

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1633rd
 MEETING**

Monday, 9 December 1968,
 at 11.15 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 62:</i>	
<i>International Year for Human Rights (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General;</i>	
(b) <i>International Conference on Human Rights</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1 (concluded)</i>	1
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1</i>	4

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Mahmassani (Lebanon), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 62

International Year for Human Rights (continued) (A/7194, A/7195, A/7195/Add.1 and Add.3-7, A/CONF.32/41, A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1635/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1636, A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1638-1641, A/C.3/L.1642/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1644, A/C.3/L.1647):

- (a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) International Conference on Human Rights

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.3/L.1626 AND ADD.1 (concluded)

1. Mr. DENNIS (Liberia), explaining his delegation's vote at the 1632nd meeting, said that his Government would wish to see the rights of every human being respected and was disturbed by situations which could lead to violations of those rights, especially in cases of armed conflict. His Government deeply regretted the problems troubling the Middle East and had supported all United Nations measures designed to bring peace, justice, understanding and tolerance to the region and to establish Israel's right to exist as a sovereign State and to enjoy friendly relations with its Arab neighbours.

2. The preambular paragraphs of the resolution adopted (A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1) were based on sound provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and resolutions 237 (1967) of the Security Council, 2252 (ES-V) and 2341 (XXII) of the General

Assembly, 6 (XXIV) of the Commission on Human Rights and 1336 (XLIV) of the Economic and Social Council. The operative part, on the other hand, was one-sided and failed to deal with the problem as a whole, to the extent that his delegation had only refrained from voting against the draft resolution because of the respect due to the principles cited in the preamble. His Government supported any humanitarian measure designed to alleviate the sufferings of a people. But at the same time it considered a balanced approach essential in questions such as the present Middle East situation, because war engendered hatred and injustice of all kinds, and frequently each side regarded itself as the offended and wronged party, forgetting the offences and wrongs it had itself committed.

3. The United Nations had recognized the gravity of the situation in the Middle East and the inhumane and unjust acts committed by both sides by sending a mediator to the area, and his Government considered that any other approach to the question which was not equally objective and balanced would create more problems than it would solve. By abstaining in the vote, his delegation had indicated its support for United Nations efforts to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and for humanitarian measures to alleviate the suffering of the civilian population involved in the conflict. It had also shown its opposition to any solution which did not take into account the wrongs done to the people of Israel. Only if Israel's right to exist as a sovereign State was recognized and respected by all could there be an end to the suffering of the civilian population on both sides.

4. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel) protested against the tactics used at the 1632nd meeting to suppress freedom of speech, which had prevented her delegation and a number of others from speaking before the vote on the resolution which had been adopted (A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1). Such conduct was an indication of the motives and spirit which had lain behind the proposal ever since its birth at the Teheran Conference and made it obvious that it was not a humanitarian proposal but a political and propaganda exercise. The inclusion of a passage from resolution I of the Teheran Conference which prejudged the results of the proposed inquiry made the text a mockery of the accepted canons of fairness and ethics. It also ignored the tragic plight of the Jewish civilians in the area of hostilities who were being persecuted and maltreated and deprived of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. The situation of those groups, to which no foreigner had access, cried out for the attention of the international community far more than the situation of the Arab inhabitants in territories held by Israel, whose safety

and welfare were ensured by the Israel authorities and whose situation was known to the public.

5. For those reasons, her Government rejected the draft resolution as one-sided, discriminatory and prejudicial to the Jarring Mission; it would do nothing but introduce another complication into an already sensitive and complex situation. Her delegation had been gratified to note that the great majority of impartial Member States which maintained relations with both Israel and the Arab States had refused to support it. Despite the reluctance of many delegations to vote against or abstain on proposals relating to human rights, less than half the Members of the Organization had voted for it. It thus reflected a minority point of view and could not be regarded as a general expression of United Nations opinion.

6. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that he was proud to have voted for the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1), which expressed concern not only for the Arab peoples at present being subjected to inhuman treatment under foreign military occupation, but also for any human beings who might find themselves in similar circumstances. The resolution reflected the feeling of urgency surrounding the creation of the proposed committee and the need for it to complete its task with dispatch. It implied that the special committee's task would not be completed until it was terminated by a decision of the General Assembly or the military occupation was ended. It also let it be understood that the committee's mission was not to be held up or paralysed by political decisions on the part of Israel, as had happened with the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, because it would have many ways of determining the truth; thus, it would be able to hear statements and receive petitions and to study the laws and regulations imposed by the occupying authorities and their other decisions.

7. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq), exercising his right of reply, rejected the Israel delegation's attempt to set itself up as the spokesman for Jews all over the world, giving them a second nationality in addition to that of the country of which they were citizens and justifying interference in the internal affairs of other States on the pretext of protecting the Jewish community. Despite its respect for Judaism as a noble religion, his delegation was categorically opposed to Zionist intervention in the affairs of the Jews in Iraq, who were Iraqi citizens and, as such, lived perfectly normal lives. The welfare of the Iraqi Jews was the responsibility of the Government of Iraq, which had passed a law to protect their interests in March 1968, and their safety was not a matter for anyone else to concern themselves with.

8. He would therefore urge the Zionist leaders to refrain from claiming a double loyalty for all Jews in the world, with a view to using them as a Zionist fifth column in the countries of which they were citizens. He wished to point out that a large number of Arab Jews who had emigrated to Israel, having been deceived by false propaganda, were now discriminated against by the European Zionists. It was paradoxical that the latter, who were not Semites,

9. Finally, he expressed his delegation's satisfaction at the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1.

10. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel) rejected the insinuation that her delegation was calling upon all Jews in the world to profess a double loyalty. She noted that the representative of Iraq had not referred to the discriminatory measures and legal steps taken by the Iraqi Government against the Jewish population in that country. Israel was a democratic society in which the whole population enjoyed equality and exercised their right to freedom of speech, which could not be said of Iraq.

11. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), exercising his right of reply, said that the statement made at the 1631st meeting by the representative of Israel, who had repeatedly complained that the Committee was a forum for propaganda, had itself been designed first and foremost to serve propaganda purposes, which was in keeping with the Israelis' regular principle of not tolerating in others what they consider justified in themselves. Regarding the destruction of homes and deportation of leaders from the occupied territories, Israel maintained that such measures were based on the defence regulations which had been introduced by the Mandatory Power in 1945 and were still in effect in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank of the river Jordan. But they could not justify the introduction by Israel of its own administration and legislation in other occupied territories, particularly the city of Jerusalem, where houses had again been destroyed and people deported.

12. It was obvious, moreover, that the 1945 regulations, which had permitted rather than authorized deportation and destruction, had been rendered null and void by the rules of international law approved at Geneva in 1949, which prohibited such acts. Furthermore, the Israel authorities had admitted that in the present case they had gone beyond even what was permitted by the 1945 defence regulations.

13. With regard to the statement made by the United States delegation at the 1632nd meeting, he had been glad to hear that the United States considered Israel a military occupant, but he had subsequently been equally disappointed by assertions which had rendered those words meaningless. Although the United States had begun by recognizing that the question was limited to respect for human rights in the occupied territories, it had then enlarged the scope of the question to cover the exercise of human rights throughout the area, thus deliberately confusing the examination by the international community of a specific situation. After saying that the discussion of a question relating to human rights should have no political overtones, the United States delegation had gone on to base its whole position on political considerations. For example, it had stated that it was necessary to await a political solution to the Arab-Israel conflict before tackling the question of human rights in the area. That position was no doubt based on a new doctrine—perhaps the "Picker doctrine"—which required that concern for human rights in an occupied territory should remain in abeyance until the occupation ended, and

lished since the 1860s for the purpose of making war less inhumane.

14. However, the United States delegation, in order to avoid so extreme a conclusion, had taken advantage of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) to maintain that both parties involved in the conflict should share the responsibility for the failure of the humanitarian mission implicit in that resolution. However, that interpretation was not consistent with the views expressed by the Security Council in its resolution 259 (1968), in which it had deplored the fact that the conditions being set by Israel had prevented the implementation of resolution 237 (1967). The view expressed by the United States delegation was perhaps due to ignorance of the facts; if not, it would be an insult to the Arab States.

15. The United States representative had also maintained that justice required an investigation covering the whole area, and not merely the territories occupied by Israel. However, the Secretary-General, in his legal analysis of the subject, concluded that Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) applied exclusively to the territories occupied by Israel since June 1967, and not to the Jewish minorities in the Arab States. There again, the United States, in its efforts to protect Israel and to prevent an investigation from being carried out in the occupied territories, had presented its own interpretation of the facts, which contradicted that of the impartial legal officers of the United Nations.

16. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), referring to the statement of the United States representative at the 1632nd meeting to the effect that the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1) would make Mr. Jarring's mission more difficult and that both parties involved in the conflict were responsible for the failure of the second humanitarian mission, pointed out that on the same day the United States representative in the Special Political Committee (629th meeting) had recalled that the Security Council, in its resolution 237 (1967), had called upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. Only about 20,000 of the innumerable refugees who had indicated a desire to return to their homes had been allowed to do so. The United States considered that an inadequate response to the resolution, and its delegation had therefore asked the Government of Israel to take meaningful steps to implement the resolution.

17. It could be inferred from that statement that Israel had not complied with the provisions of Security Council resolution 237 (1967), and was impeding the work of the humanitarian missions—a situation which called for a thorough investigation of the facts. He wondered, therefore, how the United States representative in the Third Committee could reconcile her statement with the statement he had just quoted.

Mrs. Ould Daddah (Mauritania), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

18. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq) explained that in his previous statement he had been quoting the words

of the President of the World Zionist Organization, who had said that Jews should have the courage to declare that they owed loyalty not only to the land in which they lived but also to Israel, that the flag of Israel was also their flag, and that Jews living in other countries should have the courage to defend Israel.

19. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel) reiterated her statement that the policy of Israel in the occupied territories during the past eighteen months had been humane and enlightened. What was more, Israel respected the freedom of speech and the right of protest of the Arab population; in other words, the treatment accorded to the population of the occupied territories was quite different from that which some Arab countries accorded to their own citizens.

20. The representative of Kuwait had seen fit to refer to the provisions of the Geneva Convention, but not to Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter, which stated that all Members should settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, were not endangered, and should refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. It was there, in her view, that the origin of the problem lay. She also pointed out that it was Kuwait which, in its reply to the cable dispatched by the Secretary-General, had stated that it did not accept the cease-fire and would continue to consider itself at war with Israel.

21. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) said she did not accept the rather strained interpretation of her words given by the representatives of Kuwait and Syria, nor the allegations of those representatives. But, since the debate had been somewhat prolonged, she would not reply in kind to their remarks.

22. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that the Committee was considering a humanitarian problem from which the representative of Israel had repeatedly tried to divert attention. Kuwait was a loyal Member of the United Nations and scrupulously observed all the provisions of the Charter, not merely some of them. First and foremost, the Charter recognized the rights of peoples, and in particular, the right of self-determination. The Palestine Arabs therefore had that right.

23. As for the humane and enlightened policy mentioned by the representative of Israel, he asked what humaneness there was in the expulsion of leaders, the destruction of villages, the imposition of curfews on whole communities and the daily plundering and pillaging, all of which were contrary to the 1949 Geneva Conventions.

24. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that a statement (A/C.3/L.1644) of the administrative and financial implications of the establishment of the special committee envisaged in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1 had been circulated. As stated in paragraph 2 of that document, it was not possible at the present time to provide firm estimates of the costs which might be reasonably expected should the General Assembly adopt the proposed draft resolution. Actual requirements would not be known until the special committee had been

constituted and had taken decisions on its programme of work. One representative had suggested at the current meeting that the committee could, among other things, hear statements, receive petitions and examine the laws and regulations imposed by the occupying authorities. If the work of the committee was to be as extensive as that, the competent United Nations bodies would have to take the appropriate action.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION
A/C.3/L.1633/REV.1

25. Mr. GANESH (India), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, said that its sponsors were a cross-section of the membership of the United Nations and represented the widespread concern felt throughout the world for the preservation of human rights in armed conflict.
26. There was a tendency for all wars, however limited their original aims, to degenerate into total war, especially if the belligerents were equally matched in power and tenacity. The only differences between a limited war and a total or absolute war was the number of persons involved—not only those actually fighting, but also those who were affected by its consequences.
27. Despite his innumerable triumphs in every field of life, civilized man had spent a very considerable proportion of his history in making war or in preparing for it. Man's preoccupation with war could be better understood if it was realized that in the perspective of time man had existed for a very short period and the evolution of the primitive man into a civilized being, totally devoid of violent instincts, was still far from complete. That process would probably continue for a very long time unless, in an act of madness, man suddenly decided to put an end to himself.
28. Despite that preoccupation with war, the advance of civilization had served to bring increasingly to the fore the humanitarian tendencies present in all civilized beings. The rise of the great religions had to some extent contributed to that. The futility of wars, of senseless brutality and killing, had touched a chord of sympathetic response in the hearts even of many great rulers and conquerors. It was significant that the treatment meted out to the vanquished had evolved from the indiscriminate slaughter or enslavement of soldiers and civilians in the earliest periods of recorded history, to the exchange of prisoners of war, for example, in the Middle Ages. With the coming of the industrial revolution, the very nature of war had changed; while there had been an increasing concern for the preservation of human rights during armed conflicts, the harnessing of scientific discoveries to the goals of warfare had increased the threat to human rights during such periods. In the twentieth century the desire to make warfare as humane as possible and to spare those not involved to the maximum extent possible, though a contradiction in itself, had constantly gained momentum. It could be asserted that, despite the numerous wars, international as well as local, that had plagued the first sixty-eight years of the century, the desire for peace, tolerance and mutual understanding had reached a culminating point during the last few years and, no doubt, would be translated into action before long.
29. Nevertheless, the world today was witnessing a paradoxical situation in which the vast discoveries of science and technology had placed within the reach of mankind the power to destroy once for all every living thing in the world. The intensity and destructive potential of local wars had increased proportionately. The sustained efforts which mankind had made since the beginning of the century to highlight that problem were therefore greatly to its credit, and it was interesting to note that the international community had expressed itself on the subject at almost regular intervals of twenty years, in the Hague Conventions of 1907 and the Geneva Conventions of 1927 and 1949.
30. Unfortunately, the brutality and scale of war had been increasing, and those conventions were now inadequate and ineffective. It had been estimated, for example, that in the Second World War 17 million military and 47 million civilians had died, and in the Korean war 1 million military and 4 million civilians. Currently, Viet-Nam presented a dark picture of devastation and tragedy. As for the arms and techniques employed, next to nuclear weapons the most destructive was undoubtedly the napalm bomb, which had begun to be used at the end of the Second World War. Although the Geneva Protocol of 1925 forbade the use of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, he believed that the matter should be reviewed more thoroughly. For example, the Hague Conventions made no specific reference to aerial bombardment, because at that time military aviation had not yet come into existence. Another important omission in the Geneva Conventions related to organized resistance movements which were fighting in a brave and sustained manner to bring about the liberation of their homelands, as, for example, in southern Africa. The 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War took cognizance of members of resistance movements if they formed part of the armed forces. Needless to say, that provision was hopelessly inadequate to afford protection to those freedom-fighters who were participating in the various liberation movements in southern Africa. While it was true that the fundamental value of the Geneva Conventions lay in their humanitarian spirit, which was ageless and transcended the written word, they undoubtedly had serious drawbacks, principally because they looked towards the past. In 1949, for example, the nuclear age had just dawned; a large sector of humanity had still been suffering under the colonial yoke, and liberation movements in southern Africa had not yet arisen. Consequently, it had not been possible to frame regulations that would cover them.
31. There were many lacunæ in the present laws of war, but it was not his intention to prejudge the study to be made by the Secretary-General on that question. Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1 reaffirmed both the experiences and the hopes of mankind in that respect. He therefore hoped that the Committee would adopt it unanimously. Nevertheless, he recognized that the draft resolution was no permanent solution to man's age-old struggle

humanity from senseless destruction and death, or final annihilation in the event of a nuclear war. His delegation recalled the numerous proposals it had made in the United Nations and elsewhere in the matter of disarmament, the outlawing of nuclear war, the reduction of armed forces, and allied questions. Those were essential prerequisites to save mankind from the curse of war. Finally, he quoted the words of the late Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru, who had said that the threat of nuclear war hung over the world, but that fact was not appreciated by many Governments. The choice before the world was between self-extinction or survival. The only possible solution was to divert all energies and all strength to the prevention of that catastrophe.^{1/}

32. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) thanked the representative of India for his introduction of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1. In his view, it was an important task of the United Nations to strengthen and bring up to date the humanitarian legal provisions in question. In that way, he hoped, the international community might be able to improve the protection of the civilian population, prisoners of war and combatants in armed conflicts and achieve the prohibition and limitation of the use of certain methods and means of warfare.

33. He paid a heartfelt tribute to the Red Cross, which had three times been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. He hoped that the draft resolution would receive the same unanimous acceptance as resolution XXIII had had at the Teheran Conference.

34. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that the action proposed in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, of which her delegation was a sponsor, was one of the most important to emerge from the International Conference on Human Rights. The draft resolution met a twofold concern: firstly, to secure the widest possible acceptance and the strongest possible implementation of the existing rules of war, and, secondly, to determine what gaps existed in that body of law and what were the best means of filling them.

35. The present system of rules applicable to armed conflicts comprised two basic sections. The first consisted of the law of The Hague, embodied primarily in the Conventions of 1899 and the revisions thereto adopted in 1907. Those instruments were concerned with the relations between belligerent Powers, and the only addition made to that series of treaties had been the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925.

36. The second section relating to the law of war—namely, the law of Geneva—was concerned with the protection of individuals in all armed conflicts; it comprised the four Geneva Conventions of 1949, which had been called the most complete set of regulations yet devised for the protection of the individual in time of war. However, those instruments did not adequately protect civilian populations, which, in present-day conflicts, often suffered the most from the hostilities, since the relevant Convention sought only to protect the civilian population from abuses of authority which enemy armies might commit in occupied territories.

37. The four Geneva Conventions contained a general clause which stated that a certain minimum number of humanitarian provisions were applicable to all armed conflicts, even when they were not of an international character. That clause was of particular importance, since nowadays many armed conflicts were not international, declared wars in the traditional sense and since it had also been accepted that the Hague and Geneva Conventions were declaratory of customary international law, so that the principles they contained were binding on all nations, whether or not they had formally accepted the Conventions.

38. She emphasized the necessity of strengthening and implementing the existing body of law, and said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had tried to achieve that objective by calling upon all States, in operative paragraph 5, formally to become parties to the relevant conventions and by inviting the Secretary-General, in operative paragraph 2 (a), to study steps which could be taken to secure the better application of that body of law. In that connexion, a possible suggestion might be that the States parties to the Geneva Conventions be requested to give their provisions the widest possible publicity, in accordance with the obligation they had assumed when accepting the Conventions.

39. With regard to the second of the purposes of the draft resolution, namely to determine the gaps in the present law of war, she said that the rules referring specifically to the conduct of belligerents and the means they were entitled to use in the event of hostilities had not been brought up to date since 1925. Similarly, a new and more precise definition of the categories of persons entitled to engage in warlike activities might be a constructive step at a time when guerrilla warfare had assumed such importance and when the General Assembly had recognized the legitimacy of certain types of struggle which were not declared wars but might possibly be more worthy in their objectives, and which certainly had the backing of the United Nations.

40. The draft resolution embodied an implicit appeal to the Secretary-General to suggest in the proposed study the best ways and means of filling the gaps in the present rules governing the law of war. What was certain was that none of the relevant conventions, with the single exception of the 1954 European Cultural Convention for the protection of cultural property, contained any provision for revision. Thus, any proposal for revision would imply that the instruments in question would again need to be opened for ratification, and the risks inherent in that procedure would be very serious, since it would mean that until such time as they were ratified the instruments would technically not be in force. She therefore hoped that in the Secretary-General's study other methods would be suggested, whether additional, new or supplementary conventions, or protocols to the existing conventions.

41. In the hope that the measures which the sponsors regarded as vital would be adopted to ensure that the law of war was not neglected in relation to modern technology and the realities of the world today, operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution cited four minimum principles approved without a negative vote

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, volume II, 1051st meeting, para. 20.

by the International Conference of the Red Cross held at Vienna in 1965. The first reproduced textually a provision taken from the fourth Hague Convention; the second and the third were principles accepted in international law as the premises on which the 1949 Geneva Conventions were based. With regard to the fourth principle, her delegation wanted to make it clear that it did not regard the use of nuclear weapons as a legitimate method of warfare, but in the absence of a general ban on that type of armament, it seemed important to state that the general principles of the law of war applied to nuclear weapons also.

42. She understood that in the First Committee a proposal had been put forward to the effect that the Secretary-General should undertake a study of the effects of chemical and bacteriological warfare (A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-9).^{2/} Her delegation did not consider that such a study--which it supported--overlapped with anything proposed in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, but in so far as that danger might exist, it assumed that the Secretary-General would take the necessary measures to see that it did not happen. Moreover, if the proposal was approved, her delegation was of the view that the General Committee of the Assembly should be left entirely free, at the twenty-fourth session, to determine which of the Main Committees should deal with the Secretary-General's study; in its view the proper forum might well be the Sixth Committee.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda items 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96, document A/7441 (Report of the First Committee on agenda item 27), para. 5 (b).

43. In conclusion, she appealed for unanimous approval of the draft resolution.

44. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country, as a party both to the Hague Conventions and to the Geneva Conventions, supported any initiative designed to produce humanitarian rules to mitigate the sufferings occasioned by warlike activities. His delegation had no objection to the first three principles embodied in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, but it was categorically opposed to the fourth principle affirming that the general principles of the law of war applied to nuclear and similar weapons, since that was tantamount to legitimizing the use of such offensive weapons, in direct contradiction to the declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, adopted by the General Assembly in 1961 that the use of such arms was contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The principle in question likewise ran counter to the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.447 and Add.1-5)^{3/} submitted by the Soviet Union which advocated the preparation of an international convention to proscribe the use of nuclear weapons. His delegation had therefore submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.1647) to delete the fourth sub-paragraph of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, document A/7442 (Report of the First Committee on agenda item 28), para. 5.