



General Assembly

Sixty-sixth session

61st plenary meeting

Friday, 18 November 2011, 3 p.m.

New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Agenda item 118 (continued)

The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy

Draft resolution (A/66/L.8)

Amendments (A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12, A/66/L.13 and A/66/L.14)

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I give the floor to the representative of Saudi Arabia to introduce draft resolution A/66/L.8.

Mr. Al-Mouallimi (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is introducing draft resolution A/66/L.8, entitled “Terrorist attacks on internationally protected persons”, which has been sponsored by 50 Member States from around the world.

The draft resolution comes after we all witnessed the increasing number of attacks and assaults on diplomatic missions and on individuals who enjoy and are protected by diplomatic immunity in several parts of the world, including missions to the United Nations themselves. Saudi diplomatic missions and diplomats have faced several direct and indirect attacks in various locations, including attacks on Saudi consulates in the Islamic Republic of Iran a few months ago. At that time, my Government sent a note to the Secretary-General to inform him about the incident and to strongly denounce such unwarranted actions.

A few weeks ago, a heinous plot to assassinate Saudi Arabia’s Ambassador to the United States was revealed. One person was arrested and charged with participating in that conspiracy, while another was charged but is still at large. A few days ago, authorities uncovered another plot, to assassinate Saudi Arabia’s Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, destroy the Saudi Embassy headquarters there and blow up the King Fahad Causeway linking Saudi Arabia and Bahrain.

Accordingly, the draft resolution before the Assembly today was introduced to say that “Enough is enough” — “enough” to terrorism, “enough” to attacking diplomats and endangering their safety, “enough” to attacks on diplomatic missions, “enough” to conspiracies and to the use of assassination as a means to extend influence, intimidate, impose one’s will or divert attention from internal power struggles.

My country and other sponsors have prepared an objective and balanced text for the draft resolution. Despite all of the available evidence pointing to the involvement of a specific State and a specific entity in the assassination plot, according to the documented confessions of the accused detainee, which are substantiated by other evidence, the draft resolution neither condemns nor accuses a specific State or individual. I repeat that the draft resolution neither condemns nor accuses any party. It is limited to stressing a series of basic principles, which I will now summarize.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.



First, the draft resolution condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. Secondly, it condemns attacks on diplomatic and consular missions and on diplomats. Thirdly, it condemns the plot to assassinate the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States. Fourthly, it encourages all States to take necessary steps to prevent, on their territories, the planning, financing, sponsorship or organization or commission of terrorist acts. Fifthly, it calls upon the Islamic Republic of Iran to comply with all of its obligations under international law and to cooperate in bringing to justice all those who were accused of participating in the plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador.

Some may wonder why we mention the name of the Islamic Republic of Iran in a call for cooperation in bringing the participants in this conspiracy to justice. The answer is simple. The name of the Islamic Republic of Iran came out in the confessions of the main suspect in the plot. Simple justice demands that we give the Islamic Republic of Iran the full opportunity to clear its name and prove its innocence if it is not involved in the plot.

The truth is that there are only two possibilities. Either Iran is certain of its innocence and can refute all accusations against it, in which case it has only to respond confidently and calmly to the allegations as soon as possible, or else Iran — or one of its agencies or citizens — was in fact involved in the plot, in which case it is only natural for it to deny its involvement and try to evade assuming its responsibilities in this.

Some may ask, “Is a suspect not innocent until proven guilty?” We answer clearly, “Yes”. We emphasize in the draft resolution that we are not accusing any party nor do we presuppose the guilt of any party. We simply stress basic principles and call for cooperation. Likewise, some may protest, “Why not wait until the accused are brought to trial and the courts reach a verdict?” Our answer is that cooperation with the investigation should precede a trial and that another key suspect is still at large and cannot be tried without the cooperation of Iran in bringing him to justice.

Others may ask, “Why involve the General Assembly in a matter that concerns only two States?” Our answer is that the Charter of the United Nations is the fundamental reference governing international relations, especially in issues of international peace

and security. The United Nations has adopted a comprehensive strategy to combat terrorism, and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, and other principles and instruments of international law exist to establish agreed and civilized norms for international relations. Keeping silent about violations of those norms only erodes the pillars of international diplomacy and does damage to all principles of international relations.

My country does not seek to harm Iran or any other country. My country considers Iran, its close neighbour, heir to a great civilization. Our two countries have close and longstanding bonds of geography, history and cultural heritage. My country opens its borders and its heart every year to tens of thousands of Iranians who visit the holy places in Saudi Arabia, where they are welcomed with hospitality, respect and care. My country does not want to be a party to any conflict with Iran or any other country, unless it is in a matter that threatens the security and safety of my country, the Arab Gulf region and the Middle East. My country only seeks security for its diplomats and its diplomatic and consular missions. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. President, I appeal to you to put our draft resolution — which is sponsored by more than 55 Member States — before the General Assembly for a vote. Furthermore, I respectfully ask all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution for the sake of the security and protection of all diplomats and all diplomatic and consular missions around the world. I specifically call upon the Islamic Republic of Iran, with deep respect and love, to vote in favour of the draft resolution, because any other action on its part will only reflect a lack of confidence in its own position in this matter.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to introduce amendments to draft resolution A/66/L.8, contained in documents A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12, A/66/L.13 and A/66/L.14.

Mr. Khazae (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset, Mr. President, allow me to reiterate the appreciation of my delegation and myself of the excellent way you have conducted the business of the Assembly’s current session. I also thank you for giving me the floor to express my view on the draft resolution

before us and to introduce the amendments that we have already submitted.

Before going further, I will say that I listened carefully to the statement made by the previous speaker, the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia. Of course we are very confident that the Islamic Republic of Iran has not been involved in any action like the alleged plot or in terrorist acts in the United States or anywhere else. We have been trying to be, and we have been, a source of stability in the Persian Gulf in various countries. That is our strategy in foreign policy.

Mr. President, I have already sent you a letter, copied to all my colleagues, in which I expressed the essence of our views on this draft resolution and which provides the rationale for its amendment. I also had the opportunity to lay out and elaborate on our legal arguments against it in the informal meeting held last Wednesday — a meeting that I found very useful in the sense that a number of colleagues had the opportunity to explain why this draft resolution, as is, could not be acceptable to them, either, and needed to be amended.

As I have already explained, our fundamental difficulty with the draft resolution lies in the simple fact that it is based on nothing but an unsubstantiated claim by one Member State with a long history of animosity against my country, which claim my Government has already strongly rejected. The essence of the claim has also met with strong doubts around the world, including among the elite in the United States and even many former United States officials. Under such circumstances, it is mind-boggling how such a pure and simple allegation could serve as the foundation of a draft resolution brought to the floor of the Assembly. Such an action is truly unprecedented in the history of the General Assembly and, as such, should be rejected, no matter which country is the target.

As I stated at the Wednesday consultations, the draft resolution explicitly implicates my country in the alleged plot. In so doing, it prejudices the outcome of the case immeasurably. It is very unreasonable, therefore, as well as unfair, to expect Member States to adopt a draft resolution based on an unsubstantiated allegation, thus siding with a judgement passed in an unwarranted manner against another Member State and undermining the United Nations Charter. That is why we request our colleagues not to support the draft

resolution as it stands now, and to agree with the amendments that we have proposed.

As I said the other day, of course, under Article 10 of the Charter, any issue can be raised by Member States in the General Assembly. However, it is evident that placing allegations, as well as hypothetical and unsubstantiated matters, on the Assembly's agenda would cause enormous damage to its credibility and authority.

If members of the General Assembly allow the draft resolution to be adopted without amendment, the Assembly runs the risk of setting a dangerous precedent, and it could turn into a venue for settling political scores and advancing narrow political interests. Consequently, we believe that no matter who is the target of the draft resolution, all Member States that are attached to and hold dear the principles and objectives of the United Nations should resolve to counter it. That is another strong rationale for amending the draft resolution.

The political context prevailing between my country and the prime mover of this draft resolution — the United States — is quite revealing of the intention behind it and the claim made on 11 October, as well as the media hype that followed. While the 1953 coup d'état lies at the origin of the animosity between the Iranian people and the United States Government, the hostilities directed by that country against my nation in recent decades date back, in fact, to 1979, when the Iranian people chose to be the masters of their own affairs. Widespread political and economic pressure by the United States against my country over the past many years, including unilateral sanctions and the threat of aggression, are fully known to every colleague in this Hall.

The allegation that now forms the basis of the draft resolution is yet another plot, not against the Saudi Ambassador but against my country, and another step along the same well-known path. Against that backdrop, it should not be acceptable to any of us for the General Assembly, too, to be used for advancing a political agenda against a Member State.

Unfortunately, diplomats of many countries and United Nations international civil servants have been the target of many terrorist acts and have, in fact, perished in recent and past years. A number of Iranian diplomats, too, have lost their lives after being targeted by terrorists. Unfortunately, many of our embassies and

missions, including my own Permanent Mission in New York, were attacked and ransacked just a few years ago. In another case, after more than 30 years, we have yet to find any clue as to what happened to our four diplomats abducted in Lebanon by the Zionist regime.

Many other Member States have also been the victim of terrorist attacks against their officials and official premises. Nonetheless, we do not recall that they ever tried to raise such a specific issue in the General Assembly. The question now is why a pure allegation would have been placed on the Assembly's agenda.

The ways and means of dealing with such cases are well defined and established. Cooperation among countries is chief among them. Targeting countries in multilateral forums is counterproductive and amounts to damaging the environment in which cooperation should be upheld and promoted.

I urge those who support the draft resolution not to help an accusatory tendency to grow in the United Nations. It would be a very dangerous game that undermines the credibility of this important international body if, in future, no one can prevent anybody from bringing such strange ploys and accusations against another country. If we want to do that, we will have many such cases. Many representatives have had such experiences in the past. The credibility of the General Assembly is on the table today. Such a tendency, if unchecked, will have an adverse impact on all regions, thus eroding confidence and creating tension in international relations.

We have already expressed the position of my Government in regard to the allegation in the three letters that I sent to the Secretary-General. We categorically rejected the involvement of any Iranian official or agency in the alleged plot. Moreover, we are fully aware of our obligations under relevant international legal instruments, including the 1973 Convention, and we affirm our full commitment to fulfilling such obligations.

While requesting once more that our colleagues be extremely cautious with respect to the consequences that this action by the Assembly could have for the future work of the United Nations, allow me to turn to our amendments. We have here an opportunity to bring this draft resolution back onto the right path, in which case our delegation would also join it as a sponsor,

namely, by stressing the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, which we fully support, instead of targeting a particular country. The amendments we hereby present to the Assembly are composed along those lines. We thus propose to turn the draft resolution into a text that addresses criminal acts attempted against all internationally protected persons in general.

Therefore, in the light of the preceding, in our first proposed amendment, contained in document A/66/L.11, we propose that the seventh, ninth, tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs be deleted. The seventh preambular paragraph refers to a totally peaceful and restrained demonstration in front of the Saudi Arabian consulate in Meshed, where no accident occurred. The ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs contain references to two accusatory letters that seek to implicate my country in an alleged plot. In addition to recognizing the vagueness and lack of clarity surrounding the so-called plot, as I explained previously, my colleagues should note that allegations are taken here as facts. My point here applies to all other references to the so-called plot in this draft. Therefore, we propose that those three preambular paragraphs be deleted.

In our second proposed amendment, contained in document A/66/L.12, we propose the deletion of the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which refers to an assassination plot as if it were an established and duly adjudicated case.

In our third proposed amendment, contained in document A/66/L.13, we propose the deletion of paragraph 3. Here again, the General Assembly would be invited to concur with a claim that has yet to be substantiated and run its logical judicial course.

In our final proposed amendment, contained in document A/66/L.14, we propose to amend paragraph 5 to read as follows:

“5. Calls upon Member States to comply with all their obligations under international law, including the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.”

Members will note that in document A/66/L.14, the phrase “including Diplomatic Agents” is not included

in the paragraph 5 to be amended. I insert it orally here.

In amending paragraph 5, as we propose, the General Assembly will avoid taking up an issue among parties to the 1973 Convention relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention, which, based on article 13 of the Convention, is outside the competence of the General Assembly.

Let me close by expressing our gratitude for the Assembly's patience and our confidence that the Assembly will, as always, put the interest of this Organization above any other transient consideration. I also would like to thank, in advance, all distinguished colleagues who supported us the other day and who will support the amendments that I have just introduced.

I would ask that that the Assembly take action on our proposed amendments, A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12 and A/66/L.13 together as a unit, and thereafter take action on A/66/L.14 separately.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): Before we consider draft resolution A/66/L.8 and the amendments thereto contained in documents A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12, A/66/L.13 and A/66/L.14, I would like to remind members that the discussion of agenda item 118 will be held at a later date to be announced.

In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly will first take action on the amendments contained in documents A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12 and A/66/L.13 together, and then take a decision on A/66/L.14 separately, as proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The General Assembly will now take a decision on the amendments contained in documents A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12 and A/66/L.13. Recorded votes have been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and

Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Comoros, Dominica, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uruguay, Zambia

The amendments contained in A/66/L.11, A/66/L.12 and A/66/L.13 were rejected by 96 votes against to 11 in favour, with 43 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegations of Chad and Somalia advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote against.]

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Assembly will now take a decision on the amendment contained in document A/66/L.14, as orally revised.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, China, Dominica, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uruguay, Zambia

The amendment contained in A/66/L.14, as orally revised, was rejected by 94 votes against to 12 in favour, with 45 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegations of Chad and Somalia advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote against.]

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Valero-Briceño (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is firmly committed to the fight against terrorist acts, wherever and by whomsoever they are committed, regardless of their motivations or objectives. That is why Venezuela resolutely supports the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

Venezuela further condemns any act of aggression against an internationally protected person, which is why my country acceded to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. That is also why my country understands the concern of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia over the possible threats and attacks against its diplomatic officials. We therefore hope that an expedited, impartial and fair investigation will be carried out into the reported events and that the responsible parties, if there truly are any, will be duly punished.

Venezuela has been the victim of aggression against its diplomatic and consular missions. On 23 August 2011, the diplomatic missions of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela in Tripoli were attacked. The irrational attackers were attempting, and publicly so proclaimed, to assassinate the Venezuelan Ambassador, Afif Tajeldine, who was accredited to that brother country. On that occasion, an armed and violent mob endangered the lives of the people inside and caused substantial damage to our facilities.

On 26 August, our diplomatic mission denounced to the Security Council and in a note that was circulated among all countries of that forum (S/2011/544, annex), the attack carried out against our diplomatic facilities accredited to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and sought a pronouncement from the United Nations, which, unfortunately, was never forthcoming.

Attacks against internationally protected persons are of the utmost seriousness and should be categorically condemned. The perpetrators must be

brought before the appropriate courts and tried, while being granted all of the rights of due process provided for in international law.

Last month, the United States authorities alleged that they had uncovered a plot whereby men linked to security forces in Tehran had contracted a hired killer to assassinate the Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States. Today, draft resolution A/66/L.8 has been presented to the General Assembly. The draft resolution seeks condemnation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, without any reliable evidence having been presented or even due process followed. Floating politically motivated distortions and propaganda, the idea is being hawked that the authorities of that Muslim nation underwrote or were otherwise involved in the alleged plot.

The Bolivarian Government justifiably protests that the real intention of the draft resolution is to condemn the Islamic Republic of Iran a priori for supposedly having plotted against the life of an internationally protected person. There is no evidential proof, nor is any process under way, as provided for by international law, to find the perpetrators in the case.

We are struck by the fact that the condemnations come chiefly from the very same intelligence services that baselessly alleged that Iraq was in possession of weapons of mass destruction. They are the same intelligence agencies, in the service of political and military strongmen, that daily invent lies to promote globally the political, economic and military interests of an imperialist plutocracy. Based on just such lies that country invaded Iraq, where it carried out the most heinous acts of State terrorism in the history of human civilization.

This draft resolution resorts yet again to the expedient accusation of terrorism in an unjust attempt to stigmatize a country. Yesterday it was Iraq. Today it could be Iran or any other sovereign country represented in the General Assembly. We deplore attempts to use this organ to carry out the designs of imperialist powers. We deplore attempts to use the General Assembly to harass any country that dares to disagree with imperialist Powers. By using the fight against terrorism as an excuse to drive forward a campaign of politico-military domination we have jettisoned the hard-won consensus that was reached by the Member States in agreeing on a common strategy in the fight against terrorism.

It is not within the jurisdiction of the General Assembly to rule on whether or not a country abides by international conventions in the fight against terrorism. There are other specific conventions and instruments that lay out the appropriate procedures for that.

We believe that adopting this draft resolution could do great damage to this body. It would set a dangerous precedent encouraging any country to introduce biased, politically motivated draft resolutions, leading to never-ending confrontations that would degrade the dignity of the Assembly. As we have done repeatedly in the past, we call on members of the Assembly not to let it be turned into a tool in the service of imperialist policies.

For those reasons we support amendments A/66/L/11, A/66/L.12, A/66/L.13 and A/66/L.14, proposed by the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, to make the draft resolution we adopt be one about general principles.

Allow me to conclude by stating that our delegation rejects in the most firm, categorical terms the draft resolution as it was first presented by the delegations that presented it.

Mr. Núñez Mosquera (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba's position on terrorism is unequivocal. We clearly and unambiguously reject and condemn it in all its forms and manifestations. We reject all terrorist acts, no matter against whom, and no matter where they are committed, including those in which States are directly or indirectly involved. Cuba also emphasizes the importance of guaranteeing full protection for all diplomatic missions and their personnel anywhere in the world.

In fact, our country's diplomatic missions have been victim to terrorist acts, attacks and provocations, and Cuban diplomats have been attacked and even assassinated, including the Cuban diplomat Felix García Rodríguez, shot in broad daylight on the streets of New York on 11 September 1980. Cuba's position can clearly be seen in the security enjoyed by foreign embassies based in Havana and their diplomatic personnel, a fact that is recognized by all, including the Government of the United States itself.

Cuba understands all too well the concern of Saudi Arabia for its diplomatic personnel's security, and we categorically believe that those concerns and any others on the part of any State about the security of

its foreign representatives and diplomatic staff need to be properly dealt with, so as to ensure that impunity simply does not exist.

In the specific case brought up in draft resolution A/66/L.8, which we are considering today, the truth is that the General Assembly does not have the information necessary to examine the issue seriously, deeply or objectively, nor do we have the evidence that would be required to lay responsibility for the deeds on the authorities of any one country. The General Assembly should act with maximum care and prudence, because a pronouncement by this body on such a sensitive subject could have significant future consequences, both political and legal.

Adopting draft resolution A/66/L.8 could damage the credibility of the Assembly, because it is not consistent with the legal principle of the presumption of innocence, recognized by international law and the vast majority of national judicial institutions. That would be tantamount to handing down a sentence against a country before an impartial court rules, or before we have to hand the results of independent investigations, in line with relevant international treaties. In the current circumstances, we do not believe that a decision in that case against a certain country would meet the minimum standards of due process.

At this time, even in the United States' own courts, there has been no sentencing of those individuals allegedly responsible for the plot. Furthermore, the main source of information on that incident stems from the United States Government, whose reliability does not meet the minimum standards of credibility. It is sufficient to recall that that same source affirmed that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, a lie that was used to justify the aggression that caused the death and injury of hundreds of thousands of innocent people.

Moreover, the country accused by the United States of involvement in the plot against the Saudi Ambassador in Washington has categorically denied such accusations in letters addressed to the General Assembly and the Security Council, affirming that the allegations were false and without any foundation.

Therefore Cuba believes that the draft resolution under consideration today does not contribute to the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. In a spirit of cooperation among

States and other bodies seeking a comprehensive response to the scourge, Cuba has always upheld and will continue to support the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We firmly believe in the peaceful settlement of disputes and in the non-use or threat of use of force. Therefore, we call for dialogue and negotiation.

For these reasons, Cuba will vote against the draft resolution "Terrorist attacks on internationally protected persons", contained in document A/66/L.8.

Mrs. Rubiales de Chamorro (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Nicaragua reiterates its strongest condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including State terrorism, to which Nicaragua has repeatedly been victim, with the loss of thousands of human lives and the destruction of our infrastructure and economy. Those terrorist acts compelled my country to resort to the International Court of Justice, which ruled in favour of Nicaragua and against such terrorist acts.

We will take action today on draft resolution A/66/L.8. We share its basic concern over the global fight against terrorism. Given its importance, we believe it should have been of a universal nature, and not have singled out any country. Furthermore, as it contains allegations and accusations against one Member State for which there is no credible evidence, and particularly as no competent international judicial body has considered and ruled on those allegations, an attempt is being made to compel the General Assembly to take a decision on a situation with which we are not familiar.

That pressure leads us to several questions. Is this draft resolution politically driven to achieve certain results, sounding war drums, as the media in developed countries have reported, against the Islamic Republic of Iran? Given the importance and the standing of the issue, resolutions on terrorism are adopted by consensus. Now there is an attempt to end that practice so that all States are divided and in opposition over this important matter. We also wonder why there was not the same pressure in cases of terrorist acts carried out by professed terrorists, such as the terrorist Posada Carriles and others, who move about freely in certain developed cities and are known by all.

Nicaragua shares the concern of a great many countries that believe we face a scenario in which the great Powers promote military solutions instead of

strengthening and giving priority to the peaceful and lasting settlements of conflicts. Prudence and the necessary wisdom should prevail so as to bring about political dialogue that makes it possible to establish a climate of friendship, peace and stability in that region and in other parts of the world.

Nicaragua, on account of its principled position, will vote against the draft resolution, which in its form and substance will not contribute to the global fight against terrorism. This draft resolution will only exacerbate tensions and hostility among peoples. Is that the aim of the General Assembly? We reiterate our call for good sense and a political solution.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): Last month the United States disrupted a terrorist plot to assassinate the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States. That plot did more than just target the Ambassador of a single country. It struck at one of the most sacred principles governing relations among States — the safety and protection of diplomats. Every single member of the international community has an interest in forcefully condemning such heinous acts.

Given the nature of the plot, it cannot be seen as just a simple criminal act. Attacks on internationally protected persons have long been understood as emblematic acts of international terrorism.

The United States therefore strongly supports and co-sponsored Saudi Arabia's draft resolution A/66/L.8 to deplore that plot. The resolution will send the message that attacks on internationally protected persons are unacceptable. While it expresses our collective abhorrence at the known details of the plot, it also restates and reinforces principles that are essential to the functioning of diplomacy. It is a measured and appropriate response.

A fair and transparent judicial process is now under way in the United States to prosecute one person arrested in connection with this plot. If adopted, the resolution will directly support that process by promoting international cooperation to bring to justice all those who are responsible.

In the meantime, we cannot let that plot go unanswered. To do so would suggest that acts such as this are within the bounds of acceptable behaviour to resolve international conflicts. I urge all colleagues to vote in favour of this important draft resolution.

Mr. Alotaibi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for giving us the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/66/L.8, entitled "Terrorist attacks on internationally protected persons". Kuwait, one of the sponsors of the draft, refused to accept the amendments thereto because to do so would have defeated the entire primary purpose of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution is a message from the international community reaffirming its deep concern at the plot to assassinate a member of the diplomatic community. The draft does not accuse any individual or country, nor does it contain any condemnation of any State.

The State of Kuwait, on more than one occasion, individually or through the regional and international organizations to which it belongs, has expressed its condemnation of the plot to assassinate the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, and expressed its solidarity with the sisterly Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in connection with the terrorist acts targeting the Kingdom, including crimes against diplomatic missions or internationally protected persons.

Convinced of our commitment to enhance international cooperation to combat terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, we believe that voting in favour of the draft resolution represents yet another opportunity to reiterate our commitment and strong and decisive condemnation of terrorism, wherever and by whomsoever committed and for whatever purposes. We must take appropriate measures as required by international law to prevent the plotting, financing or sponsoring of terrorist acts, and all those who commit such acts must be brought to justice.

We therefore call on all Member States to vote in favour of draft resolution A/66/L.8.

Mr. Alrowaie (Bahrain) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country has condemned, in a number of international forums, terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. It also condemned the heinous plot targeting the Ambassador of the sisterly Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

This morning, the Assembly unanimously adopted a draft resolution on the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. With the establishment of the United Nations Centre for Counter-Terrorism, we are of the view that

comprehensive international efforts should now be focused on combating terrorism.

My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/66/L.8, entitled "Terrorist attacks on internationally protected persons". The draft is an important one, as it seeks to strengthen international cooperation to combat and prevent terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. It also reiterates that respect for the principles and rules of international law governing diplomatic and consular relations is an essential factor in ensuring normal relations among States. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution and calls on all Member States to do the same.

Mr. Archondo (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Plurinational State of Bolivia, like Nicaragua, Venezuela and Cuba, condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, wheresoever committed. But even as we condemn terrorism, we must also agree that the presumption of innocence remains one of the fundamental elements of law at both the national and international levels.

What we have before us is an accusation, an ongoing investigation, and a set of clues. But the investigation has not been concluded; there has been no ruling. The draft resolution that is up for adoption in the General Assembly today states that the Assembly is deeply concerned at the plot to assassinate the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States of America. The information we have received regarding this plot has been made public, but we still do not have a definite ruling on this. There is no proof. The accused party has stated publicly that it is not involved in any conspiracy or assassination plot. We therefore have contradictory versions, making it extremely difficult for the General Assembly to take a decision in this regard.

We believe that we are prejudging the situation and rushing into a decision. Bolivia wishes to recall that the presumption of innocence remains a key element, and that until it has been shown that this was an organized plot, we must believe in the innocence of those who stand accused in this international forum.

In addition, there is a need for a neutral investigation, supported by all necessary elements, in order to arrive at a definitive decision. We believe also that it would be a very bad precedent for the General Assembly to react prematurely to facts that have as of

yet not been fully ascertained. It is for these reasons that our delegation rejects this sort of practice and hopes that this does not recur in future.

Mr. McLay (New Zealand): It has long been a core principle of the international system that for the smooth conduct of relations between States, diplomatic representatives must be accorded certain freedoms and protections. Diplomats must be allowed to go about their tasks without let or hindrance. Above all, a diplomat should not be subject to attack on his or her person, freedom or dignity.

All that has been codified in many customs and conventions, most fully in the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, which protects, among others, any representative or official of a State. That includes just about everyone in this Hall. The Convention protects us as we go about our business on behalf of our respective countries. Without that, the conduct of diplomacy will suffer.

The allegations in respect of this incident are extremely grave. They disclose prima facie evidence of a conspiracy to commit an act that violates the fundamental norms of international diplomacy, and that requires firm international condemnation. That evidence has already attracted statements from the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab League. For those concerned about precedent, there are past examples of the General Assembly speaking out on specific events. The alternative is to allow such allegations to go unremarked. The alternative is to allow any lack of cooperation to go uncensored. That should not be an acceptable course to any body of diplomats, let alone one as universal as the General Assembly.

This draft resolution does not assert that the allegations are proven. That is a matter for another time and another place, nor does the draft judge the culpability of any individuals or States. It simply refers to the allegations, and seeks only the cooperation already required of any State party under the Convention, thus supporting the current judicial process. New Zealand supports the call for full international cooperation in disclosing all the facts and bringing the perpetrators to justice. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/66/L.8. If we do anything else, we fail to speak out for and protect the diplomatic tradition of which we are a part.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

The Assembly will now take action on draft resolution A/66/L.8, entitled “Terrorist acts on internationally protected persons”.

I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Zhang Saijin (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that since the submission of draft resolution A/66/L.8, and in addition to those delegations listed in the document, the following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, and Yemen.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/66/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania,

Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen

Against:

Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, China, Comoros, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Serbia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uruguay, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/66/L.8 was adopted by 106 votes to 9, with 40 abstentions (resolution 66/12).

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): Before giving the floor to speakers in explanation of vote, may I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt): Egypt shares the concerns of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which initiated the resolution just adopted, and stresses the importance of ensuring the full protection, security and safety of internationally protected persons, including diplomatic and consular missions and their representatives, as well as representatives and officials of international organizations. Egypt further condemns in the strongest terms any terrorist attack wherever and by whomever committed.

My delegation voted in favour of resolution 66/12 in full conformity with the statement issued by the League of Arab States on 13 October, and taking due account of the statement by the Gulf Cooperation Council on 12 October on the same issue. In the meantime, Egypt reiterates that its support for the resolution should be interpreted as support for the importance of investigating all alleged violations relating to the security and safety of any internationally protected person and bringing the perpetrators of such acts to justice — including in the case at hand presented by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia — through an impartial, open and transparent legal process and with the full cooperation of the States concerned, in conformity with international law and the Charter of the United Nations and in full observance of the supremacy of the rule of law.

Mr. Meetarbhan (Mauritius), Vice-President, took the Chair.

In that regard, Egypt reiterates that the legal framework governing the prevention and punishment of crimes against internationally protected persons is clearly identified in the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. The Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, on the other hand, is a separate political framework for maximizing international cooperation against terrorism. The references in the resolution to those two different frameworks should not compromise the integrity of each individual framework and the different legal status of the obligations each contains, nor should they overshadow the well-established biennial resolution adopted by the General Assembly entitled “Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives”, which should remain the chief means of dealing with such issues in future.

Mr. Osman (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to reiterate to the Assembly that the Government of the Sudan condemns all forms and manifestations of terrorism, particularly those committed against persons enjoying international protection, including diplomats, whatever their citizenship or country of origin. We denounce in the strongest terms the attempt to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to Washington, D.C., and we look forward to the day when the transparent judicial investigations clear all the facts.

The delegation of the Sudan does not support the incrimination of any country without sufficient and substantiated legal evidence by specialized judicial bodies. My delegation would like to reiterate that this resolution should not set a precedent and should be understood in its proper context.

In conclusion, the delegation of the Sudan reiterates the need for cooperation among all Member States in combating all forms and manifestations of terrorism.

Mr. Li Baodong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China abstained in the voting on resolution 66/12, entitled “Terrorist attacks on internationally protected persons”. We oppose all forms of terrorism and always stand for compliance with international law and the basic norms governing international relations in handling State-to-State relations, as well as for effective protection of the safety and security of diplomatic personnel.

The present case is highly complicated and sensitive, and parties still have different views of the issue. Any conclusion or action must be based on comprehensive, impartial, objective and transparent investigation and on substantive evidence. Before the facts are out, parties should adopt a prudent approach, refrain from jumping to conclusions and avoid taking any action that may complicate or worsen the situation. China hopes that the countries concerned will continue to appropriately address the issue through dialogue and that they will make joint efforts to maintain peace and stability in the Middle East and in the Gulf region.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): Brazil reiterates its unwavering commitment to fighting terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. Brazil is a party to the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. We call on all States to fully comply with the obligations under the Convention.

Brazil abstained in the voting on resolution 66/12 because it has doubts on whether the United Nations should address an alleged involvement of a country in a terrorist plot in the absence of concluding evidence and without observing the presumption of innocence. Based on the principle in *dubio pro reo*, the United Nations should exercise the utmost caution when appraising situations that are *sub judice*. Situations

such as the one before us could be dealt with through judicial means on a bilateral basis.

Mr. Karev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation resolutely condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. We are firmly attached to the fight against terrorism, in keeping with the norms and principles of international law. We are seriously concerned with the rising terrorist threats and the increasing frequency of terrorist acts around the world, including against embassies, United Nations staff and diplomatic personnel.

With respect to the resolution just adopted, we unquestioningly support condemnation of acts of violence and the call on States to cooperate in the fight against such acts. We take international cooperation in this sphere very seriously. However, the text of the resolution includes a number of provisions that we consider problematic from a legal standpoint.

The tenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 could be easily interpreted as an accusation against Iran that it has not complied with its international obligations and that it has refused to cooperate with the countries concerned. Documents have been distributed at the United Nations in which States take different positions on the issue. Disputes of this kind between States can and should be settled through the established legal mechanisms, above all those contained in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, of 1973. The General Assembly should have called upon all interested Governments to settle this dispute in the appropriate forum.

Moreover, the examination by the court of this alleged plot has only just begun. Therefore, during the legal proceedings it is very important to observe the generally accepted principle of presumption of innocence. In this situation, given the serious doubts, the resolution just adopted by the Assembly violates that principle. These concerns prevented us from supporting the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour of clarifying, on behalf of the delegation of the Principality of Liechtenstein as well as my own delegation, Switzerland, the decision to abstain, after the voting process.

First let me emphasize that Switzerland and Liechtenstein firmly condemn terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, whoever the perpetrators are and whatever the locations and the motivations. The 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, is a key convention in the fight against terrorism. We are fully committed to it. It goes without saying that all States parties to that Convention are under an obligation to bring to justice the presumed perpetrators of attacks against internationally protected persons. They are likewise obligated to contribute as best they can to the outcome of the criminal proceedings.

Nonetheless, our delegations did not feel it appropriate to vote in favour of the resolution.

We understand that the assassination attempt against the ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States will soon be examined in a court of law, as it should be. But precisely because we value those proceedings, we do not believe that the General Assembly should be called upon to comment on them.

Likewise, if the resolution just adopted is intended to address a dispute between States concerning the application of the 1973 Convention, the General Assembly does not appear to us to be the appropriate forum. Article 13 of the Convention provides that States may submit such a dispute to the International Court of Justice. Again, it would appear that the most appropriate institution to deal with the subject matter of our resolution would be a court of law, which, it should be noted, is empowered to issue provisional measures to preserve the rights of each party, if necessary.

It is for those reasons that Liechtenstein and Switzerland decided to abstain in the voting on the resolution.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): India is a State party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, of 1973. We strongly believe that crimes against diplomatic agents and other internationally protected persons, which jeopardize the safety of such persons, create a serious threat to the maintenance of the normal international relations necessary for cooperation among States. We take our obligations under the Convention with the

utmost seriousness and call upon all States parties to comply fully with the provisions of the Convention in letter and spirit.

India has been a victim of terrorism for decades. We condemn terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. We have been in the forefront of global actions on counter-terrorism. Our tireless efforts as Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee established under Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) have resulted in the United Nations adopting a zero-tolerance approach to terrorism. We urge all Member States to strive for the strict implementation of this approach.

Today, however, we have abstained in the voting on the resolution, as its substance deals with a specific case in which we are not in the possession of all the facts and the matter is sub judice.

Mr. Roman-Morey (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation requested the floor to explain its abstention in the voting on resolution 66/12, which the Assembly has just adopted.

First, we would like to reiterate that Peru unequivocally condemns all acts, forms and manifestations of terrorism. No circumstances can justify them, and their perpetrators must be prosecuted and brought to justice, without exception. In this undertaking, the cooperation and commitment of the entire international community is essential, as it is only through united efforts that we will be able to eradicate this scourge, which has caused such damage and loss of life.

Allow me to recall that for Peru terrorism is not something distant. For nearly two decades we suffered under internal, national terrorism that caused the loss of thousands of human lives and a great setback in the socio-economic development of my country.

As soon as the international community learned, through the print media, of an alleged conspiracy against the life of the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru issued a press release in which it expressed its total condemnation of that act, rejected it and indicated that it hoped that the relevant appropriate legal measures would be taken immediately, in conformity with international law, so that the facts could be investigated.

Secondly, I wish to reiterate that Peru energetically condemns any act that could endanger the safety and security of missions, diplomatic agents and consular representatives.

We believe that before the General Assembly could pronounce itself in a specific manner on the aforementioned circumstances, further elements of information were needed. For that, it would have been necessary to await the outcome of an inquiry and the conclusions reached by the judicial authorities. That would have enabled us to understand the scope of the acts and identify responsibility in order to place them into due context, given the nature and legal scope of those acts, thus enabling us to take the suitable steps.

Peru believes that the resolution that was submitted and adopted reflects a legitimate concern that, as we stated previously, we share fully. We are prepared to support these concerns unequivocally. However, there are substantive reasons reflected in the resolution that, we regret, caused us to abstain in the voting.

Finally, Peru calls upon all States to lend their effective cooperation in accordance with their international obligations and in full accordance with international law to ensure that the alleged acts can be duly investigated.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile condemns all acts of terrorism under any circumstances, and in particular all acts perpetrated against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents. Consequently, my Government expresses its firm rejection of the assassination attempt against the Saudi ambassador in Washington, D.C., and calls for the full implementation of all obligations contained within the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, and in other relevant international instruments.

Chile abstained in the voting on resolution 66/12, although we share the spirit and consider valid the purpose of the resolution — to preserve the physical integrity of protected persons, as well as the inviolability of diplomatic and consular missions and their representatives. That is the framework within which the international community must undertake all efforts to prevent terrorist acts that seek to attack individuals and protected goods.

We support, and would have been an advocate of, a general pronouncement in this sense. We believe that in order for the international community to issue a pronouncement on a specific situation, it would not be advisable to pass judgement on acts without input from judicial authorities or their decision, which is still pending.

We conclude by reiterating our unequivocal condemnation of all terrorism acts and call upon all States to comply with international law and with the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

Ms. Rodríguez-Pineda (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Guatemala vigorously condemns all acts of terrorism, including those aimed at diplomatic and consular missions and their representatives. However, on this occasion we abstained in the voting on resolution 66/12 because we think it is not in the purview of the General Assembly to pronounce itself on an alleged act when the circumstances have not been fully established. That could be a precedent that, to our mind, is not proper.

Mr. Saripudin (Indonesia): Indonesia is of the view that providing security guarantees for diplomatic personnel and agents is the obligation of every country in working towards the objective of strengthening friendly relations and accomplishing internationally agreed objectives. Indonesia therefore supports efforts to enhance international cooperation in protecting diplomatic personnel and agents. At the same time, Indonesia also condemns in the strongest terms all acts of terrorism, including those directed at diplomatic personnel.

We support the investigation of the specific issue addressed by resolution 66/12 and call upon the parties concerned to lend their full cooperation. However, we believe that the fact that the text refers to a specific case that is under investigation by singling out a certain country as a responsible party will prejudice the efforts being undertaken. Indonesia therefore abstained in the voting.

Mr. Chua (Singapore): Singapore strongly condemns all acts of terrorism. We have been following this particular case very closely and with great concern. The targeted assassination of a diplomat, who enjoys protection under international law, threatens the very foundation of international diplomacy and thus has implications for all countries. The implications could be particularly serious if the

plan was indeed State-sponsored. It is therefore in the interests of all concerned countries to cooperate fully with the investigation to clarify the circumstances of the plot and to ensure that those responsible are brought to justice.

However, until investigations and the judicial processes on the case are completed, it is premature for the General Assembly to pronounce on the matter. For that reason, Singapore abstained in the voting on resolution 66/12.

Mr. Pham Vinh Quang (Viet Nam): Viet Nam has consistently maintained that international law governing diplomatic and consular relations and relating to internationally protected persons must be duly respected and implemented. We condemn terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.

Viet Nam suffered a terrorist attack against one of its diplomatic missions. We therefore share the concern of countries over attacks against diplomatic personnel. However, we are of the view that all alleged attacks must be duly investigated, in accordance with judicial standards. Therefore, Viet Nam abstained in the voting on resolution 66/12.

Ms. Williams (Grenada): Grenada fully supports the principles of diplomatic and consular inviolability. We support policies and actions to combat global terrorism, and we support the Charter of the United Nations. Further, Grenada stands in solidarity with all persons, Governments and States that are victims of terrorist actions. In that sense, we stand in full solidarity with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Although we supported the principle and the spirit of resolution 66/12, Grenada abstained in the voting, preferring a more general and, legally speaking, less premature resolution. Abstention on this resolution does not diminish Grenada's full support for the principles outlined above. Grenada's vote should be so understood. We continue to support continuing efforts for international cooperation to counter and to combat terrorism.

Mr. Srivali (Thailand): While abstaining in the voting on resolution 66/12, Thailand reaffirms its utmost respect for and adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the principles and rules of international law governing diplomatic and consular relations.

Furthermore, as a State party to various conventions and protocols related to counter-terrorism, including the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, Thailand condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including acts of violence against diplomatic and consular missions and representatives.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

I now give the floor to the representative of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Al Oyaidi (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to all those States that co-sponsored and supported resolution 66/12. It will certainly contribute positively to meeting aggression against any State Member of the United Nations or its representative.

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 118.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.