committee held 73 plenary meetings, including 24 during a 2-week trip to Africa which saw the Committee visit Kinshasa, Lusaka, and Dar es Salaam. Neither the United States nor the United Kingdom participated in the trip to Africa. The U.S. Representative pointed out to the Committee that the United States had previously expressed its reservations concerning travel away from Headquarters by the full Committee, particularly since the results produced were not commensurate with the expenditures of time and money involved.

The Committee was again chaired by Mahmoud Mestiri of Tunisia until his departure on August 20 for a new assignment. Thereafter, Vice Chairman Nava Carrillo of Venezuela served as acting chairman for the remaining Committee meetings.

¹In 1969 the Committee had the following members: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Malagasy Republic, Mali, Norway, Poland, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tanzania, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. Australia was the 24th member, but in a letter dated January 18, 1969, the Permanent Representative of Australia informed the Secretary-General that Australia had decided to withdraw from the Committee. No decision was taken during the year on a replacement.

Visiting Missions

The chairman, acting in accordance with the Committee's resolution of September 19, 1968, sought consultations with the administering powers concerning the possibility of their receiving visiting missions from the Committee. The Representatives of Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States agreed to consult with the chairman, but in each case the representatives said that the attitudes of their governments toward visiting missions remained unchanged. The U.S. Representative told the chairman that the United States had given careful consideration to his presentation, but remained of the view that visiting missions to its territories were not warranted at this time.

On August 15, after considering the report of the chairman on the results of his consultations, the Committee once again adopted a resolution regretting that the administering powers continued to frustrate the wishes of the Committee to send visiting missions to their territories and urging these powers to reconsider their attitudes. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 17 to 0, with 4 abstentions (U.S.). The U.S. Representative in explanation of vote pointed out that U.S. territories were completely open societies with full freedom of press and speech. Their progress toward self-determination had been steady and continuing without the need of any assistance from a visiting mission. He pointed out further that the United States

supplied full and complete information on each of its territories to the Secretary-General in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Territories Considered in 1969

During 1969 the Committee considered the following territories:

American Samoa	New Hebrides
Antigua	Niue
Bahamas	Oman
Bermuda	Papua
British Honduras	Pitcairn
British Virgin Islands	Portuguese territories
Brunei	St. Helena
Cayman Islands	St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla
Cocos (Keeling) Islands	St. Lucia
Dominica	St. Vincent
Falkland Islands	Seychelles
Fiji	Solomon Islands
French Territory of the Afars and the Issas	Southern Rhodesia
Gibraltar	Spanish Sahara
Gilbert and Ellice Islands	Tokelau Islands
Grenada	Trust Territory of New Guinea
Guam	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Hong Kong	Turks and Caicos Islands
Ifni	U.S. Virgin Islands
Montserrat	
Namibia	

See separate sections of this report for Committee consideration of the following territories: Namibia (p. 181), Oman (p. 43), Portuguese territories (p. 184), Southern Rhodesia (p. 186), Trust Territory of New Guinea (also covering Papua) (p. 167), and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (p. 164). The consideration of these territories and those described below were of particular interest to the United States.

GIBRALTAR

The question of Gibraltar was notable for the almost total lack of attention which it received in either the Committee of 24 or the General Assembly; this despite the request of

the previous General Assembly for the United Kingdom to end the colonial status of the territory by October 1, 1969. The Committee considered the item at only one meeting and decided to defer consideration until its next session, taking any guidance which the General Assembly might choose to provide. The Assembly, however, took no action with regard to the item, apparently in view of the reported resumption of bilateral efforts by Spain and the United Kingdom to reach a settlement of the question.

IFNI AND SPANISH SAHARA

The Committee devoted its attention almost exclusively to the process by which sovereignty over Ifni was transferred from Spain to Morocco. The instruments of ratification of the Treaty of Fez, which effected the transfer, were exchanged on May 13, 1969, and by mutual agreement the transfer occurred on June 30. On September 25 the Committee took note of this development and agreed to conclude its consideration of Ifni.

The Committee decided to continue its discussion of Spanish Sahara at its next session, subject to the guidance of the General Assembly. On December 9 the Assembly's Fourth Committee adopted a draft resolution on Spanish Sahara which had been introduced by Ghana on behalf of nine cosponsors and was similar to those of the previous 2 years. *Inter alia*, it again called on Spain to determine, in accordance with the wishes of the people and in consultation with Mauritania and Morocco as interested parties, the procedures for holding a referendum to allow the people their right of self-determination. The resolution also repeated the request that the Secretary-General consult with the Spanish Representative to arrange for a visiting mission. However, the resolution added a new

paragraph which regretted that the consultations regarding the referendum requested the previous year had not taken place. The draft resolution was adopted by a vote of 89 to 0, with 7 abstentions (Spain and U.S.). Only the Spanish Representative spoke in explanation of vote, citing the new paragraph as the reason for his delegation's abstention. The General Assembly, in plenary session, adopted the resolution on December 16 without debate by a vote of 110 to 0, with 5 abstentions (Spain and U.S.).

WEST INDIES ASSOCIATED STATES

The Committee of 24 continued its discussion of the territories of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, and St. Lucia (otherwise known as the West Indies Associated States), and St. Vincent.

On March 19, at the suggestion of Mali, the Committee decided to consider on an urgent basis the question of St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and specifically the situation in the latter island. The Committee discussed the item at three meetings and heard a petitioner on the question. On March 21 the Committee adopted a consensus in which it expressed its grave concern at the landing of British troops on Anguilla, deemed it necessary to send urgently a visiting group from the Committee to the territory, and called on the United Kingdom to assist in this effort. The United Kingdom did not participate in this discussion. The U.S. Representative, both when the item was proposed for consideration and when the consensus was offered, expressed reservations regarding the Committee's involvement in the matter since, as the result of an act of self-determination, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla had achieved a full measure of internal self-government. The U.S. Representative specifically stated that

the United States was not participating in the consensus.

At subsequent meetings the Committee, and its appropriate subcommittee, considered all of the associated states. As in previous years, the U.K. Representative limited his comments to St. Vincent, which had not yet achieved the status of associated statehood. He was able to report, however, that the constitutional problems which had delayed St. Vincent's evolution to this new status had been resolved and that on October 27 it would, as an associated state, join the other territories in achieving a full measure of self-government, including the right to terminate unilaterally the association at any time.

On October 21 the Committee adopted, by a vote of 18 to 4 (U.S.), its conclusions and recommendations on the territories which *inter alia* reaffirmed the rights of the peoples involved to self-determination and independence and the applicability of the Colonialism Declaration to the territories; regretted that the United Kingdom had not responded to its consensus on Anguilla; called on the United Kingdom to transfer all powers to the peoples of the territories, without any conditions or reservations; and again reiterated its belief that a U.N. presence was necessary at the time of self-determination in order to ensure full freedom of choice.

With regard to St. Vincent, the Committee called on the United Kingdom to receive immediately a visiting mission to the territory and to allow the people free expression of views on their future status before any decisions were made regarding new constitutional arrangements.

The U.S. Representative said the United States believed that the associated states had achieved a full measure of self-government in conformity with the U.N. Charter and that it would save much time and money if the Committee ceased to

consider these territories. As for St. Vincent, the United States believed that the United Kingdom had now met the obligations of the Charter in this case as well. The Committee had chosen to ignore the facts presented by the administering authority. This would neither help the people of St. Vincent nor stimulate the administering authority to cooperate more effectively with the Committee.

Assembly Action

The General Assembly, in addition to including the Associated States in an omnibus resolution on small territories (see below), also adopted a separate resolution on these states which was sponsored by Ghana and Nigeria in the Fourth Committee. The resolution called on the Committee of 24 to give close attention to the debate in the Fourth Committee regarding these territories and specifically to a draft resolution introduced by four Caribbean states (but not pressed to a vote) which recognized the rights of any associated state unilaterally to terminate its association with the United Kingdom and affirmed the Assembly's support for any choice the people might make in this regard. The Committee of 24 was asked to report the results of its consideration to the General Assembly at its next session. On December 12 the draft resolution was approved by the Fourth Committee without debate by a vote of 63 to 0, with 26 abstentions (U.S.), and later adopted by the General Assembly on December 16 by a vote of 90 to 0, with 22 abstentions (U.S.). The United Kingdom did not participate.

The Fourth Committee also adopted a draft resolution on information from non-self-governing territories transmitted in accordance with the U.N. Charter that included a paragraph in which the General Assembly, having noted the U.K. statement that St. Vincent had achieved full self-government, considered that

in the absence of a specific decision by the Assembly itself the United Kingdom should continue to transmit information on the territory as a non-self-governing entity. At the request of the United Kingdom, a separate paragraph vote was taken on this provision, with the result that it was adopted by a vote of 51 to 11 (U.K. and U.S.), with 19 abstentions. When the resolution was considered by the General Assembly in plenary, a separate paragraph vote was again called for with a resulting vote of 66 to 14 (U.K. and U.S.), with 19 abstentions.

SMALL TERRITORIES

A number of small territories considered separately or in groups by the Committee of 24 were later dealt with together in an omnibus resolution by the General Assembly.

Guam and American Samoa

In considering these U.S. territories the Committee had available not only the working paper prepared by the Secretariat but also the report presented by the U.S. Representative on the latest developments in the territories.

On July 3 the Committee adopted its report in which it *inter alia*: (1) considered that the economy of Guam, notwithstanding attempts to expand it, continued to revolve around the existence of military bases in the territory and believed this dependence should be brought to an end; (2) considered that although recent constitutional developments, particularly in Guam, constituted a step toward self-government, they tended in both territories to perpetuate association with the United States; and (3) invited the United States to reconsider its position toward receiving a visiting mission in the territories.

The U.S. Representative expressed reservations regarding every para-

graph of the Committee's report and specifically pointed out that:

(1) There was a healthy civilian economy on Guam and the United States was continuing its efforts to expand and diversify it. Considering the progress toward self-government, one could hardly say that the military bases had adversely affected the decolonization process.

(2) The United States could not accept the implication that association with the United States was not an acceptable culmination of the self-determination process. It was up to the people of the territories to decide what they wanted and the constitutional advances made in both territories had been taken in response to the expressed wishes and aspirations of the peoples concerned.

(3) Visiting missions were not necessary since complete freedom of information prevailed in both territories.

Seychelles and St. Helena

The Committee again considered the Seychelles and St. Helena and on June 19 adopted a report which *inter alia* reiterated its decision that any action by the United Kingdom alone, or in conjunction with the United States or any other power, to construct military bases in the so-called British Indian Ocean Territory (B.I.O.T.) was incompatible with the U.N. Charter and would lead to increased tension in Africa and Asia. It again urged the United Kingdom to respect the territorial integrity of the Seychelles by returning islands earlier detached from it; and called upon the administration to prevent infiltration of foreign economic interests, to improve the social situation in the territories, and not to impose any future status on the territories not freely accepted by the population.

The U.S. Representative said his delegation had a number of reservations on the report, feeling that it did not reflect adequately the progress toward self-government and self-deter-

mination in the territories during the year. He said the United States in particular could not accept the references in the report regarding the alleged significance of any possible plans to construct military bases in the B.I.O.T.

U.S. Virgin Islands

The Committee, in its consideration of the territory, had available the statement of the U.S. Representative before the subcommittee concerned, as well as the working paper prepared by the Secretariat. On October 2 the Committee adopted its report in which it *inter alia*: (1) reaffirmed past conclusions and recommendations, and the right of the people to self-determination and independence; (2) noted with regret that there had been no significant constitutional progress during the year; (3) invited the United States to encourage open, free, and public discussions on the various alternatives open to the people regarding their future status and to ensure that the people would exercise their right of self-determination with full knowledge of these alternatives; and (4) reiterated its belief that a U.N. presence would be essential to ensure that the people exercise their right of self-determination in full freedom.

The U.S. Representative noted that his delegation deeply regretted the negative tone of the report and the fact that it did not reflect either the developments in the territory or the discussion which had taken place in the subcommittee. Instead, it seemed to be based on preconceptions and the desire to place on record positions that changed little from year to year. He pointed with particular disappointment to the fact that a most significant development—the passage of the Virgin Islands Elective Governor Bill—had been completely ignored, while the paragraph encouraging discussions of alternatives ignored the extensive open debate, involving all

walks of life, which had taken place regarding the future of the islands. He regretted that the Committee had decided—unlike the previous year—not to mention the real problems imposed by the small size and population of the territory. Finally, he said that his delegation did not feel that a U.N. presence was in any way essential to ensure that the people realized their right of self-determination.

Assembly Action

On December 10 a draft resolution dealing with 25 small territories was circulated in the Fourth Committee under sponsorship of nine members. In its preambular paragraphs it *inter alia* expressed regret that some administering powers established military bases in territories in contravention of relevant General Assembly resolutions and deplored the attitude of administering powers which refused to receive visiting missions. In its operative paragraphs the resolution *inter alia* expressed the conviction that size and limited resources should in no way delay implementation of the Colonialism Declaration; reiterated that any attempt to disrupt “the national unity and territorial integrity of colonial territories and the establishment of military bases and installations in these territories” was incompatible with the U.N. Charter and the Colonialism Declaration; and strongly urged the administering authorities to reconsider their attitude toward visiting missions.

On December 11 the U.S. Representative sought clarification concerning the operative paragraph regarding attempts to disrupt the national unity and the establishment of military bases. Specifically he inquired if the sponsors intended to establish a connection between such threats to unity and territorial integrity on the one hand and military bases on the other. He pointed out that many territories maintained their national

unity while having bases on their soil. He wondered whether it was implied that disruption of national unity and territorial integrity was permissible so long as no bases were established. He also inquired what part of the U.N. Charter dealt with such “attempts” and with the establishment of military bases in colonial territories and whether the Charter stipulated that military bases necessarily disrupted national unity and territorial integrity.

On December 12, since the sponsors did not agree to alter the text of the operative paragraph on military bases, the U.S. Representative suggested that the entire paragraph be deleted. This suggestion was rejected by a vote of 18 (U.S.) to 51, with 19 abstentions. The U.K. Representative proposed that references to the West Indies Associated States be deleted from the draft, but this amendment was also defeated by a vote of 20 (U.S.) to 59, with 17 abstentions. The Committee then adopted the draft resolution as a whole by a vote of 68 to 1, with 22 abstentions (U.S.). The General Assembly in plenary session on December 16 adopted the resolution without debate by a vote of 88 to 1, with 26 abstentions (U.S.).

Activities of Foreign Economic and Other Interests

Acting on the request of the General Assembly, the Committee of 24 continued its consideration of the topic “Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the . . . [Colonialism Declaration] in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, and Territories under Portuguese domination and all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.”

On October 29 the Committee adopted its report which contained *inter alia* these conclusions:

(1) The countries whose "monopolies" are impeding progress toward self-determination continue to do nothing to restrain these interests and to implement previous General Assembly resolutions—in fact the monopolies in question have "consolidated and expanded the process of economic exploitation."

(2) As they are now operating, foreign economic and other interests continue to constitute a major obstacle to political independence as well as social and economic justice.

(3) In southern Africa the activities of foreign monopolies serve to strengthen the "reactionary regimes" of South Africa, Portugal, and Southern Rhodesia—and to a large extent the failure of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia is due to the "support and collaboration" that regime receives from these "monopolies."

The report condemned the activities of these foreign economic and other interests and deplored the attitudes of the states concerned that failed to implement the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions on the matter. It called on all states to take steps to stop the supply to colonial regimes of funds and other forms of assistance which are used to suppress national liberation movement.

There was a separate vote on the paragraph of the report stating that these interests constituted a major obstacle to political independence and economic and social justice, with the result that it was approved by a vote of 16 to 2 (U.K. and U.S.), with 3 abstentions. The report as a whole was adopted by a vote of 17 to 0, with 4 abstentions (U.S.). The U.S. Representative explained that his delegation did not consider that the recommendations applied to the

United States or to territories under U.S. administration. Moreover, he regretted that the report still appeared to be drawn on the basis of facts sought out to support preconceived conclusions. He said that the United States firmly rejected the idea that foreign economic investment was in any way an impediment to the achievement of self-determination—and 250 years of history firmly supported the U.S. position.

ASSEMBLY ACTION

The Fourth Committee of the General Assembly on December 9 adopted a draft resolution on this item which had been introduced by Tanzania on behalf of 17 cosponsors. As in past years, the resolution was essentially a reaffirmation of past General Assembly resolutions on the subject and an expression of approval for the Committee of 24 report. The draft resolution was adopted by a vote of 94 to 2, with 17 abstentions (U.S.). In a statement before the vote the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Finger, pointed out the inconsistency between this resolution and those of other U.N. bodies designed to encourage foreign investment in developing countries; the United States was proud of its record of encouraging the positive form of development represented by private and public foreign investment as contrasted to the supply of arms and propaganda favored by some states. He pointed out that misleading statements on this subject, made with the endorsement of the United Nations, harmed not only the people seeking development, but the reputation of the United Nations itself. He was certain that no delegation wished deliberately to impede the constructive efforts of various U.N. organizations in helping dependent territories and

peoples prepare themselves for autonomy.

The General Assembly considered the draft resolution on December 12 in plenary and adopted it without debate by a vote of 80 to 2, with 18 abstentions (U.S.).

Military Activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories

The Committee of 24 considered military activities in non-self-governing territories as a separate item on its agenda, and on October 29 adopted its report which included among its conclusions and recommendations the following points:

(1) The structure, objectives, and purposes of military establishments in colonial countries remain essentially unchanged and therefore continue to constitute one of the most serious impediments to the implementation of the Colonialism Declaration.

(2) The situation in southern Africa poses an even greater threat to international peace and security. The governments of Portugal, South Africa, and Southern Rhodesia have strengthened their military holds over African territories and have increased their activities against national "liberation movements."

(3) The "entente" between the forces of South Africa and those of Portugal and Southern Rhodesia poses a formidable threat to the independence and territorial integrity of neighboring African states.

(4) In the case of smaller territories such as Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Bermuda, and others, it was obvious that the military activities went far beyond the needs of local defense and that they were directed

against third parties in the global strategy of the colonial powers. As a result the military and strategic requirements of the administering powers were prevailing over the interests of the people.

(5) The Committee deplored the attitudes of the administering powers which have not complied with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions calling for the dismantling of existing military bases and the refraining from establishing new ones.

(6) The Committee again requested colonial powers to cease alienating land belonging to the people of the territories for use as military bases and to return all such land already taken.

The U.S. Representative, in a statement prior to the vote, regretted that once again broad conclusions were drawn without solid substantiation in fact or logic. The U.S. view of these conclusions was well known and need not be repeated. However, in citing alleged activities in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Committee was not only ignoring the rights of the United States in this strategic trust territory as defined by the Trusteeship Agreement, but also the exclusive authority of the Security Council to make any amendments to these provisions. The U.S. Representative said that he cited this point only as a glaring example of the report's inconsistency with the U.N. Charter. He urged that the Committee not adopt the report since to do so would only raise a question about the seriousness of the Committee's approach to problems concerned with colonialism. Nevertheless the report was adopted by a vote of 16 to 2 (U.K. and U.S.), with 3 abstentions.

The General Assembly considered this item only in the context of the report of the Committee of 24 and limited its action on the matter to one paragraph in the general colonialism resolution (see below p. 178).

Activities of Specialized Agencies

In continuing its examination of the implementation of the Colonialism Declaration by the U.N. specialized agencies, the Committee had available the Secretary-General's report on his consultations with the agencies on their implementation of relevant General Assembly resolutions.

The Committee also considered the report of its chairman on his consultation with the President of ECOSOC in which the chairman stated *inter alia* that he had (1) expressed appreciation for the efforts to date of the specialized agencies to implement the Declaration; (2) emphasized the need for increased assistance from the agencies to refugees from colonial territories; (3) urged that, in order to facilitate assistance to national liberation movements, the agencies should establish working agreements with the Organization of African Unity; (4) pointed out the need for greater interagency cooperation and more flexible procedures; and (5) suggested that heads of specialized agencies be urged to inform their legislative bodies of any problems they encountered in implementing the relevant General Assembly resolutions so that the member states could make the necessary policy or other changes.

After consideration of these reports, the acting chairman attempted to formulate a consensus on the item that could be approved by the Committee. Several delegations, including the United States, pointed out, however, that his draft consensus contained language identical to that their delegations had been forced to oppose when included in General Assembly resolutions. Thus not only could they not support the proposed consensus, but these delegations wondered whether a consensus was an ap-

propriate vehicle when there were obvious differences of view.

Therefore a resolution was introduced and subsequently adopted on October 2 which *inter alia* (1) expressed deep regret that some specialized agencies had not fully cooperated in implementing the relevant General Assembly resolutions; (2) called for increased assistance by the agencies to refugees from colonial territories; (3) recommended that the specialized agencies give all possible assistance to peoples struggling to liberate themselves from colonial rule, and in particular that the agencies work out with the Organization of African Unity and the liberation movements concrete programs for assisting the oppressed people of Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, and the Portuguese territories; (4) appealed for all types of assistance to be withheld from Portugal and South Africa until they renounce their policies of racial discrimination and colonial domination; and (5) invited the governing bodies of the various agencies to consider any problems which stood in the way of implementing the relevant resolutions.

The vote on the resolution was 13 to 0, with 5 abstentions (U.S.). The U.S. Representative stated in explanation of vote that, as the United States had pointed out in previous considerations of this item, a number of the provisions of the resolution were inconsistent with the agreements between some of the specialized agencies and the United Nations and in some cases with the statutes of the agencies themselves.

ASSEMBLY ACTION

On December 5 the Democratic Republic of the Congo, acting on behalf of 20 cosponsors, introduced in the Fourth Committee a draft resolution on this subject which essentially repeated the points made by the Committee of 24. In addition it, *inter alia*, singled out the IBRD and the

IMF in recommending the elimination of assistance to Portugal and South Africa and recommended that all specialized agencies, particularly ICAO, ITU, UPU, and IMCO, take all steps to end collaboration with South Africa, Portugal, and Southern Rhodesia.

On December 10 the draft resolution was adopted by a vote of 58 to 4 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. The U.S. negative vote as compared to its abstention in the Committee of 24 was the result of the additional paragraph calling for the exclusion of specific countries from the various specialized agencies. The General Assembly on December 12 in plenary session adopted the resolution without debate by a vote of 76 to 5 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions.

General Colonialism Resolution

At the 24th General Assembly, as in previous years, the chapter of the Committee of 24 report reviewing the Committee's work and containing recommendations for its activities in 1970 was debated in plenary session. This chapter stated, *inter alia*, that the Committee proposed to continue with much the same program as in 1969 including making suggestions to assist the Security Council in considering appropriate steps regarding threats to international peace and security arising in colonial territories.

Tenth Anniversary of the Colonialism Declaration

The 23d General Assembly decided to establish a Preparatory Committee

It would recommend to the Assembly the most appropriate methods and also steps to be taken in enabling small territories to exercise their right to self-determination. It would continue to investigate foreign economic interests, military bases, and the activities of specialized agencies. It was ready to prepare the documentation envisaged in connection with the 10th anniversary of the Declaration (see below) and would once again consider holding meetings away from Headquarters.

ASSEMBLY ACTION

After the Committee's report had been considered in plenary at a number of sessions, a lengthy resolution was introduced on behalf of 20 co-sponsors which was very similar to those submitted the past 2 years. In its operative paragraphs it *inter alia* approved the report of the Committee of 24 and called on all states to implement its recommendations; declared that continued colonial rule threatened international peace and security; reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of people for the right of self-determination and noted with pleasure the progress made by the national liberation movements; requested colonial powers to dismantle existing military bases in their territories and to refrain from establishing new ones; and urged the administering powers to accept visiting missions. The resolution was adopted on December 11 by a vote of 78 to 5 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions.

for the 10th anniversary of the Colonialism Declaration, to be com-

posed of the members of the Committee of 24 plus six others. The Committee was asked to prepare a special program of activities for 1970 with a view to finding further ways and means of expediting the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration.

The Preparatory Committee, with Algeria, Canada, Ghana, Indonesia, Mongolia, and Trinidad and Tobago selected for the additional seats, first met on March 25 and elected Ambassador Mahmoud Mestiri of Tunisia as chairman. The Committee met 11 times during the year, while its Working Group,¹ which was assigned responsibility for preparing the draft program of activities, met 6 times.

On July 11 the Working Group submitted a report which observed that the anniversary provided a good opportunity to review past attempts to implement the Declaration, assess the shortcomings, envisage new methods of implementation, and formulate new principles in light of this evaluation. To this end it proposed a program including, *inter alia*:

(1) A special commemorative meeting to which, in addition to member states and various international bodies, representatives of dependent peoples and national liberation movements might be invited. This could be held in conjunction with the U.N. 25th anniversary meeting and could conclude with the adoption of a new declaration or elaborate program to deal with the remaining vestiges of colonialism.

(2) Activities by the specialized agencies and other international and nongovernmental bodies, including special studies and seminars, and concrete programs to assist refugees and national liberation movements.

(3) Preparation by the U.N. Secretariat of a comprehensive compendium on the subject of decolonization not only to assist in preparing new declarations, but also to mobilize public opinion—with the Secretary-General making a major effort to disseminate information on the subject.

(4) Adoption of a motto, "Freedom and Progress," and the issuance of a stamp on this theme.

(5) Consideration by the Secretary-General of establishing contact with youth throughout the world with the aim of mobilizing this segment of public opinion on the subject.

(6) Efforts, both at the regional and national level, not only to publicize the efforts to eliminate colonialism, but also, where applicable, to take active steps to assist in these efforts.

During the Committee's consideration of these recommendations the U.S. Representative *inter alia* supported the idea of drawing up concrete programs to assist refugees, but pointed out that no action could be taken with regard to national liberation movements that was inconsistent with the U.N. Charter or the statutes of the various specialized agencies. He also expressed the hope that the documentation prepared would not be so voluminous as to be unmanageable, and that it would serve as background so that delegations could draw their own conclusions rather than have them presented readymade.

After considering the various comments, the Working Group made several revisions in its recommendations, most notably suggesting that the Committee of 24 be asked to prepare a draft declaration or a specific program of action for consideration at the special commemorative meeting. It also placed the prime responsibility for preparing the analytical study of decolonization on the Committee of 24, with assistance from the Secretariat, rather than on the Secretariat alone. With these changes the recom-

¹ Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Canada, Ecuador, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Italy, Poland, Tanzania, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia.

mendations of the Working Group were adopted by the Preparatory Committee without further objection.

The General Assembly considered the report of the Preparatory Committee in plenary and on December 4 adopted a resolution which *inter alia* approved the report and endorsed its recommendations regarding the program of activities to be undertaken. It requested the Committee of 24, in preparing the draft declaration or suggested program of action, to cooperate with other U.N. bodies concerned and to follow, in consultation

with the Committee on the 25th Anniversary, the implementation of the recommendations in the report and to report to the General Assembly at its next session.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 90 (U.S.) to 2, with 1 abstention, after which the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Black, explained that the United States had voted in favor of the resolution because of U.S. dedication to the principle of self-determination for all peoples. She reiterated, however, U.S. reservations regarding certain aspects of the report.

Namibia

The question of Namibia was considered in numerous U.N. bodies, including the Security Council, during 1969. The United Nations is particularly concerned with Namibia because of the special international status of the territory and has urged the South African Government to withdraw its administration from the territory pursuant to an October 28, 1966, General Assembly resolution. In this resolution, which the United States supported, the Assembly (1) declared that South Africa had forfeited the mandate and (2) assumed direct responsibility for Namibia.

In a letter of February 28 the President of the U.N. Council for Namibia¹ expressed that Council's deep concern with the internal situation in Namibia and its desire for urgent Security Council consideration. Two weeks later, on March 14, 46 nations submitted a formal request for a Security Council meeting.

¹ Chile, Colombia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Turkey, U.A.R., Yugoslavia, and Zambia.

First Security Council Consideration

The Security Council meeting was limited to one day, March 20, largely because prior consultations had been held. The Zambian Representative, in introducing a draft resolution, thanked delegations for their advice and support. The resolution was sponsored by six states (Colombia, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, and Zambia) and adopted by a vote of 13 (U.S.) to 0, with 2 abstentions (France and U.K.).

The resolution recognized the General Assembly's assumption of direct responsibility for Namibia until its independence and contained several provisions opposing certain acts of the South African Government. It called upon South Africa to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately. It requested the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the resolution, and, in the event South Africa failed to comply, the Council decided it would meet

again "to determine upon necessary steps or measures."

The **Zambian Representative** stated that the cosponsors of the resolution attached great importance to the paragraph declaring that "the Government of South Africa has no right to enact the 'South-West Africa Affairs Bill,' as such an enactment would be a violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly." He said the real purpose of the bill is Namibia's formal annexation by South Africa.

The **U.S. Representative, Ambassador Yost**, stated that the United States is "firmly dedicated to the achievement of freedom and independence by the people of Namibia. For our part, the United States is willing to take every peaceful and practical step under the Charter which would assist, or would be likely to assist, in the achievement of this goal." He said that the United States was able to support the draft resolution "because it wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. . . . In our judgment, this is not a situation which can sensibly and humanely be remedied by mandatory sanctions." Ambassador Yost then called upon the South African Government "to make a fresh effort, in cooperation with the United Nations, to resolve the problem," by such means as receiving unconditionally a special representative of the Secretary-General to discuss Namibia.

South Africa's Reply

On April 30 the South African Government replied to the Security Council through the Secretary-General by transmitting a March 20 statement by the Foreign Minister in the South African Senate. The Foreign Minister refuted the Council for Namibia's charges of illegal actions by South Africa with regard to the

treatment of Namibians. He stated that "there is no legal basis for the activities of the so-called Council for South-West Africa or for Security Council intervention." He then repeated an earlier statement by the Prime Minister that the proposed changes in the territory were for better administration and "would not affect the separate international status of South-West Africa."

An extract from a public address by the South African Prime Minister on March 21 was also transmitted. It consisted of a reply to Ambassador Yost's "friendly suggestion" on meeting with a special U.N. representative. The Prime Minister said that he could not receive such a representative unconditionally but that South Africa was "willing to receive a personal representative of the Secretary-General, if we could be assured that factual information put at his disposal would not simply be ignored as had often happened in the past," and provided the representative was acceptable to both sides.

There was no further action during the year on sending a special representative.

Committee of 24

Toward the end of its African trip the Committee of 24 on May 22 adopted a consensus¹ on the question of Namibia that expressed concern at South African actions in Namibia, including the imposition of apartheid, the creation of "bantustans" or self-governing homelands, and the virtual annexation of the territory. The Committee deplored the outside support for South Africa and called upon "the Governments concerned immediately to cease extending assistance and cooperation to South Africa." The consensus also called for

¹ The United States and the United Kingdom did not participate in the trip and did not join in the consensus.

support of the Namibians' struggle for freedom and expressed the hope that the Security Council would meet to determine the necessary steps to take in view of South Africa's failure to comply with the Council's resolution.

The Committee adopted a second consensus on July 3 because of the South African action in placing a group of Namibians on trial under the South African Terrorism Act of 1967. The consensus expressed the Committee's grave concern at South Africa's illegal action in committing the group to trial, recalled that the action was in violation of both General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, and expressed the view that the Council should "consider urgently effective steps or measures" to obtain South Africa's compliance with its decisions.

The United States joined in the second consensus because it shared the "general feeling of profound indignation" at the trial, but explained that it could not associate itself with any language that could be construed as predetermining its position on any action the Security Council might take.

Second Security Council Consideration

The 11 members of the Council for Namibia submitted a request on July 24 for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the South African Government's "wholly negative reaction" to the Security Council resolution of March 20. Fifty-one other U.N. members associated themselves with the request for a Security Council meeting.

The situation in Namibia was considered by the Security Council from July 30 to August 12, when a resolution was adopted by a vote of 11 to 0, with 4 abstentions (Finland, France, U.K., and U.S.). The resolution, *inter alia*, condemned the South

African Government "for its persistent defiance of the authority of the United Nations," recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibians and requested increased moral and material assistance to these people, and called upon South Africa to withdraw its administration from Namibia no later than October 4. The resolution also provided that, should South Africa fail to meet this deadline, the Security Council "will meet immediately to determine upon effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the relevant chapters of the United Nations Charter."

Ambassador Yost expressed U.S. agreement with the views of the other delegations on the facts of the state of affairs in Namibia and its causes, and stated that "South Africa introduces into a territory where it has no right to govern the worst features of that racially discriminatory rule which is its own unhappy trademark." He then addressed himself to remarks made by representatives of other delegations in which they had stated that the time had come to adopt measures under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter. Indicating the inability of the United States to support that view, he said that "despite our indignation at the callous behavior of the illegitimate occupying authority, we should all be careful not to embark on an unrealistic course of action which could have the opposite result from the one we intend." He pointed to the findings of a committee of experts that South Africa "would not be readily susceptible" to economic sanctions and to the particular comments of the committee on "the psychological effects of these measures along with South Africa's present economic capacity to withstand such measures and the will of its people to do so."

Concerning the United Nations itself, Ambassador Yost stated that it would not serve the purpose of strengthening the organization "if we

were prematurely to impose upon the United Nations burdens which it is still incapable of carrying, to demand that it fulfill tasks which we member states have not yet collectively given it the power to fulfill." However, he added that "we should keep the pressure of world opinion focused on the actions of the illegal occupying authority in violation of the Charter" and of U.N. resolutions. He then announced that the United States continued "to call the attention of the Government of South Africa to what the United States considers to be the illegal application of its domestic legislation to the territory of Namibia."

South Africa's Reply

In a lengthy letter to the Secretary-General dated September 26, the South African Foreign Minister reviewed in detail the history of Namibia with respect to South Africa and the international community. Attached to the letter was an equally lengthy annex with information on some of South Africa's activities in the territory. Although the letter was in response to the Security Council resolution of August 12, it addressed itself to all U.N. resolutions that assert the termination of South Africa's mandate for Namibia. South Africa insisted that the substance of these resolutions "remains wholly unrealistic and without justification in fact and in law."

General Assembly

The question of Namibia was allocated by the General Assembly to its Fourth Committee which held a general debate on Namibia, together with the Portuguese territories and Southern Rhodesia, from October 3 to 27. An interim draft resolution, ultimately sponsored by 70 members,

was introduced on October 17. It condemned South Africa for failing to comply with the Security Council resolution of August 12 and drew the attention of the Council to "the deteriorating situation." The resolution was adopted by the Committee on October 21 by a vote of 96 (U.S.) to 2 (Portugal and South Africa), with 6 abstentions (Australia, Botswana, France, Ivory Coast, Malawi, and U.K.). The General Assembly adopted the resolution as reported by the Fourth Committee on October 31 by a vote of 95 (U.S.) to 2, with 6 abstentions.

Ambassador Phillips explained that despite its abstention on the August 12 Security Council resolution the United States was able to vote for the Assembly's resolution because the latter drew the Council's attention to the situation, whereas the former had set a time limit for South African withdrawal.

The Fourth Committee further considered the question of Namibia at five meetings in November. A more comprehensive draft resolution was introduced on November 21, sponsored by 38 member states, and was adopted on November 24 by a vote of 83 to 2, with 18 abstentions (U.S.). The resolution again condemned South Africa for its refusal to withdraw its administration from Namibia, drew the attention of the Security Council to the need to take appropriate measures "to solve the grave situation," expressed solidarity with the Namibians in their legitimate struggle, requested "all states to provide increased moral and material assistance to them," and commended the work of the U.N. Council for Namibia.

On November 24 the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Finger, expressed U.S. agreement with much of the resolution, but said it was unable to support the resolution because the third preambular paragraph contained a statement to the effect that the situation in Namibia

constituted a threat to international peace and security, and thus was a clear reference to Chapter VII of the Charter. While recalling U.S. condemnation of South Africa's refusal to withdraw from Namibia, he pointed out that the Security Council had never found that the situation in Namibia constituted such a threat. Moreover, as had been stated many times previously, the United States does not support the terms of reference under which the Council for Namibia functions. The U.S. Representative also took exception to allegations made during the general

debate by some delegations that certain Western countries were providing financial and economic assistance to South Africa, and pointed out that the United States was not giving any such assistance.

On December 1 the General Assembly adopted the resolution without change by a vote of 92 to 2 (Portugal and South Africa), with 19 abstentions (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, U.K., and U.S.).

Portuguese Territories

Committee of 24

In 1969 Committee consideration of the African territories under Portuguese administration (Angola, Mozambique, and Portuguese Guinea) began in May during the Committee's meeting in Africa where several petitioners were heard. However, no draft resolution was introduced until the Committee returned to New York.

An 11-power draft resolution, introduced on June 19, condemned the "colonial war" being waged by Portugal which "constitutes a crime against humanity and a grave threat to international peace and security"; condemned the activities of economic and other interests which "strengthen Portugal's domination" over the territories; condemned "the rendering of military assistance in any form by any state to the Government of Portugal, either directly or indirectly"; called upon all states, particularly those in NATO, *inter alia*, to curtail "the training of Portuguese military personnel with-

in or outside the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization"; drew the attention of the Security Council "to the further deterioration of the situation in the territories under Portuguese domination, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security," and "to the urgent need for adopting the necessary measures to make mandatory the provisions" of the relevant U.N. resolutions.

The resolution was adopted on June 24 by a vote of 16 to 2 (U.K. and U.S.), with 3 abstentions (Italy, Ivory Coast, and Norway). In explaining his negative vote the U.S. Representative said that the resolution contained many features that the United States could not support, and he expressed regret at the Committee's regression from the efforts made in the General Assembly in 1968 to consult on texts so that resolutions might be more realistic and constructive. He repeated the point made many times before that, "to be meaningful, a resolution must have the support of those who are called upon to give

it effect," and this could only be accomplished through consultations.

General Assembly

The Portuguese territories were considered by the Fourth Committee between October 8 and November 14. On November 12 Ghana, Ceylon, India, and Dahomey introduced a draft resolution which was finally sponsored by 44 states. The Committee considered the draft at four meetings from November 12 to 14 while the sponsors of the draft resolution also consulted with other delegations.

After some modifications, the draft resolution in its final form condemned (1) Portugal's refusal to grant self-determination and independence to the people of the territories; (2) Portugal's policy of using its territories "to violate the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African states"; (3) the colonial war waged by Portugal; (4) the collaboration between Portugal, South Africa, and Southern Rhodesia which was "designed to perpetuate colonialism and oppression"; and (5) the intervention of South African forces against the people in the Portuguese territories. The resolution urged all states, and particularly NATO members to withhold any assistance to Portugal, and called upon all states and specialized agencies to increase their moral and material assistance to the people of the Portuguese territories. It also recommended that the Security Council take effective steps to put an end to colonialism and racial discrimination in Africa.

The Portuguese Representative stated that the draft resolution made a number of serious assertions, some legally untenable, others not in keeping with the facts, and

yet others expressed in such a way that they could only lead to a dangerous escalation of violence. He said that Portugal had no aggressive intentions toward the independent countries of Africa but wished instead for cooperation and good neighborly relations. He then repeated Portugal's readiness to conclude nonaggression treaties with any African states desiring to do so.

On November 14 Ambassador Finger stated that the United States "believes very strongly that the Government of Portugal should in its own best interest grant self-determination to the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea (Bissau)." He added, however, that the draft resolution, while purporting to recall the Manifesto on Southern Africa (see p. 20) "negates the spirit of the Manifesto; in fact, it tends to shut the door to a possible dialogue with Portugal" by its "uncompromising and condemnatory" character. While expressing appreciation for the consultations on the draft resolution held by the sponsors, the U.S. Representative stated that it was regrettable that the discussions "had to be built on such an unsound foundation," i.e., a draft resolution with provisions far removed "from what we would consider a useful approach."

He pointed out that "in addition to our misgivings over the general thrust of this draft, which we consider misguided, certain provisions are particularly objectionable in our view," notably the condemnations made. He then explained that the United States was abstaining on the draft resolution, rather than voting against it, because of the U.S. desire to signify its support for the concept of self-determination and "to recognize the effort of certain of the sponsors to consult with us."

The Fourth Committee approved the draft resolution on November 14 by a vote of 88 to 3, with 16 absten-

tions (U.S.), and the General Assembly adopted it without change on November 21 by a vote of 97 to 2 (Portugal and South Africa), with 18 abstentions (Argentina, Australia,

Belgium, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, France, Gabon, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, U.K., and U.S.).

Southern Rhodesia

The Security Council, the General Assembly, and the Committee of 24 continued to consider the question of Southern Rhodesia and the 1965 unilateral declaration of independence by the colony's white minority regime. In 1969 a major U.N. effort on this question was the attempt to make the comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against the illegal regime in Salisbury more effective. This effort was centered in the seven-member special committee on sanctions¹ established by the Security Council in 1968 to examine such reports as are submitted by the Secretary-General on the implementation of the sanctions and to seek information on possible evasions. The June 20 referendum in Southern Rhodesia on proposals for a new constitution and on declaring a republic was a prime concern of the United Nations.

Committee of 24

The general debate in the Committee of 24 on the question of Southern Rhodesia was held from March 4 to 26 and during the Committee's African trip in May. Several petitioners were heard at Lusaka and Dar es Salaam.

On March 24 the U.S. Representative expressed regret at the continued defiance of the illegal regime and re-

iterated the U.S. policy of seeking a peaceful solution. He said that it was premature to criticize the sanctions program as inadequate and ineffective, and that "effective implementation of the mandatory sanctions program by all member states would contribute to the achievement of a peaceful change in the policies of the illegal regime and the achievement of full political rights for all of the Rhodesian people." He concluded by expressing regret over the continuing illegal detention and imprisonment of political opponents and over the new constitutional proposals.

Following the February 1969 trial and conviction by the Ian Smith regime of a nationalist leader, the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole, Syria and Sierra Leone introduced on March 24, on behalf of 12 states, a draft resolution on the specific issue of the regime's "acts of repression." The resolution, adopted unanimously on March 26, expressed profound indignation at Sithole's trial and conviction, and the detention and assassination of other nationalist leaders. The draft also expressed concern over the new constitution and requested the United Kingdom to prevent its introduction as well as "to take immediate measures to secure the release of all political prisoners."

The U.S. Representative said that the United States joined wholeheartedly in the expression of indignation at the Smith regime's illegal detention of national leaders. He added that the United States was

¹ Algeria, France, Pakistan, Paraguay, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

"deeply concerned at the efforts of this illegal regime to further entrench its abhorrent racial policies through the device of an illegal constitution." He noted, however, that it was unrealistic to expect the United Kingdom to be able to achieve the objectives set forth in the draft resolution.

On June 6, when the Committee reconvened after its African trip, Tanzania, Syria, Yugoslavia, and Sierra Leone introduced a draft resolution cosponsored by 11 states. This resolution was adopted on June 10 by a vote of 19 to 2 (U.K. and U.S.), with 2 abstentions (Italy and Norway). *Inter alia*, the resolution (1) condemned the U.K. failure to take "effective measures" to bring down the illegal regime; (2) condemned the South African intervention in Southern Rhodesia; (3) condemned the policies of those governments that continue to have relations with Southern Rhodesia; and (4) drew the Security Council's attention to the urgent need to (a) further expand sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and (b) impose sanctions on South Africa and Portugal.

After the vote the U.S. Representative pointed out that the Security Council was actively seized of the problem of Southern Rhodesia and said that the United States would express its view more fully in the Council, which was to meet shortly. He reiterated the continuing U.S. dedication to the objectives of self-determination and independence for Southern Rhodesia, but said that the draft resolution contained some provisions which did not represent a realistic approach to the realization of those objectives.

Security Council

At the request of 60 U.N. members on June 6, the Security Council convened on June 13 to consider the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Also on the agenda were the first and

second reports of the sanctions committee (December 1968 and June 1969). The Council debated the question at seven meetings with a view to increasing the pressure on the Smith regime to comply with the relevant U.N. resolutions.

On the first day of debate the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Yost, stated that the proposals in the Southern Rhodesian referendum were conceived in racism, and that "their design is to perpetuate the rule of the white minority and to render majority rule, or the attainment of political equality by members of the black majority, forever impossible." He then commented on some of the provisions of the new constitution (e.g., franchise, land tenure, declaration of rights), which was subsequently endorsed by the Southern Rhodesian electorate on June 20, and said, "The course of action which Mr. Smith and his colleagues now advocate cannot lead to peace and progress, but rather to extremism and bitter strife in which the cause of peace is sure to suffer." He concluded by urging the Council, as a first step, to condemn the proposed constitution and the illegal regime itself prior to June 20.

On June 19 the Algerian Representative tabled a draft resolution (also sponsored by Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, and Zambia) which would have urged the United Kingdom to use force in the territory; extended sanctions to South Africa and Mozambique; decided that all states should sever immediately "all economic and other relations with the illegal racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia, including railway, maritime, air transport, postal, telephonic and wireless communications, and other means of communication"; and called for moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of Southern Rhodesia. The draft was not adopted. The vote on June 24 was 8 to 0, with 7 abstentions (Colombia, Finland,

France, Paraguay, Spain, U.K., and U.S.), one short of the 9 affirmative votes required by the U.N. Charter.

In explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Yost said the Council's failure to reach a consensus condemning the illegal regime and the proposed constitution was unfortunate. It was regrettable that the United States and other member states were confronted by a draft resolution they were unable to support, "because the only beneficiary of our differences is the illegal regime we seek to condemn." While noting that the United States was in broad agreement with the aims of the draft resolution, he declared that U.S. objections to certain provisions were well known. Two major defects which he singled out were (1) advocating the use of force as a means of solving the problem, and (2) extending economic sanctions to South Africa and Portugal. The United States respected the reasons set forth by the British Representative on why the British were not prepared to use force. He added that the use of force in this case would "serve to jeopardize rather than support" the Council's objective of maintaining international peace and security. With respect to applying sanctions to South Africa and Portugal, he said that it "would seem to us to be a dubious course introducing additional grave complications into a situation already complicated enough."

General Assembly

The Fourth Committee considered Southern Rhodesia from October 3 to November 3. A draft resolution, finally sponsored by 41 states, was introduced on October 30 by the Representatives of Tanzania, the U.A.R., and Nigeria. On November 3 the Committee adopted it by a vote of 79 to 8 (Australia, Belgium, Nether-

lands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, U.K., and U.S.), with 17 abstentions (Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Norway, Spain, and Sweden).

The resolution condemned the U.K. failure and refusal to take effective action in Southern Rhodesia. It called upon the United Kingdom (1) to take effective measures, including the use of force, to put an end to the illegal regime; (2) to ensure the immediate release of African nationalists detained in Southern Rhodesia; and (3) to ensure "the immediate expulsion of all South African forces from Southern Rhodesia." The resolution also called upon "all states, specialized agencies and other international organizations concerned to extend all moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements" of Southern Rhodesia, and drew the Security Council's attention to the need to (1) widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal regime "to include all the measures laid down in article 41 of the Charter," and (2) impose sanctions on South Africa and Portugal.

In an explanation of vote the U.S. Representative in the Fourth Committee reaffirmed the illegality of Southern Rhodesian "independence" and the continuing U.S. conviction that self-determination in the territory should be exercised by all the people. He pointed out, however, that the Committee members were fully aware of the U.S. objections to some of the resolution's provisions, and singled out the call upon the United Kingdom to use force and the call for the extension of sanctions to South Africa and Portugal.

The draft resolution was adopted by the General Assembly without change on November 21 by a vote of 83 to 7 (U.S.), with 20 abstentions.

Part IV

Legal and Constitutional Developments

International Court of Justice

During 1969 Swaziland accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under article 36 of the Court's Statute, and the United Kingdom filed a new declaration to replace its declaration of November 27, 1963. At the end of the year 45 states had accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. A number of countries, including the United States, continue to maintain significant reservations to their acceptances.

The Court was officially represented at the 24th session of the General Assembly by a number of members of the Bench including President Bustamante y Rivero of Peru and Judge Jessup of the United States. The Court submitted the second edition of its annual report to the Assembly covering the period August 1, 1968, to July 31, 1969. Its report contained a proposal to amend article 22 of the Statute which presently requires the seat of the Court to be at The Hague. The Court proposed to revise the article to read, ". . . The Hague or at such other place as shall at any time be approved by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Court." It was explained that the Court had no present intention to move from the Netherlands but that, like other international institutions, it was desirable that it "have the latitude of being

established at whatever place, in the course of the years, it might be considered that it could function most effectively."

On December 4 the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Security Council, unanimously adopted a resolution providing that a state which is a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice but is not a member of the United Nations shall participate in the procedure for effecting amendments to the Statute. The General Assembly referred the substance of the Court's proposal to the Sixth Committee which, due to lack of time, decided to consider it at the 25th Assembly in 1970.

On October 27 the Security Council and General Assembly, meeting separately but concurrently, elected five judges to the Bench for 9-year terms beginning February 6, 1970: Hardy C. Dillard, Professor Emeritus of International Law and Dean of the University of Virginia Law School (United States); Eduardo Jiménez de Aréchaga (Uruguay); Federico de Castro (Spain); Louis Ignacio-Pinto (Dahomey); and Platon D. Morozov (U.S.S.R.).

During 1969 the Court delivered one judgment in the two cases concerning the North Sea Continental Shelf and continued to deal with the case concerning the Barcelona Trac-

tion, Light and Power Co., Ltd. At the end of the year the latter was the only case remaining on the Court's docket. The Court delivered no advisory opinions during 1969, nor was a request for an advisory opinion addressed to the Court.

CASE CONCERNING THE BARCELONA TRACTION, LIGHT AND POWER CO., LTD. (*Belgium v. Spain*, NEW APPLICATION 1962)

This case, originally submitted to the Court in 1958, concerns a dispute between Belgian nationals who were shareholders in the Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Co., Ltd., a Canadian corporation, and the Spanish Government. In its complaint the Belgian Government, on behalf of its nationals, alleged that the conduct of the Spanish authorities in declaring the company bankrupt and liquidating its property was contrary to international law and that Spain was responsible for the resulting damages. The Court's judgment of July 24, 1964, had joined to the proceedings on the merits two Preliminary Objections raised by Spain. These were, first, that the Belgian claim was inadmissible because, assuming the Belgian interest was established, Belgium lacked standing in law to make a claim on behalf of a Belgian interest in a Canadian company, and that, even if Belgium had standing, the claim was inadmissible because of failure to exhaust local remedies. The two parties submitted extensive pleadings on these objections and on the merits; each requested and received several extensions of the time limits, and the Spanish Government's rejoinder, which is the last of the pleadings, was filed on July 1, 1968. Oral proceedings began at The Hague on April 15, 1969, and concluded July 22. The Court is expected to deliver its judgment early in 1970.

CASES CONCERNING THE NORTH SEA CONTINENTAL SHELF (*Denmark v. Federal Republic of Germany; Federal Republic of Germany v. Netherlands*)

On February 20, 1967, two Special Agreements were filed in the Registry relating to the delimitation of the continental shelf in the North Sea between the Federal Republic of Germany and Denmark on the one hand, and between the Federal Republic and the Netherlands on the other. The Court joined the proceedings in the two cases on April 26, 1968. Oral proceedings were held at The Hague from October 23 to November 11, 1968. The Court delivered its decision on the two cases in a single judgment on February 20, 1969.

The two Special Agreements asked the Court to decide what principles and rules of international law are applicable to the delimitation by the countries concerned of the areas of the continental shelf in the North Sea that appertain to each of the parties beyond the partial boundaries determined in bilateral conventions between Denmark and Germany in 1965, and Germany and the Netherlands in 1964. The three countries did not ask the Court to delimit the further boundaries involved, the parties undertaking to effect delimitation by agreement in accordance with the Court's decision.

The waters of the North Sea are shallow, the whole seabed, except for the Norwegian Trough, consisting of continental shelf at a depth of less than 200 meters. Most of it had already been delimited between the coastal states concerned. The parties had, however, been unable to agree on the prolongation of the partial boundaries referred to above. Denmark and the Netherlands contended that this prolongation should be effected on the basis of the "equi-distance-special circumstances" rule. The Federal Republic argued that application of this principle would curtail its proper share of the con-

tinental shelf area, on the basis of proportionality to the length of its North Sea coastline.

In its judgment the Court took note that the starting point of the development of the law of the continental shelf was the U.S. "Truman Proclamation" of September 28, 1945. It rejected, however, the contention of Denmark and the Netherlands that the delimitations in question had to be carried out in accordance with a mandatory "equidistance-special circumstances" rule as defined in article 6 of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf. That rule provided that, in the absence of agreement to employ another method, all continental shelf boundaries must be drawn by means of an equidistance line unless "special circumstances" were recognized to exist. Denmark and the Netherlands contended that the configuration of the German North Sea coast did not justify the finding of "special circumstance." Furthermore, the Court indicated that Germany had not ratified the convention and was not legally bound by the provision of article 6, as were Denmark and the Netherlands.

The Court likewise rejected the contention advanced by Germany in favor of apportioning the continental shelf into "just and equitable" shares in proportion to length of sea-frontage. It held that the rights of the coastal state in respect of the area of continental shelf constituting a natural prolongation of its land territory under the sea exist *ipso facto* and *ab initio* by virtue of its sovereignty over the land. The "just and equitable" share doctrine could apply only to apportionment of the whole of an as yet undelimited area, which was inapplicable to the fundamental legal concept of continental shelf entitlement.

The Court also rejected the contention of Denmark and the Netherlands that Germany was bound to accept delimitation on an equidistance

basis by virtue of customary international law with which post-convention practice of even nonparties complied. It held that the equidistance principle was not a customary rule which the Geneva convention had codified, nor had it become so since the conclusion of the convention in 1958. The Court's judgment, which is both an important and conservative appreciation of treaty law, holds that practice by nonparties consistent with a treaty rule cannot be taken as compelled by a universally binding rule unless two conditions are met.

Not only must the acts concerned amount to a settled practice, but they must also be such, or be carried out in such a way, as to be evidence of a belief that this practice is rendered obligatory by the existence of a rule of law requiring it. . . . The frequency, or even habitual character of the acts is not in itself enough. There are many international acts, e.g., in the field of ceremonial and protocol, which are performed almost invariably, but which are motivated only by considerations of courtesy, convenience or tradition, and not by any sense of legal duty.

The judgment held that in each case delimitation should be

. . . effected by agreement in accordance with equitable principles, and taking account of all the relevant circumstances, in such a way as to leave as much as possible to each Party all those parts of the continental shelf that constitute a natural prolongation of its land territory into and under the sea, without encroachment on the natural prolongation of the land territory of the other

and that, if this delimitation results in overlapping areas which negotiation fails to resolve, these are to be divided equally unless the parties decide on a joint regime. The Court ordered the negotiators to take into account the general coastal configuration and any special or unusual features; the physical and geological structure and natural resources of the shelf areas; and the element of a reasonable degree of proportionality which a delimitation carried out in accordance with equitable principles ought

to bring about between the extent of the continental shelf areas appertaining to the coastal state and the length of its coast measured in the general direction of the coastline, taking account of the actual or prospective effects of any other continental shelf delimitations between adjacent states in the same region.

The Court gave its decision by 11 votes to 6. President Bustamante and Judges Jessup, Padilla Nervo, and Ammoun wrote separate concurring opinions; Judge Zafrulla Khan appended a declaration; and Judges Bengzon, Tanaka, Koretsky, Lachs, Morelli and Judge *ad hoc* Sørensen dissented.

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. The 21st General Assembly elected Richard D. Kearney of the United States a member of the Commission in 1966.

In discharging its functions the Commission studies topics it believes suitable for codification or which other U.N. bodies, usually the General Assembly, refer to it. It selects one of its members to prepare a report and, following a preliminary discussion, generally requests 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. After 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, may review the articles itself,

may note them, or may remand them to the Commission for further study. Two of the conventions discussed later in this section—those on the law of treaties and on special missions—were based on articles prepared by the Commission.

At its 21st session, held in Geneva June 2–August 8, the Commission considered four topics: relations between states and international organizations, succession of states and governments, state responsibility, and the most-favored-nation clause in the law of treaties. Work on the first topic is the furthest advanced.

The Commission adopted 29 articles dealing with representatives of states to international organizations and has submitted them to U.N. members for comment. The articles are divided into sections on facilities, privileges and immunities of permanent missions to international organizations, conduct of the permanent mission and its members, and end of functions of such missions. These 29 articles complement a group of 21 articles adopted in 1968, which lay down principles and procedures concerning the functions and responsibilities of a permanent mission to an international organization and dealt with such matters as size and com-

position of the mission, credentials, accreditation, and notifications to the organization and the host country. The Commission expects to consider at its 22d session additional articles on permanent observers of nonmember states and on delegations to sessions of organs of international organizations and to conferences convened by such organizations. A second reading of the articles in 1971 should conclude the Commission's work on this topic.

The second major topic on the Commission's agenda—the succession of states and governments—is divided into two parts: succession in respect of treaties and succession in respect of matters other than treaties. The first part deals with how far treaties previously concluded and applicable with respect to a given territory continue to be applicable after a change in the sovereignty over that territory, as, for example, when a colonial territory becomes independent. The Commission discussed four articles on the topic in 1969 and is expected to devote considerable attention to the first part of the succession question in 1970.

The special rapporteur on succession in respect of matters other than treaties submitted a controversial report on economic and financial acquired rights and state succession, in which he advanced the proposition that the successor state was not bound by the acquired rights granted by the predecessor state unless it freely acknowledged those rights or if, under certain circumstances, its competence with respect to such rights was restricted by treaty. The report engendered considerable debate in which varying views were expressed.

At the conclusion of the debate on the topic, the Commission decided that rather than proceeding to the preparation of draft articles on ac-

quired rights, the rapporteur should devote his next report to public property and public debts.

The Commission's approach to the subject of state responsibility represented a shift from the emphasis on responsibility for injury to aliens which characterized the Commission's earlier work on the topic. The special rapporteur submitted his first report on the subject in 1969; following a discussion of the topic the Commission agreed that the first group of articles on the subject should deal with the elements of an international wrongful act. The Commission will examine this aspect of the topic in 1970. In subsequent sessions it expects to proceed to the second stage of its inquiry: the determination of the legal consequences which flow from the performance of such wrongful act.

Work on the fourth topic—the most-favored-nation clause in the law of treaties—will focus on the legal character of the clause and the legal conditions governing its application. The Commission considered the first report of the special rapporteur and laid down guidelines for preparation of the second report in 1970.

On November 12, in a resolution adopted unanimously on recommendation of the Sixth (Legal) Committee, the 24th General Assembly noted with approval the Commission's intention to continue at its 1970 session work on the four topics discussed above and to bring its work program up to date. By the same resolution the Assembly asked the Commission to add to its agenda the topic of treaties concluded between states and international organizations or between two or more international organizations.

International Trade Law

The U.N. Commission on International Trade Law¹ was established by the General Assembly in 1966 to promote "the progressive harmonization and unification of the law of international trade." UNCITRAL's second session, which took place in Geneva March 3-31, had topics in three substantive areas on its agenda: international sale of goods, international payments, and international commercial arbitration.

International Sale of Goods

This topic was divided into five subtopics: the Hague conventions of 1964, the Hague Convention on Applicable Law of 1955, time limits and limitations (prescription) in the field of international sale of goods, general conditions of sale and standard contracts, and Incoterms and other trade terms.

In 1964 a diplomatic conference held at The Hague adopted conventions relating to a Uniform Law on the International Sale of Goods and to a Uniform Law on the Formation of Contracts for the International Sale of Goods. Although only five ratifications are required, neither of the conventions had entered into force by the end of 1969. The United States, which participated in that conference, has

¹The members of UNCITRAL are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Kinshasa), Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Hungary, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Romania, Spain, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

always believed that the uniform law on sales, which was conceived primarily in the perspective of external trade between neighboring countries, had a number of major weaknesses when applied to international trade involving overseas shipment.

The U.N. Secretary-General circulated two questionnaires asking governments whether they intend to ratify or accede to the Hague conventions of 1964 and 1955. A number of countries, including the United States, expressed the view that the 1964 conventions should be revised in order to make them widely acceptable. Other countries, however, argued for retaining the integrity of the 1964 texts. In view of the various opinions expressed, the Commission decided to request the Secretary-General to complete an analysis of the comments of governments to lay before an UNCITRAL working group on sales. The United States is one of the 14 members of the working group which was scheduled to meet in New York in January 1970.

In reply to the second questionnaire the United States said that it did not intend to become a party to the 1955 convention. This convention, which has seven parties and has been in force for 5 years, was also discussed by the Commission. Although comments on it tended to question rather than to reject the rules therein, UNCITRAL decided to deal with the 1955 convention in much the same manner as the 1964 conventions.

The object of the work on time limits and limitations (prescription) in the field of international sale of goods is to harmonize the rules for raising claims in connection with international sales transactions. A principal problem in achieving uniformity

in this area is that generally in civil law countries the rules relating to time limits and limitations are considered part of the substantive law, whereas in common law countries they are considered part of procedural law. UNCITRAL decided to refer the topic to a seven-member working group, which would prepare a draft convention for consideration at the 1970 session.

In the discussion on general conditions of sale and standard contracts, the United States expressed the opinion that greater use of general conditions of sale by parties to international contracts would, as a practical matter, promote the unification of the law of international trade. The Commission agreed that the wider use of such conditions would be desirable, and decided to transmit several of the general conditions prepared by the ECE to the other regional economic commissions in order to determine whether those conditions might be suitable or adaptable to trade in other parts of the world.

Incoterms, trade terms developed by the International Chamber of Commerce in 1953, are widely used in international trade. UNCITRAL decided that it would be desirable to encourage their worldwide use and asked the Secretary-General to take steps to bring its views to the attention of the regional economic commissions.

International Payments

This agenda item was divided into three subtopics: negotiable instruments, bankers' commercial credits, and guarantees and securities. The first of these received the most thorough examination.

The Commission considered that there were three possible ways to promote unification of the law of negotiable instruments: (1) achieve wider acceptance of the Geneva con-

ventions of 1930 and 1931¹ dealing with the matter; (2) revise those conventions, which in the main follow a civil law approach, with a view to making them more acceptable to common law countries; or (3) create a new negotiable instrument.

UNCITRAL concluded that the prospects for achieving wider acceptance of the conventions were not promising. It also rejected revision, since it believed neither the civil nor the common law countries would be prepared to alter their national law on negotiable instruments, a step which, in view of the scope of the Geneva conventions, would be a precondition to revision along the lines suggested. The Commission concluded that creation of a new international negotiable instrument was most likely to produce uniformity. Accordingly, it requested the Secretary-General to draw up a questionnaire on the subject, address it to governments and banking and trade organizations, and prepare an analysis of replies for UNCITRAL's next session.

In considering bankers' commercial credits UNCITRAL concentrated on the "Uniform Customs and Practices for Documentary Credits" of the International Chamber of Commerce ("the Code") and on the mechanisms for review and revision of the Code. The Commission decided to endorse the use of the Code.

Following a brief discussion of guarantees and securities UNCITRAL decided to defer further consideration of that topic until 1970.

International Commercial Arbitration

UNCITRAL decided that the first step in this area was to encourage

¹ Geneva Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connexion with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 1930, and Geneva Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connexion with Cheques of 1931.

states that had not yet done so to accede to the 1958 U.N. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. It also decided to appoint a special rapporteur on problems concerning the application and interpretation of that convention and on similar problems with respect to the 1961 European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration.

Other Matters

An agenda item on international legislation on shipping raised the question of the relationship between UNCITRAL and UNCTAD rather

than any issue of substance. The Commission agreed to include international legislation on shipping among the priority items on its work program for the 1970 session.

UNCITRAL also decided to seek General Assembly approval for the publication of a yearbook. On November 12 the General Assembly adopted by a vote of 52 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions, a resolution recommended by its Sixth Committee which expressed appreciation of the work of UNCITRAL's second session and included a paragraph providing, in principle, for the publication of an UNCITRAL Yearbook, the precise format of which would be discussed at the Commission's third session.

Law of Treaties

The United States was one of 110 countries participating in the second session of the U.N. Conference on the Law of Treaties, April 9–May 22, which concluded its work by adopting the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a milestone in the codification and development of international law. The convention was adopted by a vote of 79 (U.S.) to 1, with 19 abstentions, and opened for signature on May 23.

The 80 substantive articles deal with all aspects of the law of treaties: conclusion and entry into force; observance, application, and interpretation; amendment and modification; invalidity, termination, and suspension; and depositaries, notification, corrections, and registration. The agreement on a series of rules governing these questions and their incorporation in a single document is a significant accomplishment which should facilitate the conduct of foreign relations in all parts of the world.

Prior to 1966, when the International Law Commission adopted its comprehensive articles on the law of treaties, it was difficult for states to know what rules governed many aspects of treaty-making. They could deduce the substance of a number of rules by consulting opinions of international tribunals and writings of scholars, but in many areas the rules were obscure or unclear. During the 15 years the law of treaties was on the Commission's agenda, governments furnished it with considerable evidence of state practice not theretofore readily available. This evidence enabled the Commission to formulate rules concerning the conclusion and entry into force of treaties which are fully consistent with contemporary treaty practice.

At the 1968 session of the Conference the United States devoted considerable effort to improving the articles submitted by the Commission. For example, the article dealing with

modification of treaties by subsequent practice, which presented potential problems for a majority of states, was deleted. Another major area of concern to a number of states, including the United States, was the high level of abstraction which characterized a majority of the invalidity articles. Improvements were made in the articles dealing with provisions of internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties, separability of treaty provisions, and supervening impossibility of performance. At the same time, the United States succeeded in preventing (1) deletion of the article dealing with loss of a right to invoke a ground for invalidating, terminating, withdrawing from, or suspending the operation of a treaty, and (2) the weakening of safeguards built into the article on fundamental change of circumstances (*rebus sic stantibus*).

The invalidity articles dealing with peremptory norms of international law posed a most difficult challenge to the Conference. While there was general agreement that there are certain treaties which states may not validly conclude—treaties to engage in piracy or the slave trade are among the most frequently cited examples—the language proposed by the Commission to deal with the problem was devoid of standards: “A treaty is void if it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.” After extensive debate the Conference incorporated a requirement, satisfactory to the United States, that the norm be “recognized by the international community of states as a whole.”

An overriding problem for many countries was the absence from the text before the Conference of adequate procedures for the settlement of disputes. At the first session of the Conference the chairman of the U.S.

delegation, Ambassador Richard D. Kearney, had pointed out that despite substantial improvements made in the text the acceptability of the convention for the United States would depend on the incorporation of such procedures as an integral part of the convention.

At the outset of the second session the Conference addressed this issue in the committee of the whole and adopted a 19-state proposal providing for a two-stage procedure—conciliation followed by arbitration—for settlement of disputes relating to the invalidity, termination, or suspension of treaties. Between committee and plenary consideration support for this proposal grew, but the opponents of compulsory settlement were able to block it under the two-thirds rule applicable to the plenary stage. At that point it appeared that the Conference would fail.

On the final day of the Conference, however, a coalition of African and Arab states succeeded in putting together a “compromise package” that secured the necessary majority. The first element of the “compromise” secured satisfactory procedures for the settlement of disputes relating to validity of treaties. A new article 66 provides that if a dispute relating to invalidity, termination, withdrawal from, or suspension of the operation of a treaty has not been solved within a period of 12 months any party may, if the dispute concerns the application or interpretation of articles 53 or 64 (those on peremptory norms of international law), apply to the International Court of Justice for decision. Any party may refer a dispute arising under any other invalidity article to a conciliation commission empowered to make findings of fact and conclusions of law and to recommend to the parties a solution to the dispute. The U.N. Secretary-General is to provide assistance and facilities for the commissions and the United Nations will bear the expenses of the conciliation procedures.

The second element of the "compromise" provided for the adoption by the Conference of a separate declaration inviting "the General Assembly to give consideration . . . to the matter of issuing invitations in order to ensure the widest possible participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties." The sponsors said that voting for the declaration would not entail any obligation on behalf of a state to vote at the 24th General Assembly to invite "other states" to become parties to the convention. Subject to this understanding, the United States voted for the declaration.

A notable feature of the convention is the carefully struck balance between the forces of stability and change. By codifying the customary law principle of *pacta sunt servanda* the convention strengthens the keystone of the treaty structure. The incorporation of satisfactory rules on settlement of disputes permits the recognition of rules such as *rebus sic stantibus*, which offers a safety valve against undue rigidity in the face of circumstances not foreseen by the parties when they concluded the treaty.

As the number of countries in the

world increases and the volume of treaties grows, it is most useful to have an agreed body of law governing treaties. By the end of the year 36 countries had signed the convention and 1 (Nigeria) had deposited its ratification.¹ Although it may be some time before the required 35 countries have completed ratification procedures, the convention is already being cited as the authoritative statement of the law of treaties and is likely to govern much of the world's treaty relations in the years to come.

On December 8 the General Assembly, acting on recommendations of its Sixth Committee, decided without objection to defer until its next session consideration of the Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. By a vote of 72 (U.S.) to 10, with 18 abstentions, the Assembly approved the procedure set up in article 66 of the convention which *inter alia* called for the Secretary-General to provide assistance and facilities to the conciliation commissions, and for the United Nations to meet their expenses.

¹ The United States signed on Apr. 24, 1970.

Special Missions

In 1969 the General Assembly completed its work on special missions by adopting a Convention on Special Missions and an Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. The convention and optional protocol were adopted by the Assembly on December 8 by a vote of 98 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention, and opened for

signature and ratification or accession at U.N. Headquarters on December 16.

The convention deals with the rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of temporary missions sent by one country to another to perform specific and limited diplomatic tasks, in contrast to permanent diplomatic missions such as embassies or legations.

The International Law Commission began its work on the law of special missions, or *ad hoc* diplomacy, in 1960 and completed its draft in 1967. The General Assembly decided to assign the codification task to its Sixth Committee rather than to convene a plenipotentiary conference. The basis for this decision was the desire to avoid the costs of a special conference and the relative simplicity of the task given the precedents of the existing Vienna conventions on diplomatic and consular immunities.¹

In the U.S. view, the Commission's proposals were, on the whole, carefully considered and well drafted. They struck a reasonable balance between the interests of the sending state, which generally seeks extensive privileges and immunities for its missions, and the interests of the receiving state, which often seeks to limit them. Since the United States is both a sending and a receiving state, this balance maintained both in the Commission draft and in the convention as adopted by the General Assembly serves U.S. interests well.

The Sixth Committee worked on the draft at both the 23d and 24th sessions of the General Assembly, reviewing it article by article and making a number of changes. Many of the changes were primarily stylistic, but others removed ambiguities which were potential sources of confusion or abuse. Most of the changes were improvements from the U.S. point of view. In no case did the General Assembly seriously alter the basic pattern set forth by the International Law Commission.

The Assembly strengthened and clarified the central idea that a state is under no legal obligation to receive a special mission or to treat every mission which it does receive as entitled

to the rights provided by the convention. A "special mission" had been defined in the Commission's draft as:

. . . a mission of a representative and temporary character sent by one state to another state to deal with that state on specific questions or to perform in relation to the latter state a specific task

Article 1 (a) of the convention as adopted by the General Assembly stresses the element of consent and reads:

a "special mission" is a temporary mission, representing the state, which is sent by one state to another state with the consent of the latter for the purpose of dealing with it on specific questions or of performing in relation to it a specific task

The phrase "representing the state" clarifies the phrase "representative character" and establishes that the definition covers missions that represented the state as a whole in dealings with other states, but not visits to other countries by groups of government officials concerned with limited technical matters not involving representation of the state.

In some cases the Commission showed a greater willingness than the General Assembly to move beyond the provisions of the 1961 Vienna convention. For example, the Assembly deleted article 42 of the Commission's text which read:

The sending state shall waive the immunity of any of the persons mentioned in paragraph 1 of article 41 in respect of civil claims in the receiving state when this can be done without impeding the performance of the functions of the special mission, and when immunity is not waived, the sending state shall use its best endeavors to bring about a just settlement of the claims.

Instead, the Assembly adopted a separate resolution on the matter, as had been done in conjunction with the 1961 Vienna convention. It was argued that since the operation of

¹ 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

the article depended so largely on the discretion of the sending state, the obligation would not be effectively altered by following the resolution approach. The resolution, entitled "Settlement of Civil Claims," was adopted December 8 by a vote of 101 (U.S.) to 0, with 3 abstentions. It contained the same concept as the draft article, but was recommendatory rather than obligatory. Many members, including the United States, regarded it as unfortunate that there was not a majority willing to express this notion in a substantive article of the convention.

Another area in which the Assembly refused to move beyond 1961 was in the settlement of disputes. The Representative of Switzerland¹ submitted a draft article on dispute settlement that provided for ultimate recourse to the International Court of Justice, but also provided for arbitration or conciliation procedures should the parties prefer one of these to resort to the Court. The United States supported the Swiss proposal which was defeated in the Sixth Committee on November 10 by a vote of 33 (U.S.) to 53, with 11 abstentions.

Instead, the Sixth Committee adopted by a vote of 84 to 0, with 13 abstentions (U.S.), an optional protocol that provided exactly the same settlement procedure. The United States abstained because it believed the optional protocol system was generally obsolete and could not provide fair and prompt procedures in connection with the settlement of disputes.

The United Kingdom proposed the addition of a new article to the convention which would have ex-

panded its application to cover conferences. Many delegations acknowledged that the question of the legal status, privileges, and immunities of members of delegations to international conferences constituted a gap in the law relating to international representation. However, they expressed reservations about seeking to fill this gap in the special missions convention. The United Kingdom withdrew its draft article, and the Sixth Committee requested the International Law Commission to take into account in its further work on the subject the interest and views expressed in the Committee's debates.

The Sixth Committee devoted a number of meetings to the final clauses of the convention, particularly the question of which states were to be invited to become parties. On November 17 the Sixth Committee rejected, by a vote of 39 to 46 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions, a Soviet proposal which would have invited "all states" to become parties, leaving it to the Secretary-General to try to decide which putative signatories were states and which were not. A second proposal, by Ghana and India, to invite in addition to the usual formula parties to the limited test ban treaty or the outer space treaty, was rejected by a vote of 37 to 48 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. The formula finally adopted, by a vote of 68 (U.S.) to 26, with 16 abstentions, was the so-called "Vienna formula." It was proposed by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and read, after minor amendment by the Sixth Committee:

The present convention shall be open for signature by all states members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and by any other state invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a party . . .

¹ Although not a U.N. member Switzerland was invited to participate in the Sixth Committee's deliberations, without the right of vote, because of its position as a state that frequently receives special missions.

Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities

On December 19 President Nixon transmitted the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations to the Senate and recommended that the Senate give its advice and consent to accession.

The convention was designed to implement articles 104 and 105 of the U.N. Charter and was approved unanimously by the General Assembly on February 13, 1946. By the end of 1969, 101 of the 126 U.N. members had adhered to the convention.

In 1947 the convention was submitted to Congress for approval by joint resolution together with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. The Headquarters Agreement passed both Houses. The convention was approved by the Senate and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but the House as a whole took no action. The convention was resubmitted to the 81st Congress, but no action was taken.

In accordance with the more usual practice concerning conventions dealing with diplomatic and consular matters, the President submitted the convention to the 91st Congress under the treaty power of the Constitution. In his transmittal message the President said:

As host to United Nations Headquarters the United States bears special responsibility for the status of the United Nations, its officials, and representatives of its members. We should have acceded to the convention long ago. Over the years, our failure to do so has become a source of embarrassment to the United States as well as increasingly troublesome to the U.N. Secretariat and to a growing number of U.N. member states.

The convention grants various privileges and immunities to the United Nations as an organization, to

representatives of U.N. members, to U.N. officials, and to experts on official United Nations business. Many of these privileges and immunities are already enjoyed under the 1945 International Organizations Immunities Act or under the Headquarters Agreement.

The basic effect of the U.N. convention on current U.S. law would be to extend privileges and immunities in three areas.

First, nonresident representatives of U.N. members—that is, representatives who briefly attend such meetings as the General Assembly but are not resident in New York City as members of permanent missions to the United Nations—would receive broader privileges and immunities than they now receive. Under current law, such representatives are afforded functional immunity for official acts only. Under section 11 of the U.N. convention, they would be afforded privileges and immunities equivalent to those accorded diplomats in Washington, except that immunity from civil suit would continue to be for official acts only.

Second, under section 19 of the convention, diplomatic privileges and immunities would be accorded the Secretary-General, Under Secretaries-General, Assistant Secretaries-General, and their spouses and minor children. This group is currently only entitled to immunity for official acts.

Third, section 22 of the convention provides that individual experts on U.N. missions would be granted such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the performance of their missions. This group is only granted very limited transit privileges under current law.

The President proposed that U.S. accession to the convention be sub-

ject to three reservations. Section 18(b) provides for exemption of salaries and emoluments of U.N. officials from taxation. A first reservation would provide that this immunity is inapplicable to U.S. nationals and aliens admitted for permanent residence. Section 18(c) provides for the immunity of U.N. officials from national service obligations. A second reservation would make this immunity as well inapplicable to U.S. nationals and aliens admitted for permanent residence. A third reservation would confirm the right of the United States to compel any person who has abused his priv-

ilege of residence to leave the country. The proposed reservation is patterned after section 13(b) of the Headquarters Agreement. It is aimed at guaranteeing the present right of the United States to secure the removal from its territory of any person whom there is cause to believe has engaged in activity prejudicial to the national interest.¹

¹ The Senate gave its advice and consent to accession Mar. 19, 1970; the President signed the instrument of accession Apr. 15; and the instrument of accession to the convention was deposited with the U.N. Secretary-General Apr. 29, 1970.

Friendly Relations

The Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States in Accordance with the United Nations Charter held a fifth session in New York, August 18-September 19.

The Special Committee¹ was created by the General Assembly in 1963 to review the basic international law principles contained in the U.N. Charter to see whether agreement on more detailed statements of these principles could be reached. These fundamental principles include (1) prohibition against the threat or use of force, (2) equal rights and self-

determination of peoples, (3) nonintervention in the domestic affairs of states, (4) sovereign equality of states, (5) peaceful settlement of disputes, (6) good faith fulfillment of international obligations, and (7) cooperation among states.

The Special Committee has drawn up texts agreed to by all members on four of the seven principles: sovereign equality, peaceful settlement, fulfillment of international obligations, and cooperation among states. The slow pace of its work is due in large measure to the requirement, insisted on by the United States, that international legal rules should be developed by the General Assembly only after careful study and where there is a reasonable degree of consensus.

The Special Committee decided to concentrate at its 1969 session on developing agreed statements on non-use of force and on self-determination; it made some progress on each.

¹ The members are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, France, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Malagasy Republic, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Syria, U.S.S.R., U.A.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

Prohibition Against Threat or Use of Force

This prohibition is the fundamental principle of modern international law and is stated in article 2(4) of the U.N. Charter:

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

Agreement on a detailed elaboration of this principle has been difficult not only because of its basic character and controversiality, but also because of armed conflicts in various parts of the world that have occurred since the Special Committee began its work.

The United States made some progress in its effort to obtain agreement on the express application of this principle to international lines of demarcation, such as those in Germany, the Middle East, and East Asia, as well as to traditional frontiers. In recent history the use of force across such demarcation lines has drawn nations into armed conflict at times threatening to bring about general war. All members agreed to consider the possibility of including a statement along the following lines:

Every state likewise has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force to violate international lines of demarcation [lines of territorial demarcation] which are established by an international agreement binding on it or by a decision of the Security Council, or which it is otherwise mandatory under international law for it to respect.

Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as prejudicing the positions of the parties concerned with regard to the status of such lines under their special regimes or as affecting their temporary character.

The question of terminology remains open, as shown by the bracketed

alternative phrase. The difficulties turned not on any disagreement as to the scope of article 2, paragraph 4, but rather on the felt need of many not to enhance the legal status of such lines in other contexts.

Considerable progress was made toward a statement concerning military occupation, nonacquisition of territory by armed force, and nonrecognition. What has been the law of the land for the United States ever since it became a party to the Charter of the Organization of American States in 1951 is still not fully accepted by some countries. However, at the 1969 session agreement was reached on a statement that except for the bracketed portion parallels article 17 of the OAS Charter:

The territory of a state shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter. The territory of a state shall not be the object of acquisition by another state resulting from the threat or use of force. No territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force [in contravention of the provisions of the Charter] shall be recognized as legal. The foregoing is without prejudice to action taken by the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Inclusion of the bracketed portion, not agreed, was insisted on by the U.S.S.R.

Progress in obtaining additional signatures to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, article VI of which obliges signatories "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament," made possible agreement in the Special Committee on a statement relating both to general disarmament and limited measures, and applicable to all countries whether or not bound by the nonproliferation treaty. The consensus statement reads:

All states shall pursue in good faith negotiations for the early conclusion of a universal treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control and strive to adopt appropriate measures to reduce international tensions and strengthen confidence among states.

Some progress was also made by the United States and the Western group in gaining acceptance of the view that the prohibition against force applies not only to overt military invasion, such as in Korea in 1950, but also to the covert organization of invading armed bands and the instigation of civil strife and terrorism in other countries. Preliminary agreement was reached on the statement that:

Every state has the duty to refrain from organizing or encouraging the organization of irregular or volunteer forces or armed bands, including mercenaries, for incursion into the territory of another state.

The Special Committee also agreed to consider a statement along the following lines:

Every state had the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another state or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to in the present paragraph involve a threat or use of force.

A principal problem standing in the way of final agreement on these two statements is the desire of many countries to except individual acts of force against a metropolitan power that is suppressing the peoples of a colonial territory; a few others would deny entirely the application of this principle to any people seeking self-determination. It was generally agreed that the elaboration should include a paragraph relating the prohibition to the principle of equal rights and self-determination. The United States proposed, but there was no agreement on, the following statement:

Every state has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives

peoples under foreign domination of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence.

Efforts to resolve this problem will be a focal point of the Special Committee's 1970 session.

Equal Rights and Self-Determination of Peoples

The Special Committee held its first discussion in depth of the contents of the principle of equal rights and self-determination in 1969. Article 1(2) of the Charter includes among the Purposes of the United Nations:

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

and article 55 of the Charter refers to the need for international economic and social cooperation as a prerequisite

. . . to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination

The principle of equal rights and self-determination has in recent years been among the most controversial elements of the Charter, particularly in its application to colonial situations.

A basic decision taken by the Special Committee at the urging of the United States and other members of the Western group was to agree that the principle has universal application. A number of newly independent countries had at first insisted that its relevance was exclusively or principally to classical colonial situations, but it was pointed out that President Wilson and those who followed him had developed the modern applica-

tion of the principle primarily in a European rather than a colonial context, and that questions of human rights relating to the fundamental freedoms of ethnic minorities was a problem for almost every state, not merely in connection with distant colonies.

An initial problem arising in connection with drafting an agreed statement of the basic principle was whether, as the Western group urged, it should be predicated upon the duties of states or, as most African members and the U.S.S.R. insisted, primary emphasis should be placed on the rights of peoples. The Special Committee agreed to give further consideration to a proposal occupying a middle position:

The principle enshrined in the Charter of equal rights and of self-determination of all peoples, by virtue of which they [have complete freedom to] [freely] determine, without external interference, their political status and [freely] [to] pursue their economic, social and cultural development, shall be respected and its realization shall be promoted by every state in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

The Special Committee also agreed to certain other important aspects of this principle. A U.S. proposal emphasizing the human rights aspects of the principle and reflecting article 56 of the Charter was agreed in the following statement:

Every state has the duty to promote through joint and separate action the universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Special Committee also took pains to avoid the possibility of abusive application of the principle by agreeing, on the initiative of Italy, to the statement that:

Every state shall refrain from any action aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of any other state or country.

The most difficult work on this principle concerned the details of the

principle as applied to colonial or dependent peoples. Many newly independent states consider that the Charter and the practical experience of the United Nations in the last 25 years give a basis for the conclusion that each dependent people is entitled to national statehood and independence, that they are entitled in the cause of independence to receive arms from other countries, that a colonial power may not legitimately employ armed force or repressive measures against a people struggling for freedom, and that a colonial power cannot under modern international law be regarded in these circumstances as possessing sovereignty over its dependent territories.

As the U.S. Representative, Herbert K. Reis, noted, the more extreme statement of these views could be understood only in terms of reaction to the more stubborn colonial problems remaining in Africa, and the United States could not agree that the Charter justifies the application of these conclusions to all countries that have responsibility for dependent peoples. A people might be legally characterized as "dependent" or "colonial," but it was obvious that this did not in every case mean that the people could fairly be described in the words of some recent General Assembly resolutions as "being subjected to colonial oppression." France noted the difficulty in relating the principle of self-determination to the prohibition against the use of force and pointed out that only when all peaceful means of achieving self-determination had failed might other measures be adopted.

Finally, there was considerable confusion and some resistance to the concepts contained in the following language from a U.S. proposal:

The existence of a sovereign and independent state possessing a representative government, effectively functioning as such to all distinct peoples within its territory, is presumed to satisfy the principle of equal rights and self-determination as regards those peoples.

The function of this paragraph is to indicate that while the right of self-determination is universal it does not threaten the existence of multinational states, since the right was presumed fulfilled *inter alia* when "all distinct peoples within" such a state are effectively represented. At the same time, it provides the necessary basis for denying that the right has been fulfilled in the case, e.g., of states whose political order systematically excludes certain ethnic, racial, or national groups from effective participation in government or otherwise discriminates against them in this respect. It thus reflects the concept of article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states that "Everyone has the right to take part in the Government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives."

Some of those who objected to the inclusion of this paragraph thought it unnecessary; others thought it overreaching in that it might suggest that all states must adopt a representative form of government to satisfy the right.

General Assembly Action

The General Assembly discussed the report of the Special Committee in its Sixth Committee, November 24–December 1. On November 28 the U.S. Representative, Mr. Coleman, stressed the importance of the Special Committee's work and the significance of achieving

results by consensus even when this required sacrifices from delegations. Cameroon made an effort to provide the basis for a meaningful consensus on the self-determination concept by proposing that wording be developed to the effect that force and rebellion could only be used as a last resort, and that the use of force by colonial peoples would be regarded as an unreasonable solution where a procedure was available through which independence or the exercise of the right of self-determination could be achieved within a reasonable period.

The substance of a resolution calling on the Special Committee to prepare "a comprehensive report containing a draft declaration on all of the seven principles" in time for consideration by the Assembly at its 25th session was negotiated without difficulty and adopted unanimously by the Sixth Committee.

The principal debate was over the site for the 1970 session of the Special Committee. The United States wanted to hold the session in New York in order to reduce the costs incurred by the United Nations. However, an amendment proposed by Ghana calling for the Special Committee to meet at Geneva was adopted by a vote of 30 to 6 (U.S.), with 47 abstentions. The resolution as a whole, providing for the Committee "to meet in the first half of 1970 at Geneva or at any other suitable place for which the Secretary-General receives an invitation," was adopted unanimously by the Committee on November 29 and by the plenary on December 8.

Definition of Aggression

The Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression

held its second meeting in New York, February 24–April 3. It did not make

significant progress toward an agreed definition of aggression although a number of new draft definitions were tabled and an informal working group established. Despite its continuing doubts about the need for a definition of "aggression," the United States continued to participate in good faith in the work of the Committee, and joined with five other countries to submit a draft definition.

The Committee's discussions were somewhat less polemical than at the 1968 meeting. They encompassed the proposals that had been put forward in 1968 and three new draft definitions: (1) one submitted February 26 by the U.S.S.R.; (2) one submitted March 24 by Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Iran, Malagasy Republic, Mexico, Spain, Uganda, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia which was a revision of a 1968 draft; and (3) one submitted March 25 by Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Soviet Draft

The text submitted by the Soviet Union was similar in many respects to earlier Soviet drafts which had been submitted intermittently over the last 40 years to various international bodies concerned with the definition of aggression. The Soviet text would have the General Assembly declare that:

1. Armed aggression (direct or indirect) is the use by a state, first, of armed force against another state contrary to the purposes, principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Included in the list of acts to be considered "armed aggression" if used first were declaration of war; the use of nuclear, bacteriological, or chemical weapons; bombardment; and invasion. The draft also declared that:

. . . The use by a state of armed force by sending armed bands, mercenaries, terrorists or saboteurs to the territory of another state and engagement in other forms of subversive activity involving the use of armed force with the aim of promoting an internal upheaval in another state or a reversal of policy in favor of the aggressor shall be considered an act of indirect aggression.

In other paragraphs the draft declared that territorial gains resulting from armed aggression would not be recognized, that armed aggression was an international crime against peace, and that other acts in addition to those listed might constitute aggression "if in each specific instance they are declared to be such" by the Security Council.

The United States criticized the use of the term "armed aggression" as seeming to imply there could be other forms of aggression than those involving the use of force within the meaning of article 2 (4) of the Charter. The Soviet text's reliance on the principle of first use was also at variance with the Charter and could lead to anomalous and unacceptable consequences. As drafted the text suggested either (1) that the state attacked would be limited in the means of self-defense it could use (e.g. if attacked by nuclear weapons it could legitimately respond only by nuclear but not by conventional weapons), or (2) that the state that is the victim of a *de minimus* violation such as an attack on a naval vessel or a single shot across a border could legally respond with all the means at its disposal, including nuclear weapons. The former interpretation was obviously unsound and the latter would be at variance with the important principle that the use of force in the exercise of the inherent right of self-defense is limited by the requirement that the defensive force be limited to what is necessary to defend against the danger and proportionate to it.

In support of the notion of the "first strike" or priority principle,

which is also present in the 13-power text (see below), the proponents argued that any other notion would leave room for the concept of "preventive wars," require the introduction of subjective elements, or be so complex as to be inoperable.

The United States also pointed out the omission of significant elements which had been in earlier Soviet texts. In dealing with "indirect aggression" this draft was narrowly restricted to *sending* armed bands, whereas earlier texts had also denominated as aggression the *support* of armed bands, the *encouragement* of subversive activity, the *promotion* of the outbreak of civil war, the *promotion* of an upheaval or a reversal of policy in favor of the aggressor, and the refusal by a state to take all measures within its power on its own territory to deny armed bands aid or protection when requested to do so.

13-Power Draft

The new 13-power draft would have the General Assembly, *inter alia*, declare that:

2. For the purpose of this definition, aggression is the use of armed force by a state against another state, including its territorial waters or airspace, or in any way affecting the territorial integrity, sovereignty, or political independence of such state, save under the provisions of paragraph 3 hereof or when undertaken by or under the authority of the Security Council;

3. The inherent right of individual or collective self-defense of a state can be exercised only in case of the occurrence of armed attack (armed aggression) by another state in accordance with article 51 of the Charter;

4. Enforcement action or any use of armed force by regional arrangements or agencies may only be resorted to if there is decision to that effect by the Security Council acting under article 53 of the Charter;

7. When a state is a victim in its own territory of subversive and/or terrorist acts by irregular, volunteer or armed

bands organized or supported by another state, it may take all reasonable and adequate steps to safeguard its existence and its institutions, without having recourse to the right of individual or collective self-defense against the other state under article 51 of the Charter

In other paragraphs the draft declared that the territory of a state is inviolable and no territorial acquisition by force should be recognized. The draft also listed specific acts, such as attack by armed force, bombardment, and blockade which constitute aggression "when committed by a state first against another state in violation of the Charter."

The United States considered this draft even more unacceptable than its 1968 predecessor. The text's apparent exclusion from the scope of the concept of aggression of a large class of illegal uses of force that might be characterized as "indirect aggression" would permit an aggressor to escape the prohibitions of the Charter simply by a judicious selection of the means of illegal force he employed. The apparent denial of the Charter-protected right of self-defense against many indirect uses of force was criticized on similar grounds. Finally, the distinction drawn between so-called "direct aggression" and "indirect aggression" had little basis in the Charter. Article 2 (4) of the Charter, which prohibits the "use of force," does not distinguish among the various forms of illegal force, and articles 1 and 39 speak simply of "aggression" making no distinction on the basis of the means of violence employed. Other weaknesses of the draft were its inaccurate paraphrasing of articles 2 (4), 51, and 53 of the Charter, and its failure to take adequately into account the responsibilities of the General Assembly.

The proponents of the 13-power text argued that it was necessary to separate out and define "direct aggression" before moving to the more difficult task of defining "indirect aggression." Indirect aggression, they

said, was less serious and should not give rise to the same right of self-defense as "direct aggression." They laid stress on the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the Charter and argued that certain acts including those of foreign armed bands on the territory of a state did not constitute armed attack. Finally, they argued that "indirect aggression" was covered by the Charter principle of non-intervention and should not be dealt with in a definition of aggression.

Six-Power Draft

The draft sponsored by Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States read as follows:

I. Under the Charter of the United Nations, "aggression" is a term to be applied by the Security Council when appropriate in the exercise of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security under article 24 and its functions under article 39.

II. The term "aggression" is applicable, without prejudice to a finding of threat to the peace or breach of the peace, to the use of force in international relations, overt or covert, direct or indirect, by a state against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations. Any act which would constitute aggression by or against a state likewise constitutes aggression when committed by a state or other political entity delimited by international boundaries or internationally agreed lines of demarcation against any state or other political entity so delimited and not subject to its authority.

III. The use of force in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense, or pursuant to decisions of or authorization by competent United Nations organs or regional organizations consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, does not constitute aggression.

IV. The uses of force which may constitute aggression include, but are not necessarily limited to, a use of force by a state as described in paragraph II

A. In order to:

(1) diminish the territory or alter the boundaries of another state;

(2) alter internationally agreed lines of demarcation;

(3) disrupt or interfere with the conduct of the affairs of another state;

(4) secure changes in the Government of another state; or

(5) inflict harm or obtain concessions of any sort;

B. By such means as:

(1) invasion by its armed forces of territory under the jurisdiction of another state;

(2) use of its armed forces in another state in violation of the fundamental conditions of permission for their presence, or maintaining them there beyond the termination of permission;

(3) bombardment by its armed forces of territory under the jurisdiction of another state;

(4) inflicting physical destruction on another state through the use of other forms of armed force;

(5) carrying out deliberate attacks on the armed forces, ships, or aircraft of another state;

(6) organizing, supporting or directing armed bands or irregular or volunteer forces that make incursions or infiltrate into another state;

(7) organizing, supporting or directing violent civil strife or acts of terrorism in another state; or

(8) organizing, supporting or directing subversive activities aimed at the violent overthrow of the Government of another state.

In introducing the text the U.S. Representative, John Lawrence Hargrove, emphasized that consistency with the U.N. Charter was the key-stone of the draft, and there was no provision in it intended to derogate from or otherwise alter any right or obligation contained in the Charter. He pointed out that the first paragraph stated the role of the concept of aggression in the Charter, while the first sentence of the second paragraph was the general definition and "to the extent that it employs the language of article 2(4) of the Charter, upon which any definition of aggression must rest, it follows that language exactly."

All who commented on the text welcomed its tabling as a positive

step by the cosponsors. Criticism centered on (1) the requirement of purpose or intent in paragraph IV A, which, it was argued, introduced an unwarranted subjective element; (2) the language relating to "other political entities" in paragraph II, which was a complicating factor creating difficulties from the point of positive international law; and (3) the equating of direct and indirect aggression.

The proponents of the six-power draft responded that the function of paragraph IV was to eliminate *de minimus* incidents from the scope of the definition and bring the definition in line with the gravity that under the Charter should attach to a finding that an act of aggression had been committed. No one had identified any act of force that could properly be regarded as aggression which could not be determined to fall within the scope of at least one of the five subparagraphs of paragraph IV A. It was also pointed out that the enumeration was not intended to be exhaustive. The express inclusion of political entities as potential perpetrators or victims of aggression was defended on the basis of the key positions occupied by such entities in today's world, and their involvement in so many of the actual threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, or other acts of violence that had taken place since 1945.

A number of delegations, including the United States, pointed out the need for a consensus that was as broad as possible and that included the permanent members of the Security Council who would play a central role in the utilization of any definition. They stressed the need for consensus on any statement purporting to elucidate or create legal rules. Various speakers commented that any text not commanding such support would be worthless.

Some delegations argued, on the other hand, that the insistence on

great-power approval was outdated in an era when all peoples justly claimed a right to a role in international affairs. According to this line of reasoning, if a definition were supported by the great majority of states even though not unanimously it would inform world public opinion about the legal restrictions on the use of violence in international affairs and enable people to judge the foreign policy decisions of governments and, where required, bring pressure to bear to alter policies that represented a significant departure from acceptable international behavior.

Toward the end of its meeting the Special Committee established a working group of the whole to consider in greater detail the various drafts tabled and points of view presented in the Committee. The working group sought to identify those paragraphs from the various proposals on which there was general agreement in substance and those portions of the drafts on which there were differences of view of varying degrees of seriousness. Time did not permit the working group to advance beyond consideration of certain of the preambular paragraphs of the U.S.S.R. and 13-power drafts.

General Assembly Action

The debate on the report of the Special Committee during the 24th General Assembly added little to what had already been said at the Special Committee meeting. In a resolution adopted December 12 by a vote of 83 to 1 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions, the Assembly directed the Committee to meet again in Geneva in 1970. The United States opposed the resolution because of its belief that the decision to convene the Committee in Geneva would involve un-

necessary expense. The United States said that it would have abstained if the meeting had been convened at Headquarters, but it could not vote

affirmatively on the resolution since it included in its preamble language asserting "the urgency of defining aggression."

Assistance in International Law

On December 12, on the recommendation of the Sixth Committee, the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution continuing the U.N. Program of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination, and Wider Appreciation of International Law. This program, established in 1965, helps to strengthen the ability of peoples to achieve their goals in the international arena and to promote respect for the rule of law. The principal agencies in the program are UNITAR, UNESCO, and the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General, whose report to the 24th Assembly summarized the activities of the program in 1969 and set forth the plans for 1970, plays a central role in coordinating and implementing the program.

During 1969 UNITAR organized a regional seminar at the Central University of Ecuador in Quito from January 13 to 25. Senior- and middle-grade government officials and scholars from the region heard papers read and discussed problems in the fields of the law of the sea, multinational water development projects, and multinational public enterprises. From August 11 to 29 it sponsored a regional refresher course for Asian participants at Quezon, Philippines. The 20 participants from 13 countries heard lectures on a variety of international legal problems from 9 distinguished speakers, including Prof. Albert A. Garretson of New York University Law School whose

topic was international law relating to natural resources.

UNITAR also participated with the U.N. Office of Legal Affairs in organizing and financing a fellowship program in international law. Eighteen fellows from as many countries studied at the Hague Academy of International Law or took part in an international law seminar in Geneva. Half of them also received practical training in the legal offices of some of the U.N. organizations. The fellowship program will be continued along the same lines in 1970. In addition, UNITAR is planning a regional seminar in international law for Africa in 1970. Topics under consideration for the seminar include the international legal aspects of decolonization, legal problems relating to economic and political integration in Africa, and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

UNESCO's program and budget for 1969-70 included an allocation of \$102,000 for international law activities. Ten fellowships were authorized to make it possible for young scholars from developing countries to spend an academic year at a university distinguished for its teaching of international law and to attend the Hague Academy of International Law during the vacation period. In addition UNESCO sent a consultant to Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Zambia to study the possibility of offering increased international law training in that region. To aid international

law teaching, UNESCO established a basic list of 100 to 150 works on international law; it is also sponsoring several studies relating to international law.

The Secretary-General continued to coordinate and direct aspects of the assistance program. For example, the Register of Experts and Scholars in International Law was updated; U.N. legal publications were provided to 50 institutions in developing countries; a Geneva seminar on international law was held June 16-July 4; and coordination with UNCITRAL was strengthened.

The United States supports the as-

sistance program and is a member of the 10-nation Advisory Committee¹ that assists in the planning and administration of the program. As part of its 1969 participation in the program, the U.S. Government provided traveling expenses for approximately 25 students from as many countries to take part in a summer program at Harvard Law School sponsored jointly by Harvard University and the American Society of International Law.

¹ Belgium, Ecuador, France, Ghana, Hungary, Iraq, Tanzania, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

Aircraft Hijacking

Efforts within the U.N. system to deal with the problem of aircraft hijacking were carried on in both ICAO (see p. 147) and the U.N. General Assembly.

Securing the safety of international air travel was cited by President Nixon in his September 18 address to the General Assembly as one of those areas of great concern to all U.N. members regarding which "there should be no national differences." He pointed out that "by any standards, aircraft hijackings are morally, politically, and legally indefensible. . . . I urge the United Nations to give high priority to this matter. . . . [which] involves the interests of every nation, the safety of every air passenger, and the integrity of that structure of order on which a world community depends."

The Netherlands, joined by 11 other states, subsequently moved to have an item entitled "Forcible diversion of civil aircraft in flight" added to the Assembly's agenda. The United States strongly supported this action,

viewing it as an appropriate and welcome initiative to focus international attention on a problem that had assumed increasingly serious and worldwide dimensions. Speaking in the General Committee on October 9, Ambassador Yost pointed out that nonpolitical consideration of the hijacking problem in the General Assembly would not interfere with efforts by ICAO or other organizations to deal with it effectively, but would instead serve to strengthen, reinforce, and accelerate such efforts.

On November 10 a draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malagasy Republic, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Upper Volta, and Uruguay was submitted in the Assembly's Sixth Committee. It (1) called upon states to ensure that their national legislation provided an

adequate framework for effective legal measures against all acts of unlawful interference with civil aircraft in flight; (2) urged states to ensure that persons who perpetrate such acts are prosecuted; (3) urged full support for the efforts of ICAO toward the speedy preparation and implementation of an international convention providing for measures making unlawful seizure of civil aircraft a punishable offense and prosecuting persons who commit that offense; and (4) invited states to ratify or accede to the Tokyo Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft. This convention provides in part for prompt release of a hijacked aircraft, passengers, and crew.

On December 5 the Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 67 (U.S.) to 1 (Cuba), with 17 abstentions (Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Mali,

Mongolia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian S.S.R., and U.S.S.R.). The resolution was adopted in plenary on December 12 by a vote of 77 (U.S.) to 2, with 17 abstentions.

Speaking in plenary on December 12, Congressman Dante B. Fascell reaffirmed U.S. support for constructive efforts by the international community to resolve the hijacking problem. He described the resolution just adopted as a timely, appropriate, and potentially very helpful contribution to that task, and noted that it properly reflected the General Assembly's role in marshaling international opinion in favor of vigorous action, both national and collective, that should be taken in the immediate future. At the same time he pointed out that ICAO remained the forum best suited for working out the technical details of practical arrangements, including appropriate international legal instruments, for dealing with the problem.

Part V

Budgetary and Administrative Matters

United Nations Budget

The initial U.N. budget estimates for the calendar year 1970 were presented to the General Assembly's Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) by the Secretary-General on October 2, 1969. The estimates called for gross expenditures of \$164.1 million, compared with \$154.9 million appropriated for 1969 and \$141.2 million spent in 1968. In making his presentation, the Secretary-General noted that a number of further proposals involving additional requirements would have to be presented in the course of the Assembly.

The Secretary-General called attention to the unsatisfactory U.N. financial situation and said:

For too long now, we have had to cope with each crisis situation as it arises, year by year, and even day by day, by one measure of expediency or another—by borrowing, by postponing, and by appeals for voluntary contributions or for the patience and forbearance of creditors.

After referring to the legacy of debts from the U.N. Emergency Force and the U.N. Operation in the Congo amounting to \$38.8 million, the Secretary-General said:

. . . there has been since 1963 a progressive erosion of budget resources as a result of the nonparticipation in the financing of certain items of regular budgetary expenditure, notably the servicing of U.N. bonds. Through 1969, the cumulative shortfall in budget receipts—that is to say, the withholding of assessed contributions—will have amounted to \$26.7 million. . . . Unless

and until a *modus vivendi* is arrived at for reducing or refinancing the organization's indebtedness and for reaching an accommodation on disputed budget items, some measures of arbitrary retrenchment to the detriment of important programs and services may soon be inescapable.

The Committee also had before it the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) which proposed that the Secretary-General's initial estimates be reduced by \$1.3 million to a level of \$162.8 million.

On October 21 Congressman Fascell, the U.S. Representative in the Fifth Committee, addressed the Committee. He pointed out that for nearly 25 years the United Nations and its affiliated agencies had grown considerably. This growth had been necessary and beneficial to the world community, but it had not proceeded at all times along clearly defined, rational, and systematic lines. Noting that the Fifth Committee had a legitimate concern for the organization, its management, and wise use of resources, he suggested that the Committee give attention to the budgetary, administrative, and other relationships between the United Nations, its voluntary programs, and the entire family of U.N. organizations. He also declared that as the United Nations takes on new activities, "we must constantly reassess our priorities to see whether they are still valid."

Turning to the question of the 1970 budget, Congressman Fascell expressed the belief that the Secretary-General had been wise to consider that the present is a "period in which to assess the existing resources, capacity, and methods of work of the United Nations—that it is a period of consolidation." He considered that the Secretary-General's budget estimates for 1970 reflected this view and that he should be commended for them. Congressman Fascell also indicated support for the reductions in the estimates recommended by the ACABQ but said that it was premature to take a position on the budget since it was too early to know what the final level would be.

Continuing, the U.S. Representative made some suggestions for administrative and budgetary reforms. He called for savings in conference and documentation costs, for a strengthening of the ACABQ to enable it to fulfill its expanding responsibilities, and for a serious effort to find a solution to the U.N. financial problems. In concluding his remarks he reiterated the need for a meaningful reappraisal of the operations of the organization, and said:

It is an obvious fact, not requiring any lengthy elaboration, that a sound financial basis and effective management are essential if this organization is to enjoy significant growth and live up to the expectations which millions of peoples throughout the world have placed in it.

The financial resources required to sustain the organization's growth will not be forthcoming if the member states lose faith in the organization's ability to use them wisely and effectively. Already, a number of governments have questioned the wisdom of providing the United Nations with significantly increased support unless and until our organizational structures, methods of work, and guidelines for future development are changed so as to alleviate the concern which has been expressed in this forum. In my view, the United Nations must respond to this situation.

Representatives of 67 other member states spoke during the general discussion of the 1970 budget. They

generally congratulated the Secretary-General on his improved budget presentation and indicated support for his estimates as amended by the recommendations of the ACABQ. Although several representatives urged continued budgetary restraint, a substantial number of others expressed a fear that efforts at economy might inhibit the implementation of programs designed to assist in the economic and social development of member states.

During the budget discussion the Indian Representative introduced a resolution, cosponsored by 26 other delegations, calling for a study by the Secretary-General of the factors that have contributed to the expansion of the U.N. budget in the past. The resolution requested an economic and financial analysis of the staff and budget increases in both money and real terms, taking into account reductions in the purchasing power of the amounts contributed and the correlation between the rise in budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and the rise in the level of the national budgets of states contributing more than 1% of the regular U.N. assessed budget.

The United States and a number of other delegations believed that several features of the resolution, including the 1% contribution provision, singled out a particular group of countries for purposes of unfavorable comparison. However, the Fifth Committee on December 12 adopted the resolution by a vote of 52 to 9, with 20 abstentions, and the General Assembly in plenary session on December 17 adopted it by a vote of 91 to 13, with 16 abstentions. The United States voted against the resolution, and the great majority of the other developed countries either voted against it or abstained.

During the course of the General Assembly and pursuant to its decisions the Secretary-General submitted additional requests for \$6.2 million bringing his total request to

\$170.3 million. The ACABQ recommended that these additional requests be reduced by \$0.6 million.

On December 17 the General Assembly adopted a gross expenditure budget for 1970 in the amount of \$168,420,000, accepting the total reductions of \$1.9 million recommended by the ACABQ in the Secretary-General's total request for \$170.3 million. The vote was 103 (U.S.) to 6, with 9 abstentions. This budget represented an increase of \$13.5 million over the 1969 level. The increase was attributable principally to the general rise in costs; the recruitment of additional staff for new or expanded programs, including increases in economic and social development activities; increased conference costs, particularly in preparation for several large conferences on such subjects as the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the human environment; and increased appropriations for new construction and the rental of additional premises.

Although the United States voted for the budget, it made clear that its

vote did not imply satisfaction with the U.N. budgetary situation. The U.S. Representative, Congressman Whalley, emphasized that the United Nations must acquire far stronger habits of fiscal responsibility and coordination, and a far clearer sense of priorities.

Our vote for this budget therefore, is a sign of American determination to stand by the United Nations. We are convinced, as I have pointed out earlier, that the budget level is excessive, in view of the need for consolidation and review of United Nations operations based upon the survey of the utilization and deployment of Secretariat manpower and the Jackson Study.¹ Given this fact, our vote for the budget does not constitute an approval of the actual budget level but rather is an act of faith based upon our support for major United Nations programs.

After deducting credits due the United States for U.N. bond repayments and interest, the U.S. share of total assessments against members for 1970 was \$46,450,986.

¹ "Review of the Capacity of the U.N. Development System," see p. 71.

Expansion of U.N. Facilities

The Secretary-General's proposals for new construction and major alterations to the existing premises of U.N. Headquarters were submitted in response to a resolution adopted by the 23d General Assembly that authorized an architectural and engineering study on which reliable cost estimates could be based. The Secretary-General's proposals, together with the comments of the ACABQ, were discussed in the Fifth Committee December 10-15.

The plans provided for the construction of an eight-story building on a site south of the U.N. area between

41st and 42d Streets from First Avenue to an extension over the Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive and park area. The new construction, together with alterations and additions to existing premises, would ensure sufficient space for the United Nations, UNICEF, and UNDP through 1979. The cost of the plans were estimated in the architect's report at \$73,399,000 as of November 1969. The Secretary-General as a matter of prudence based his financial planning on a figure of \$80 million to allow for upward trends in construction costs and other contingencies.

On December 11 Wilbur H. Ziehl, speaking for the United States, supported the Secretary-General's recommendations. He traced the development and growth of the United Nations since it first moved into its New York Headquarters and said:

The United States Government recognizes the need for expansion of United Nations Headquarters facilities and supports the proposed construction of an additional building. As you know, financial support for this project is dependent upon first receiving assurances from the current General Assembly that it endorses and supports the project. Then congressional, and we understand New York City, appropriations would be sought. Full efforts will also be exerted to assure maximum support from private sources. The administration will request congressional authorization and appropriation in the FY 1971 budget for a United States contribution not to exceed \$20 million.

On behalf of the Mayor of the City of New York, Mr. Ziehl was authorized to state that subject to the endorsement and support of the project by the General Assembly the Mayor would seek to match the Federal contribution.

Various delegations raised questions regarding the proposed construction plans and location of the United Nations in New York. In particular, questions arose concerning the progress of U.S. ratification of the U.N. Convention on Privileges and Immunities and the scope and performance of host country responsibilities. With regard to the Convention, Mr. Ziehl announced that the President of the United States had directed that it be transmitted promptly to the U.S. Senate for its advice and consent to accession. He also explained the work of the informal Joint Committee on Host Country Relations (composed of the U.S. Mission, 14 other missions with balanced geographic distribution, and chaired by the Secretary-General) and of the Host Country Advisory Committee (composed of cooperating nongovernmental organizations and cochaired by the U.S. Permanent Representative and the

Mayor of New York City). He described the activities of those bodies in providing services and assistance to facilitate the functioning of the U.N. diplomatic community, and he pointed to the many services provided by the City of New York and private U.S. citizens to improve the conditions of life in New York for the U.N. community.

Canada, Iran, Nicaragua, and Norway introduced a simple draft resolution, favored by the United States, authorizing the Secretary-General to proceed with the construction of the proposed project, but this draft was revised and amended several times to incorporate the varying views expressed in debate. A compromise draft resolution cosponsored by 13 states was ultimately adopted by the Committee on December 15 by a roll-call vote of 62 (U.S.) to 10 (Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian S.S.R., and U.S.S.R.), with 12 abstentions (Algeria, Burma, Burundi, France, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Togo, Tunisia, and Upper Volta). It was subsequently amended further in the General Assembly before adoption on December 17 by a vote of 95 (U.S.) to 14, with 10 abstentions.

In its final form the resolution authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the execution of the proposed construction project, subject to the necessary funds being firmly pledged and committed and the total financing plans being reviewed and approved by the ACABQ in 1970. The Assembly decided that appropriations in the U.N. regular budget should not in any circumstances exceed \$25 million to be spread over 10 years beginning in 1971.

The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to submit a further study in 1971 of the optimum distribution of Secretariat functions between New York, Geneva, or any other appropriate location, bearing in mind not only the construction proj-

ects in progress or envisaged but all other pertinent factors as well; and to inquire into the possibility and desirability of relocating all or part of certain units of the United Nations, "bearing in mind the efficiency of the operations of the Secretariat."

The United States supported the resolution, but after the vote Ambassador Phillips expressed the U.S. concern that "nothing be done which would in fact jeopardize the continued effectiveness of direction, con-

trol, and coordination of the essential elements of the Secretariat." If the Secretary-General is to put together a comprehensive program for the benefit of all U.N. members, it is essential that the Headquarters elements needed to assist him in that job not be fragmented. The U.S. Representative also warned against the increased and unnecessary costs which result to an organization when unnecessary or ill-advised fragmentation takes place.

Conferences and Documentation

The problem presented by the constant increase in documentation and rapid proliferation of conferences has been a source of concern to the United States and other U.N. members for a number of years. This concern gave rise to studies—by the Secretary-General, the Committee on Conferences, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Committee of Seven on the Reorganization of the Secretariat, and the ACABQ—that were considered by the Fifth Committee during the 24th General Assembly.

On October 21, during the Fifth Committee's general consideration of the U.N. budget, the U.S. Representative, Congressman Fascell, said:

There is another area to which many delegations have referred as one in which savings can be made; that is, conference and documentation costs. We strongly share this view. The problems which exist in this area arise almost entirely from the demands of member states, and there is only a minimal amount which the Secretary-General can do on his own to solve them. We are convinced that the best way in which to deal with this matter is for this committee to approve the recommendations of the Committee of Seven, which are before us.

The Fifth Committee considered the questions of conferences and doc-

umentation between December 1 and 9. On December 4 the Fifth Committee, and on December 11 the Assembly in plenary session, adopted without objection a draft resolution containing a number of recommendations aimed at curtailing the volume of publications and documentation. The United States believed that these recommendations would result in both greater efficiency and monetary savings.

In the resolution the Assembly (1) appealed to all U.N. organs, bodies, and committees to consider ways of reducing documentation, in particular the possibility of adopting a less voluminous and costly form of records; (2) requested the Secretary-General, in light of his own comments and those of the ACABQ, to implement as quickly as possible those recommendations and suggestions that fall within his competence and authority and to continue his efforts to reduce documentation; (3) requested the Secretary-General to submit to the 25th General Assembly a list of the resolutions of the General Assembly and its subsidiary organs that call for periodic reports, with an indication of the number of pages of each of these documents, and invited

the ACABQ to submit recommendations for shortening, discontinuing, or issuing less frequently such reports; (4) decided that no U.N. body should have both verbatim and summary records, that verbatim or summary records should not be provided for any newly established subsidiary body of the General Assembly or for a special meeting or conference unless they were specifically authorized in the enabling resolution; and (5) requested the Secretary-General to report to the 25th Assembly on the implementation of the present resolution and to include in his report any reasons he might have for not implementing the recommendations and suggestions made by the Joint Inspection Unit, the ACABQ, and the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat.

The United States also voted in favor of a draft resolution on conferences that was adopted by the Fifth Committee on December 9 by 69 to 0, with 3 abstentions, and approved unanimously by the General Assembly on December 16.

In this resolution the Assembly (1) expressed regret that the Committee on Conferences had been unable to

bring about "a more orderly and manageable calendar of conferences"; (2) decided to reconsider the membership and terms of reference of the Committee on Conferences at the 25th General Assembly and in the meantime not to reconstitute the membership of the Committee; (3) requested the Secretary-General to present to the 25th Assembly a study on the whole area of conferences and meetings held by subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, including trends, costs, and personnel, and incorporating proposals for the calendar of conferences for 1971 and following years; (4) decided that no meetings other than those covered by the calendar for 1970 should be convened, except for emergency meetings; (5) decided that, as a general rule, not more than one major special conference should be scheduled in any one year; (6) requested the Secretary-General to submit to the 25th General Assembly a calendar of conferences for 1972 and 1973; and (7) noted that ECOSOC had already achieved some success in reducing the number of meetings of its subsidiary bodies and urged it to continue its efforts in this direction.

Assessments

The U.S. percentage shares of the assessment budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the IAEA are listed below:

	1969 Percent	1970 Percent
United Nations	31.57	31.57
FAO	31.91	31.57
ICAO	30.87	30.87
ILO	25.00	25.00
IMCO	9.82	9.06
ITU	11.62	11.60
UNESCO	29.73	29.73
UPU	4.25	4.25
WHO	30.87	30.87
WMO	23.89	23.89
IAEA	31.57	31.50

U.N. Scale

During the 24th General Assembly the criteria for determining the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations were discussed in the light of the special report prepared by the Committee on Contributions pursuant to a request of the 23d Assembly. The Committee on Contributions, which is composed of 12 experts who serve in their individual capacities, is responsible for recommending the scale of

assessments to the General Assembly on a triennial basis. The Assistant Director for Statistical Standards of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, Raymond T. Bowman, was a member of the Committee from 1959 through 1969. The 24th Assembly elected Ambassador Seymour M. Finger of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations as Mr. Bowman's replacement.

The U.N. scale of assessments, within limits prescribed by floor and ceiling principles and subject to modifications for low per capita national income, is based broadly upon relative capacity to pay, measured by comparison of estimated net national products at market prices. Under the floor principle no member state is assessed less than .04%. With respect to the ceiling, the General Assembly, upon U.S. initiative, decided in 1957 that "in principle, the maximum contribution of any one member state to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations shall not exceed 30 percent of the total." In accordance with this principle, which is being implemented in stages, the U.S. percentage share was reduced from 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ % to 31.91% during the period 1957-67 and was further reduced to 31.57% for the years 1968-70.

The Committee on Contributions in 1969 undertook a detailed review of the criteria used in establishing the scale in light of suggestions for changes made at the 22d and 23d sessions of the General Assembly, particularly suggestions for further reductions in the percentage assessments of developing countries who generally have low per capita incomes.

The report resulting from this review contained no recommendations for changes in the present criteria, and stated:

In general, the Committee is satisfied that the various guidelines laid down for it by the General Assembly have withstood the test of time and permit the establishment of a balanced and equitable scale based primarily on the principle of capacity to pay.

At the same time the report noted that several members of the Committee favored further reductions in the percentages of countries with per capita incomes below \$1,000. It also recorded the view of some members that with the present application of the ceiling principles the burden of the increases in the maximum allowance for lower per capita income would be shifted almost entirely to the countries with per capita income above \$1,000 except those protected by the ceiling principles. It was pointed out, therefore, that the Committee would require a certain amount of flexibility so as not necessarily to exclude the highest contributor in the distribution of the burden resulting from the increase in the maximum allowance.

The Committee decided that it should not pronounce itself on the appropriateness of the ceiling principle with respect to the highest contributor, which was a matter of decision by the General Assembly. However, it also stated that further reductions in the U.S. assessment to reach the 30% level "may not be appropriate in the present circumstances" and that some members of the Committee, taking into account proposals to grant further relief to certain developing countries, had noted that "some upward adjustment in the present rate of assessment might be envisaged." As far as the floor principle was concerned, the Committee saw no reason for changing its previously expressed view that the ground for maintaining the minimum rate remained valid.

The U.S. Representative, Congressman Fascell, explained the U.S. position on the U.N. scale on October 21. He said that the United States agreed with the conclusion of the Committee on Contributions that the various guidelines had withstood the test of time. "Accordingly, we believe that no new guidelines are required for the Committee on Contributions in connection with its establishment

of a new scale of assessments next year."

The report of the Committee on Contributions was discussed at six meetings of the Fifth Committee during which the divergent viewpoints reflected in the report were expressed in the statements of delegations. During this discussion the U.S. delegation opposed changes in the criteria and took the position that the Committee on Contributions must continue to carry out its mandate as laid down in the 1957 resolution by which the U.S. percentage share is being reduced in stages to the level of 30%.

It became evident during the debate that no general agreement could be reached among U.N. members on any revision of the criteria. Consequently, the Fifth Committee decided to take note of the report of the Committee on Contributions and to recommend that the latter take into due consideration the debate that had been held, continue its studies on the subject, and report as appropriate.

On December 5, the General Assembly without objection took note of the consensus reached by the Fifth Committee.

Budgets: Specialized Agencies and IAEA

The gross budgets of the specialized agencies and IAEA totaled about \$186.4 million in 1969 and increased by \$17.7 million to \$204.1 million in 1970. This 1970 increase of \$17.7 mil-

lion compares with an increase of \$14.3 million in 1969 over 1968.

The breakdown of the 1970 budgets is as follows:

Agency	1969	1970	Increases
FAO.....	\$29,930,500	\$35,284,000	^a \$5,353,500
ICAO.....	8,004,481	8,169,554	165,073
ILO.....	27,500,689	30,750,000	^a 3,249,311
IMCO.....	1,135,820	1,258,888	123,068
ITU.....	5,286,340	6,071,258	784,918
UNESCO.....	37,456,750	37,456,750	(b)
UPU.....	2,123,935	1,805,486	(318,449)
WHO ^c	60,747,800	67,650,000	6,902,200
WMO.....	2,926,906	3,418,216	491,310
IAEA.....	11,251,000	12,250,000	999,000
Total.....	186,364,221	204,114,152	17,749,931

^a First year of biennium (biennial increase).

^b Second year of biennium.

^c Effective working budget.

The most important single factor in the 1970 budget increases is the rise in wages and prices necessary to maintain the prior year's level of opera-

tions. The WHO budget increase included \$4.1 million for this factor, of which \$2,295,000 represents the cost of a U.N. system salary increase for

professional personnel. In FAO \$2.4 million is attributable to wage and price rises, in ILO \$1,583,000, and in IAEA about \$500,000. Thus, of the total increase in the gross budgets of these four agencies, about half is for wage and price rises.

Program increases in WHO include \$1 million for the development of public health services and \$770,000 for the education and training of health personnel.

FAO's program increases include \$295,000 for its fisheries department, \$290,000 for the expansion of the joint FAO/IBRD Cooperative Program, and \$190,000 for forestry programs. In ILO an additional \$625,000 was approved for further implementation of the World Employment program.

The cost of providing supporting services for the inception of the World Weather Watch is the major program increase in WMO. IAEA's program increases are primarily attributable to an expansion of the Agency's safeguard program.

During 1969 the United States made major efforts for maximum economy in the specialized agencies and concerted with other major contributors in an effort to arrive at common positions on budgets and on measures to assure that the organizations were operating with maximum efficiency. In two of the larger agencies—WHO and FAO—the United States voted against the proposed budgets for 1970 after efforts to obtain agreement on acceptable levels failed.

Voluntary Programs

A number of programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are financed by voluntary contributions from participants rather

than by regular assessments on the members. Significant U.S. contributions to programs in this category for the 1969 calendar year are as follows:

	<i>Amount (Thousands of dollars)</i>
U.N. Children's Fund: Cash.....	13,000
Commodities	4,313
Nigeria/Biafra: Commodities under P.L. 480.....	17,856
U.N. Development Program.....	71,000
U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.....	800
U.N. Institute for Training and Research.....	400
U.N. Fund for Population Activities.....	2,265
U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees:	
Cash Contribution.....	13,300
Commodities	8,900
U.N. Technical and Operational Assistance to the Congo....	500
Special Contribution for Viet-Nam.....	400
U.N./FAO World Food Program:	
Cash Contribution.....	1,300
Commodities and Shipping Services.....	30,500
IAEA Operational Program.....	1,000
WMO Voluntary Assistance Program.....	1,500
U.N. Force in Cyprus.....	6,000

The U.N. Technical and Operational Assistance to the Congo, which started in 1960 shortly after the Congo gained its independence, is designed to provide experts and advisers needed to perform vital services until such time as trained Congolese are available to carry on the tasks. In 1969 experts and advisers were provided in the important fields of agriculture, aviation, economic analysis, education, police training, public finance, public works, and transportation.

The U.N. program for the Congo continued to operate in 1969 under a funds-in-trust arrangement by which interested governments could make voluntary contributions. In 1969 expenditures totaled \$2 million. Assistance was also provided through the UNDP, the specialized agencies, and the Congolese Government.

The costs of UNFICYP are met by governments providing troop contingents and by voluntarily pledged contributions. The Secretary-General estimated that the cash cost to the United Nations of maintaining the Force in 1969 was \$14,905,000, compared with \$18,500,000 for 1968. The lower 1969 cost reflected a 25% reduction in the Force which was implemented during the last quarter of 1968.

Total UNFICYP costs to the United Nations for the 69-month period beginning March 27, 1964, and ending December 15, 1969, were estimated at \$110,210,000. This figure does not include (1) the substantial share of the costs of the troop contingents borne directly by the governments providing such contingents; (2) the costs absorbed as the responsibility of the Government of Cyprus; nor (3) the value of the airlift services at the beginning of the UNFICYP operation which were provided without charge by the Governments of Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Voluntary pledges for 1969 were \$12,931,507, resulting in total government pledges for the 69-month period of \$101,970,140. These pledges, together with \$687,000 received from other sources, brought total estimated cash resources to \$102,657,140 or \$7,552,860 less than total estimated requirements.

The United States pledged cash contributions of \$6.0 million toward the 1969 expenses of UNFICYP. U.S. pledges for the 69-month period total \$46.1 million. In addition the United States provided through 1965 air transport services valued at \$1,254,107 for the rotation of troops and equipment.

Personnel

The 1969 year-end tally of Americans working in the secretariats of the United Nations and the specialized agencies resembled very much the situation at the end of 1968. In some of the agencies the percentage of Americans on the professional staff rose, in others it fell but in either event the changes were small. Overall, at the end of 1969 there were 821 Americans in the secretariats or 32

more than in 1968.

Although the number of Americans employed as experts in the UNDP rose from 320 to 341 the percentage of 7.13% at the end of 1969 was too small in relation to the U.S. capacity to provide experts and to the U.S. financial contribution to the UNDP.

With a view to improving U.S. participation, the Congress approved

legislation to encourage Federal employees to accept posts in international organizations. Under this authority Federal employees may, with the consent of their agencies, transfer for service with international organizations for periods of up to 5 years with reemployment rights and the preservation of their pension and insurance benefits. Upon their return to the Federal Government they would be entitled to any difference between the pay and allowances of the international organization and those of the Federal agency for the same post.

With respect to senior posts in the United Nations and specialized agencies, the U.S. position remained unchanged. In all the principal agen-

cies the United States was represented in one or more senior posts.

During the 24th General Assembly the United States proposed for incorporation in the report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly the following paragraph concerning career development of the Secretariat staff:

The Fifth Committee expressed its hope that the Secretary-General would make every effort taking into account the recommendations of the Committee on the reorganization of the Secretariat, to ensure the existence of satisfactory opportunities for career development for Secretariat staff members in order to induce highly qualified individuals to remain in the Secretariat.

This proposal was adopted unanimously.

Principal Organs of the United Nations

The U.N. Charter established six principal organs of the organization: General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, International Court of Justice, and Secretariat.

The General Assembly

The General Assembly is the only principal organ of the United Nations on which all 126 members are represented. These are listed below:

Afghanistan	Greece	Niger
Albania	Guatemala	Nigeria
Algeria	Guinea	Norway
Argentina	Guyana	Pakistan
Australia	Haiti	Panama
Austria	Honduras	Paraguay
Barbados	Hungary	Peru
Belgium	Iceland	Philippines
Bolivia	India	Poland
Botswana	Indonesia	Portugal
Brazil	Iran	Romania
Bulgaria	Iraq	Rwanda
Burma	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Burundi	Israel	Senegal
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Italy	Sierra Leone
Cambodia	Ivory Coast	Singapore
Cameroon	Jamaica	Somalia
Canada	Japan	South Africa
Central African Republic	Jordan	Southern Yemen
Ceylon	Kenya	Spain
Chad	Kuwait	Sudan
Chile	Laos	Swaziland
China	Lebanon	Sweden
Colombia	Lesotho	Syrian Arab Republic
Congo (Brazzaville)	Liberia	Tanzania
Congo (Kinshasa)	Libya	Thailand
Costa Rica	Luxembourg	Togo
Cuba	Malagasy Republic	Trinidad and Tobago
Cyprus	Malawi	Tunisia
Czechoslovakia	Malaysia	Turkey
Dahomey	Maldives	Uganda
Denmark	Mali	Ukrainian S.S.R.
Dominican Republic	Malta	U.S.S.R.
Ecuador	Mauritania	United Arab Republic
El Salvador	Mauritius	United Kingdom
Equatorial Guinea	Mexico	United States
Ethiopia	Mongolia	Upper Volta
Finland	Morocco	Uruguay
France	Nepal	Venezuela
Gabon	Netherlands	Yemen
Gambia	New Zealand	Yugoslavia
Ghana	Nicaragua	Zambia

The 24th regular session of the General Assembly convened Sept. 16, 1969, and adjourned Dec. 17. The Assembly elected Angie E. Brooks (Liberia) President, and the chairmen of the delegations of Barbados, Chile, China, Denmark, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia as the 17 Vice Presidents.

The chairmen of the seven main committees, on which each member may be represented, were:

First (Political and Security)—Agha Shahi (Pakistan)

Special Political—Eugeniusz Kulaga (Poland)

Second (Economic and Financial)—Costa Caranicas (Greece)

Third (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural)—Turkia Ould Daddah (Mauritania)

Fourth (Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories)—Théodore Idzumbuir (Democratic Republic of Congo)

Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary)—David Silveira da Mota, Jr. (Brazil)

Sixth (Legal)—Gonzalo Alcivar (Ecuador)

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.

<i>Permanent members</i>	1969	1970
China	Algeria	Colombia
France	Hungary	Finland
U.S.S.R.	Pakistan	Nepal
United Kingdom	Paraguay	Spain
United States	Senegal	Zambia

On Oct. 20, 1969, the Assembly elected Burundi, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, and Syria for terms beginning Jan. 1, 1970.

Economic and Social Council

Twenty-seven members elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms ending Dec. 31 of the year given in the heading.

1969	1970	1971
Belgium	Argentina	Indonesia
France	Bulgaria	Jamaica
Guatemala	Chad	Norway
Kuwait	Congo (Brazzaville)	Pakistan
Libya	India	Sudan
Mexico	Ireland	U.S.S.R.
Sierra Leone	Japan	United Kingdom
Tanzania	United States	Uruguay
Turkey	Upper Volta	Yugoslavia

On Oct. 20, 1969, the General Assembly elected Brazil, Ceylon, Ghana, Greece, Italy, Kenya, Peru, and Tunisia, and reelected France for terms beginning Jan. 1, 1970.

ECOSOC held its 46th session in New York, May 12–June 6, the first part of its 47th session in Geneva, July 14–Aug. 8, and the resumed part of its 47th session in New York, Oct. 13, 27–31, and Nov. 17–18.

Trusteeship 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 36th session in New York, May 29–June 19, 1969.

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 in parentheses. Members are listed in order of precedence.

José Luis Bustamante y Rivero (Peru) (70), President
Vladimir M. Koretsky (U.S.S.R.) (70), Vice President
Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice (United Kingdom) (73)
Kotaro Tanaka (Japan) (70)
Philip C. Jessup (United States) (70)
Gaetano Morelli (Italy) (70)
Muhammad Zafrullah Khan (Pakistan) (73)
Luis Padilla Nervo (Mexico) (73)
Isaac Forster (Senegal) (73)
André Gros (France) (73)
Fouad Ammoun (Lebanon) (76)
Cesar Bengzon (Philippines) (76)
Sture Petré (Sweden) (76)
Manfred Lachs (Poland) (76)
Charles D. Onyeama (Nigeria) (76)

On Oct. 27, 1969, the General Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently but concurrently, elected Hardy C. Dillard (U.S.), Federico de Castro (Spain), Eduardo Jiménez de Arechaga (Uruguay), Platon D. Morozov (U.S.S.R.), and Louis Ignacio-Pinto (Dahomey) for terms beginning Feb. 6, 1970.

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 Secretary-General is U Thant, of Burma, whose current term of office ends Dec. 31, 1971.

United States Representation

United States Missions

U.S. MISSION AT U.N. HEADQUARTERS IN 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 Representative of the United States to the United Nations, the mission carries out the instructions of the President, transmitted normally by the Secretary of State, in U.N. bodies. It also serves as the channel of communication between the U.S. Government, on the one hand, and the U.N. organs, agencies, and commissions at the Headquarters and the delegations of other nations to the United Nations, on the other. It is a base of operations for the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly and to other U.N. organs and agencies when they meet in New York.

The structure, organization, and functions of the U.S. mission to the United Nations have been determined in the main by the following factors:

(1) The requirements of the U.N. Charter and the resolutions of the U.N. organs.

(2) The provisions of the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Cong.) as amended by Public Law 341 of the 81st Congress, and Public Law 206 of the 89th Congress.

(3) Executive Order 10108.

(4) Location of U.N. Headquarters in the United States and the consequent need for the United States to

assume the responsibilities of "host government."

(5) The fact that the United States is represented on all organs and almost all commissions and committees of the United Nations.

The main source of policy guidance and strategic direction for the conduct of U.S. participation in the United Nations is the Department of State.

The chief of mission, who has the rank of ambassador, is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and also represents the United States in the Security Council. He is assisted by other persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status, appointed by the President to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations. 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, and legal advisers, public affairs specialists, and an administrative section. This staff assists the U.S. Representative in (1) planning the tactical pursuit of U.S. policy objectives in the light of the political, economic, and parliamentary situations in U.N. organs and bodies; (2) consultation, negotiation, and liaison with other delegations and the U.N. Secretariat; (3) preparation of 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 Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.) and the International Organizations Immunities Act (Public Law 291, 79th Cong.), 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 concerning U.S. participation in the United Nations at New York; (7) planning and administering conference operations; (8) providing necessary research, reference, reporting, communications, and general services; and (9) carrying out the administrative, personnel management, fiscal, protocol, and security functions of the U.S. mission.

U.S. MISSION AT U.N. EUROPEAN OFFICE IN GENEVA

The United States is represented at the European Office of the United Nations by a permanent mission at Geneva, Switzerland. Under the direction of the U.S. Representative to the European Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations, the Geneva mission is responsible for relations with and reporting on the activities of U.N. bodies and specialized agencies located there. These bodies include the U.N. Economic Commission for

Europe, the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, and the World Meteorological Organization. In addition, the mission is responsible for relations with other international organizations located in Geneva and for the necessary liaison with the missions of other countries accredited to these organizations.

The chief of the mission reports directly to the Secretary of State and the Department of State. Instructions to the mission are sent by the Department of State. The mission works in close coordination with the U.S. Embassies and the U.S. Mission to the European Communities.

OTHER U.S. MISSIONS

During 1969 the United States also maintained several special missions elsewhere. The Office of the U.S. Representative to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization was maintained in Montreal, Canada, and a U.S. mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency was maintained at Vienna, Austria. A representative responsible for U.S. relations with the U.N. Industrial Development Organization was also stationed in Vienna.

In addition, the United States maintained a liaison group in Paris for relations with the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and a similar group in Rome for relations with the Food and Agriculture Organization.

United States Representatives

THE UNITED NATIONS

Permanent Representative and Chief of U.S. Mission to the United Nations:

Charles W. Yost

Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations:

William B. Buffum

Deputy Permanent Representative on the Security Council:

Christopher H. Phillips

Representative on the Economic and Social Council:

Glenn A. Olds

Representative on the Trusteeship Council:

Christopher H. Phillips

The General Assembly

**TWENTY-FOURTH REGULAR SESSION,
NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 16-DECEMBER 17,
1969**

Representatives:

William P. Rogers¹

Charles W. Yost

William B. Buffum

Dante B. Fascell

J. Irving Whalley

Shirley Temple Black

Alternate Representatives:

Christopher H. Phillips

Glenn A. Olds

Rita E. Hauser

William T. Coleman, Jr.

Joseph E. Johnson

¹ The Secretary served as Chairman of the Delegation, *ex officio*, during his presence at the session. At other times Ambassador Yost served as Senior Representative.

SPECIAL BODIES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Advisory Commission of UNRWA

Representative: Dwight J. Porter

Deputy Representative: J. Thomas McAndrew

U.N. Scientific Advisory Committee

Representative: Isador I. Rabi

U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

Representative: Richard H. Chamberlain

Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Representative: William B. Buffum

Alternate Representatives: Arnold W. Frutkin, Herbert K. Reis, Peter S. Thacher

Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Representative: Seymour Maxwell Finger

Alternate Representative: John Eaves, Jr.

Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (formerly Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament)

Representative: Gerard Smith

Alternate Representatives: Adrian S. Fisher, Culver Gleysteen, James F. Leonard

Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States

Representative: Herbert K. Reis

Alternate Representative: Robert B. Rosenstock

Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD

8th session (Geneva, Jan. 21-Feb. 10; May 5-20)

Representative: Henry Brodie

Alternate Representative: John W. McDonald, Jr.

9th session (1st and 2d parts) (Geneva, Aug. 26–Sept. 23)

Representative: Henry Brodie

Alternate Representative: William E. Culbert

Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations

Representative: Seymour Maxwell Finger

Advisory Committee on the U.N. Program of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination, and Wider Appreciation of International Law

Representative: Stephen M. Schwebel

Industrial Development Board of UNIDO

3d session (Vienna, Apr. 24–May 15)

Representatives: Walter M. Kotschnig, William J. Stibravy

Alternate Representative: Robert E. Simpson

U.N. Commission on International Trade Law

2d session (Geneva, Mar. 3–31)

Representative: Seymour J. Rubin

Alternate: Lawrence H. Hoover

Committee on Conferences

Representative: Wilbur H. Ziehl

Alternate Representative: Sol Kuttner

Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression

Representative: John Lawrence Hargrove

Alternate Representatives: Robert B. Rosenstock, Everett E. Briggs

Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction

1st session (New York, Feb. 6–7)

Representative: David H. Popper

Alternate Representative: Peter S. Thacher

2d session (New York, Mar. 10–28)

Representative: Charles W. Yost

Alternate Representatives: Leonard C. Meeker, David H. Popper, William T. Pecora, Peter S. Thacher

3d session (New York, Aug. 11–29)

Representative: Christopher H. Phillips

Alternate Representatives: Ward P. Allen, William T. Pecora, John R. Stevenson, Peter S. Thacher

The Security Council

Representative:

Charles W. Yost

Deputy Representatives:

William B. Buffum

Christopher H. Phillips

Military Staff Committee

Representatives:

Andrew McB. Jackson, Jr., Vice Adm., USN, to Mar. 31

John M. Lee, Vice Adm., USN, from Mar. 31

Ferdinand J. Chesarek, Lt. Gen., USA, to Mar. 9

Harry J. Lemley, Jr., Lt. Gen., USA, from Mar. 10 to July 31

Richard G. Stilwell, Lt. Gen., USA, from Aug. 1

Joseph R. Holzapple, Lt. Gen., USAF, to Jan. 31

John W. Carpenter III, Lt. Gen., USAF, from Feb. 1

Deputy Representatives:

Archer R. Gordon, Capt., USN, to June 30

Benjamin T. Douglas, Capt., USN, from July 1

Ernest P. Lasche, Col., USA, to July 31

Arthur A. Olson, Col., USA, from Aug. 1

James M. Boyd, Col., USAF, to July 31

Gerald M. Adams, Col., USAF, from Aug. 1

The Trusteeship Council

Representative:

Christopher H. Phillips

Alternate Representative:

Seymour Maxwell Finger

The Economic and Social Council

Representative:

Glenn A. Olds

Deputy Representative:

Walter M. Kotschnig

FUNCTIONAL COMMISSIONS

Human Rights: Rita E. Hauser
Narcotic Drugs: Harry J. Anslinger
Population: William H. Draper, Jr.
Social Development: Jean Picker
Statistical: Julius Shiskin
Status of Women: Elizabeth Duncan Koontz

REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS

Africa

9th session (Addis Ababa, Feb. 3-14)
Chairman, U.S. Observer Delegation:
Waldemar A. Nielsen

Asia and the Far East

25th session (Singapore, Apr. 15-28)
Representative: Glenn A. Olds
Alternate Representative: William M. Kerrigan

Europe

24th session (Geneva, Apr. 9-23)
Representative: Christopher H. Phillips
Alternative Representatives: Herbert F. Propps, Leonard Felsenthal

Latin America

13th session (Lima, Apr. 14-23)
Representative: Robert E. Culbertson
Alternate Representative: Milton Barall

SPECIAL BODIES OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Executive Board of UNICEF

Alternate Representative: Katherine Bain

Committee on Housing, Building, and Planning

Representative: George Snowdon

Committee for Program and Coordination

Representative: Walter M. Kotschnig
Alternate Representative: Clarence I. Blau

Intergovernmental Committee of the UN/FAO World Food Program

15th and 16th sessions (Rome, May 5-13, Oct. 13-18)
Representative: Irwin Hedges
Alternate Representatives: Rulon Gibb, Robert Rossow, Jr.

Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Program (UNHCR)

20th session (Geneva, Oct. 20-29)
Delegate: Clement J. Sobotka
Alternate Delegate: James L. Carlin

Governing Council of the UNDP

7th session (New York, Jan. 9-23)
Representative: Arthur E. Goldschmidt
Alternate Representatives: Clarence I. Blau, William M. Kerrigan
8th session (Geneva, June 16-July 2)
Representative: Glenn A. Olds
Alternate Representative: Robert W. Kitchen, Jr.

The Specialized Agencies and IAEA

Food and Agriculture Organization

15th session FAO Conference (Rome, Nov. 8-27)
Delegate: Andrew J. Mair
Alternate Delegates: Walter M. Kotschnig, Joel Bernstein, Ralph W. Phillips, Robert Rossow, Jr.
52d, 53d, and 54th sessions FAO Council (Rome, June 9-20, Nov. 3-7, Nov. 28)
Delegate: Andrew J. Mair
Alternate Delegates: Ralph W. Phillips, Robert Rossow, Jr.

Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization

6th session IMCO Assembly (London, Oct. 15-29)
Delegate: William K. Miller
Alternate Delegate: Willard J. Smith, Adm., USCG
Extraordinary session IMCO Council (London, Mar. 11-14)
Delegate: John W. McDonald
Alternate Delegate: Carroll Perry, Jr.
22d session IMCO Council (London, May 12-16)
Delegate: John F. Buckle
Alternate Delegate: Charles P. Murphy, Adm., USCG
23d session IMCO Council (London, Oct. 29)
Delegate: William K. Miller
Alternate Delegate: John W. McDonald

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

U.S. Governor, Board of Governors:
Joseph M. Barr, until Mar. 14
David M. Kennedy, from Mar. 14

Alternate U.S. Governor:
Eugene V. Rostow, until Aug. 19
Nathaniel Samuels, from Aug. 19

U.S. Executive Director:
Covey T. Oliver, until Nov. 4
Robert E. Wieczorowski, from Nov. 4

Alternate U.S. Executive Director:
Emmett J. Rice

International Civil Aviation Organization

U.S. Representative on the Council of ICAO:
Robert P. Boyle, until May 23
Charles F. Butler, from May 23
Alternate Representative: George G. Sink

International Development Association

The Officers, Executive Directors, and Alternates are the same as those of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

International Finance Corporation

U.S. Governor, Board of Governors:
Joseph M. Barr, until Mar. 14
David M. Kennedy, from Mar. 14

Alternate U.S. Governor:
Eugene V. Rostow, until Aug. 19
Nathaniel Samuels, from Aug. 19

U.S. Executive Director:
Covey T. Oliver, until Nov. 4
Robert E. Wieczorowski, from Nov. 4

Alternate U.S. Executive Director:
Emmett J. Rice

International Labor Organization

53d International Labor Conference
(Geneva, June 4-26)

U.S. Government Representatives: George L-P Weaver, George P. Delaney

U.S. Employer Representative: Edwin P. Neilan

U.S. Worker Representative: Rudolph Faupl

International Monetary Fund

U.S. Governor, Board of Governors:
Joseph M. Barr, until Mar. 14
David M. Kennedy, from Mar. 14

Alternate U.S. Governor:
Eugene V. Rostow, until Aug. 19
Nathaniel Samuels, from Aug. 19

U.S. Executive Director: William B. Dale
Alternate U.S. Executive Director: John S. Hooker

International Telecommunication Union

U.S. Representative, Administrative Council:
Thomas E. Nelson

U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

U.S. Member, Executive Board:
Katie S. Louchheim, until Sept. 15
Louise Gore, from Sept. 15

Universal Postal Union

16th Universal Postal Congress (Tokyo, Oct. 1-Nov. 14)

Chairman, U.S. Delegation: William M. Blount

U.S. Representative, Executive Council:
Walter Sheble, until May 1
Daniel S. C. Liu, from July 1

World Health Organization

22d World Health Assembly (Boston, July 8-25)

Delegate and Chairman, U.S. Delegation:
William H. Stewart

U.S. Member, Executive Board: Dr. S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr., from July 28

Alternate Member: Dr. Benjamin V. Blood, from July 28

World Meteorological Organization

U.S. Representative, Executive Committee:
Robert M. White

International Atomic Energy Agency

13th General Conference (Vienna, Sept. 23-29)

U.S. Representative: Glenn T. Seaborg
U.S. Member, Board of Governors:
Henry D. Smyth



1969 PR

