

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION  
*Official Records\**



FIRST COMMITTEE  
53rd meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 6 December 1977  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 37: CONCLUSION OF A WORLD TREATY ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 50: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 127: DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DETENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/32/PV.53  
7 December 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 50 and 127 (continued)

CONCLUSION OF A WORLD TREATY ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (A/32/94, 95, 97, 108, 112, 114, 119, 122, 123, 181 and Add.1)  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (A/32/68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78, 89, 93, 117, 128, 140, 153, 154, 157, 164 and Add.1, 165 and Add.1-2; A/C.1/32/2, 8)  
DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DÉTENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (A/32/242; A/C.1/32/L.1, L.2)

Mr. YOUNG (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to be with you in this Committee for the first time, and I am sure it will not be the last.

The subject of reducing international tension and preventing nuclear war is of deep and urgent concern to all of us. In this hall, the meeting place of nations, no subject could be more germane than the creation of a common vision of how to achieve the friendly and co-operative relations the Charter describes as our common ideal.

When the Soviet Union asked that this item be included in our agenda, it advanced two specific proposals. The first is a draft declaration designed to point the way to limiting and lessening tensions and conflicts between States. The second is more specific in its concern with various measures that States might undertake to lessen the danger of nuclear war. Most of us are familiar with the ideas contained in these proposals; all of us share the concern for peace that they reflect.

Both West and East have made real progress in recent years in escaping from the dialogue of suspicion and hostility which marked the cold war. We have launched new efforts to reduce areas of conflict, sought to negotiate differences on the basis of mutual benefit and looked for opportunities to build a more enduring framework of peace.

(Mr. Young, United States)

Because confrontation between East and West imposes burdens on all, the world has generally welcomed these efforts to channel competition into less dangerous, more constructive directions. Negotiations on strategic arms limitations (SALT) and mutual balanced force reductions (MBFR), although undertaken in an East-West context, have relevance to the security of the world as a whole. To the degree that negotiations between East and West have broadened to include additional issues of urgent concern to the world community, détente has become increasingly relevant to the entire membership of this Organization. If the United States and the Soviet Union are able to avoid a military build-up in areas such as the Indian Ocean, all of us will benefit. If the efforts my country is making together with the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union result in a comprehensive ban on all nuclear explosive tests acceptable to all, the danger of nuclear war will visibly recede. Progress towards elimination of chemical weapons and the prohibition of radiological weapons would be welcome indications that improved relations between East and West can produce dividends in which all can share, especially since those weapons would likely never be used by them against each other but might slip into regional conflicts in various parts of the world.

(Mr. Young, United States)

But before deciding here that détente is the final model on which our relations should be based, let us ask whether we are setting our sights high enough. The principles of the Charter of this Organization demand more of us than avoidance of conflict, more than a reduction of tension between adversaries. That is an imperative of the nuclear age, and my Government is committed to the constructive pursuit of détente in that sense. But we should frankly acknowledge that differing systems cannot assure the welfare of the international community just by limiting their own conflicts. We must also unite to meet the obligations created by our own common fate and growing interdependence. And here we encounter more demanding criteria against which to measure our actions.

At the outset let us recognize that new codes of principle are no panacea. The history of the United Nations and the world tells us that dedication to principle can be a catalyst for peace. But without precise efforts to carry principle into practice, tensions can even be exacerbated when issues are reduced to abstractions which are, in turn, used to escape compromise.

We are all familiar with the techniques of drafting new codes of principle. They are as old, I am sure, as recorded history. A principle for me, a sacred tenet for you, a high-sounding escape clause for him: this is diplomacy in the abstract. We can hardly deny that its practice has at times helped to improve the way in which we organize our international behaviour. Men are moved by visions and ideals as well as by bread and soil. But unless coupled with a real commitment to seek solutions to specific problems, abstractions can be a barrier to constructive dialogue rather than a framework for it.

What can we do to be sure that our debate here does not become another hollow exercise in rhetoric? How can we profit from the setbacks and successes of recent years? With others, we have learned that different social and economic systems can only exist peacefully in the world if we actively work together to improve the lives of their peoples and help others to do likewise. We have found that creative and constructive

(Mr. Young, United States)

competition can be useful when artificial barriers are removed and ideas and people freely exchanged. We have recognized the need to harness the energies of mankind to the solution of these pressing problems - poverty, disease, racism, affronts to human dignity and impairment of human freedom.

Let me suggest how an agenda of co-operation can be shaped which would translate some of the principles we are talking about here into real progress. The agenda might be divided into four broad areas: political settlement of regional disputes, arms control and disarmament, North-South economic relations and human rights. Let me begin with peaceful settlement of disputes.

First let us recognize that selective application of the principles of détente can only increase tension in the long run. As we and the Soviet Union have broadened the spectrum of our negotiations to deal with our activities in third areas of the world, the larger goals we proclaim have been advanced. We have subscribed to a statement reiterating our commitment to joint efforts to promote negotiations leading to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We have agreed on the need for mutual restraint in all areas of the world. But more needs to be done if we are to prevent United States-Soviet competition from spilling over into other areas of the world. My Government cannot subscribe to the invocation of the principle of détente in one part of the world while declaring another exempt on the basis of some countervailing principle.

In the tradition of the colonial past, external rivalries continue to be transferred to the African continent. A genuine effort to reduce international tensions must apply equally in Africa as elsewhere. We can all join in and applaud the efforts to bring order out of chaos in areas where conflict is in progress or provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of violence. But the presence in Africa of nearly a quarter of Cuba's armed force and the interjection of Cuban military advisers in troubled areas throughout the continent can only lead to more deaths and suffering - both Cuban and African. The injection of arms into areas

(Mr. Young, United States)

with turbulent régimes as in the Horn of Africa or into turbulent societies like Uganda can only step up tension, spread conflict and lead to unnecessary loss of life. An essential element of détente must be a new effort to isolate East-West competition from regional and internal conflicts in Africa. Only thus can African solutions to African problems be developed. We call upon the Soviet Union and Cuba to assist Africans in the task of nation-building rather than contributing to the escalation of death and destruction.

In the Middle East my Government believes the dramatic meeting between President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin creates new opportunities to give substance to the long recognized need to reduce tensions in the area. We will be sending a representative to Cairo and we are giving careful consideration to the Secretary-General's suggestion of a subsequent meeting to prepare the ground for Geneva. We believe that this discussion of détente should attempt to build on the historic events of recent days and provide added impetus to a new dialogue of peace.

The second crucial issue facing us is that of arms control. More than any other single issue, that has been the focus of East-West détente. As President Carter outlined in his speech to the General Assembly, the United States intends to intensify efforts to limit and reduce all armaments, control nuclear technology and restrict the arms trade. In this session of the General Assembly, in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in our bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitations and other urgent matters there is evidence of a new commitment to progress.

This year's disarmament debate in this Committee offers promise of a growing consensus on critical issues such as non-proliferation and keeping regions of the world free from the poison of competition in nuclear arms. But as we consider the progress we have made in disarmament against the model we are trying to construct of relations between States, we must admit that much more needs to be done.

(Mr. Young, United States)

The United States places special importance on next year's special session on disarmament as the forum for continuing discussions on those issues. We believe this Conference should give strong impetus to progress towards realistic and concrete arms control measures. For our part, we plan to approach the special session on disarmament with concrete proposals and an open mind on the suggestions advanced by others. We hope that in addition to reversing the trend towards greater accumulation of weapons of mass destruction, it will be possible to curb the growth of conventional armaments. Our co-sponsorship of this year's Nordic draft resolution calling for consideration of the relationship between disarmament and development signals a new United States willingness to consider ways in which expenditures for arms can be translated into a new impetus for development.

(Mr. Young, United States)

Thirdly, we believe that the human dimension of détente must play a central role in an interdependent world. Increasingly, all of us are diminished by infringements of the rights of individuals or groups anywhere. Now 35 nations are reviewing the implementation of the 1975 Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The conclusion of the Final Act itself was an achievement; yet, two years after its signature much remains to be done to realize the high objectives set forth in this document.

There have been encouraging developments as well. Today there is an increased recognition that human rights issues have a legitimate place in the bilateral and multilateral negotiating agenda. And there is increasing acceptance of the concept that suspicion and tension between nations result from artificial barriers to contact between individuals across national borders.

Apartheid, as a peculiarly obnoxious insult to mankind will get the condemnation that it deserves from this body; other cruel and systematic violations of human dignity deserve equally to be discussed and condemned. Genocide and torture must be combated actively by all.

No member of my Government feels more deeply than I that political, disarmament and human rights questions cannot be considered apart from their economic dimension. As we look to a more harmonious world order, we must seek to avoid confrontation on the issues that divide North and South as well as those which have split East from West. No nation should hold itself aloof from these efforts on the spurious grounds that it has no historical responsibility for the gap between rich and poor. Our joint responsibility to build a better future is more important than sterile debates over a division of responsibility for the past. What needs to be done is a matter for the present and the future, and involves all of us. We are ready to seek new approaches to old controversies which will bring developing and developed countries closer together in a common search for solution rather than dividing them on a sterile debate about abstract principle.

In our view, it is possible to build an international economic order based on the principles of co-operation and mutual benefit. We recognize a particular responsibility here, because the effective and efficient functioning of the international economic system inevitably depends on growth and stability in the developed world. There is a reciprocal obligation as well, since as the world

(Mr. Young, United States)

economy becomes more integrated, the developing countries depend increasingly for their own prosperity on the markets and goods of their developed partners. I can think of no area where this delicate balance of reciprocal benefit and obligation has more relevance for all of us.

We have already begun the task of building co-operative mechanisms in which to discuss the issues on the economic agenda. The seventh special session and the Paris Conference on International Economic Co-operation provided some first steps. The discussion of economic issues thus far in this session of the Assembly has been constructive and forward-looking. But we cannot afford the luxury of postponing concrete next steps. We must continue the dialogue and find meaningful answers to as yet unanswered economic questions. Members will find my delegation a willing partner in these discussions.

I have outlined some thoughts about the basic model of international co-operation which underlies United States thinking. We are no longer living in a bipolar world, and the pattern of our relations with each other should not reflect a temporary balance between rival systems. We must all adapt to increasing interdependence and recognize the new obligations that it brings with it. We must recognize that there are new centres of power throughout the world and that events are not determined by the super-Powers or the state of the relationship between them. Most important, we should acknowledge that it is our actions more than our words which will bring about the better world we all pray for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to invite the Committee's attention in particular to agenda item 127, entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war".

I requested the representative of Iran, Mr. Hoveyda, to use his good offices informally to produce the relevant document in consultation with members interested in that item.

I now call on Mr. Hoveyda to report to the Committee.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, when you did me the honour of asking me to carry out this task of co-ordinating efforts with a view to producing for the declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente a text acceptable to all the members of this Committee, I got into touch with the principal members interested in this question. Immediately, I encountered such obstacles that I thought that you had given me an impossible mission. After a few days of discussion I found myself in the position of the popular Iranian figure who, having been appointed a judge in his village, was dealing with his first case. After listening to the accuser he said to him: "You are quite right. Then, having listened to the defendant, he told him also: "You are right". At that point his wife, who was following the proceedings from behind a curtain in the courtroom, said to him: "My husband, you have become a fool; they can't both be right". Whereupon, he turned to his wife and said: "You are right too".

I can assure the Committee that, listening to the various viewpoints, I was sympathetic to them all, because everyone was right. But, and this is the point at which I found my mission becoming impossible, I could not put into a document such divergent points of view. I must confess that I was discouraged, and I had intended to come to see you, Sir, and to tell you that after a week of discussion it seemed to me impossible to fulfil the task that you had entrusted to me.

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

However, thanks to your encouragement, Mr. Chairman, I resumed my efforts and if we have succeeded in producing a document before this Committee today I must say that it is first and foremost due to the co-operation of certain representatives of the various geographical groups which made up our Committee, who were good enough to give daily encouragement and to help me in the very difficult negotiations which have taken place over the period of more than a month.

The draft text of the declaration before the Committee is the result of intensive negotiations among the representatives to whom I have referred and with the many members of the Committee who had an interest in this matter. I also kept the Soviet delegation, which had considered making certain proposals, informed of the position, together with all the permanent members of the Security Council, and a number of delegations which had shown an interest in the negotiations. These negotiations were conducted in the small group which you asked me to set up, Mr. Chairman, and also outside the group through my own efforts and those of two of my colleagues in the Iranian delegation to the First Committee.

As I said at the very beginning of my statement, I have tried to reflect in this draft declaration all the viewpoints of the various groups in an attempt to strike a balance acceptable to all. In an exercise of that kind no one is going to be completely satisfied. This document is rather long and it contains repetitions of ideas and concepts - even of words. Personally I find the sentences somewhat convoluted and cumbersome in certain parts and at times we go to the very brink of solecism. I should like to assure my colleagues here that those who were good enough to help me, and I myself, certainly did not forget anything that we learned about grammar and style at school; if to some delegations certain parts of this document appear unsatisfactory, that is simply because it was necessary to create conditions for a very difficult compromise.

Therefore, I hope that members of the Committee will be indulgent in their attitude towards this exercise which I, together with my colleagues, have undertaken and that instead of trying to improve the content or style of this document, they will be content to "shoot the pianist", as the saying goes, in the statements that they make on this draft declaration after its adoption.

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

It can be seen that this document has no author. It has been reproduced by the Secretariat with a blank space before the colon. If, as I hope, there are no other proposals under this item and this draft text is accepted without a vote - subject, of course, to statements which delegations may wish to make - and if those conditions are met I shall be ready to submit it on behalf of my delegation.

It remains only for me to thank all the representatives who were good enough to help me in this difficult task, all the delegations who took part in the negotiations and, finally, all the groups who were so kind as to demonstrate considerable flexibility and understanding in these negotiations and whose goodwill in the final analysis made it possible to conclude a task which, as I said at the beginning, seemed to be impossible.

The CHAIRMAN: Members of the Committee will have time to study this draft declaration and it will be considered, together with other draft resolutions, on Thursday.

Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

The adoption by the General Assembly, seven years ago, of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was a new step taken by the international community in its struggle for the strengthening of the bases of world peace and security. This Declaration, in terms of its goals, objectives and principles, upon which agreement was achieved, is a new document strengthening the Charter of the United Nations and also its goals and objectives.

On this basis the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security cannot, in our view, be isolated from the United Nations Charter because in actual fact this is a whole group of principles which go hand in hand with those of the Charter, which have to be implemented under the control of the United Nations. Hence the importance of this Declaration stems from the fact that it is based upon the very nature and the *raison d'être* of the United Nations; that is to say, the maintenance of world peace and security. Indeed, the United Nations was founded originally in order to attain a major clear-cut objective: that of the establishment of international peace which would be solid, based on devotion to the principles of the Charter and the renunciation of the arms race, the balance of terror, and aggression.

The Declaration of the United Nations on the Strengthening of International Security contains a number of principles and ideals. It has laid stress inter alia on the commitment of countries to renounce the use of force or the threat of the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in a way incompatible with the objectives of the United Nations.

The Declaration provides for non-interference in the internal affairs of States in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the principles of equality among peoples, including total respect for the rights of people to self-determination.

(Mr. Jazzar, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Declaration stresses the inadmissibility of the use of force in order to impose occupation of territory, because this is incompatible with the provisions of the Charter. Furthermore, the Declaration stresses the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory belonging to another State by force, by aggression or by the threat of such. I would add that this Declaration calls upon all countries to contribute to the strengthening and consolidation of world peace and security through a system of collective security and efforts designed to strengthen the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations.

At the beginning of my statement I said that seven years had elapsed since the international community had adopted the document on the strengthening of world security. In spite of the content of this historic Declaration, our world continues to be lost in a maze of crises and serious problems headed by the problem of the Middle East, because Israel is continuing its barbarous aggression against the Arab nations and continuing to occupy vast Arab territories. Furthermore, the Zionist State continues to refuse to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and is still continuing its policy of expansion and aggression and the creation of new settlements in Arab territories. Israel refuses to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the creation of an independent State on its land, Palestine.

Without any doubt, the position of refusal and defiance of Israel shows how little the Zionist State cares about respect for the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the United Nations, which have so often provided for the withdrawal by Israel from Arab territories and the exercise by the Arab people of Palestine of its right to self-determination and the creation of an independent homeland.

(Mr. Jazzar, Syrian Arab Republic)

An objective analysis of the experience acquired over the last few years, ever since the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, reveals that one cannot achieve the objectives and noble ideals contained in this historic, important document without international efforts aimed at eliminating hotbeds of tension created by the forces of colonialism, imperialism and racism, which are engendered by foreign occupation and foreign domination in all its forms. These forces have had recourse to pressure and aggression in order to obstruct the economic, social and political independence of the peoples of the world. There is no doubt that the establishment of a new world order in the political and economic order cannot effectively contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security unless it is based on justice, equality and the restructuring of the unequal relations which at present exist among various nations of the world.

Furthermore, general and complete disarmament, and in particular nuclear disarmament under effective and strict international control; and the total renunciation of the manufacture, use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons, as well as chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction, will make it possible for the world to live in peace, security and stability.

With regard to item 37 of the agenda, my delegation has repeatedly expressed our support for the initiative of the Soviet Union last year, with a view to the conclusion of an international treaty on non-use of force in international relations. Our position stems from our long experience in the Arab region, because the Arab countries, throughout history, have been the victims of attacks and invasions have continued up to the present day. Much of our territory has been subjected to military occupation by Israel, and

(Mr. Jazzar, Syrian Arab Republic)

the Palestinian people have been dispersed after being driven out of their country, and are still being denied their right to self-determination and the creation of a homeland. The Charter of the United Nations has laid stress on the obligation of all Member States to preserve international peace and to prevent war. It is well known that all Members of this Organization are obliged to support the provisions of the Charter, including paragraph 3 of Article 2, which calls upon Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Also, paragraph 4 of Article 2 makes it incumbent upon all Member States to renounce the use of force or the threat of the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

(Mr. Jazzar, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

Although all those provisions constitute a rule of international law they have not yet succeeded in the present circumstances in ridding the world of war and there are still hotbeds of tension and an escalation of crises in many parts of the world. Thus, we feel that it is necessary to produce a new instrument which will banish the use of force from international relations and become another in the series of instruments and international declarations based upon the principles of the Charter. That new instrument would have to fill all the gaps which have appeared in other instruments and declarations already adopted by the United Nations but which have not succeeded in sparing the world the use of force and aggression in international relations, or the effects thereof.

While recognizing the importance of the fact that the international community has backed the idea of the proposed new treaty, the new instrument should be drafted in such a way that its provisions clearly and categorically reflect the rights of peoples and countries to resist aggression, eliminate foreign occupation and reflect the right of the peoples of the world to struggle by all means available to them so that they will be able to exercise their right to self-determination, thwart aggression and achieve their independence and freedom.

The nature of the close links between economic and political independence means that it is difficult to lay a solid foundation for international peace and security unless the natural resources and economic interests of many countries are protected from attempts at pillaging and expropriation. That is why it must reflect clearly the right of all peoples to fight, by all means available to them, in order to be able to exercise control over their natural resources, to preserve their interests and to exercise their political and economic sovereignty.

My delegation has already made clear its position on agenda item 107. We have already congratulated the Soviet Union on the initiative it took to include in the agenda an item entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war". We did so

(Mr. Jazzar, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

in a statement at one of the first meetings of this Committee at the beginning of our proceedings. However, if we look at all three items under discussion we see to what extent those questions are linked together. Their common goal is to guarantee the security of mankind and a decent life for man based upon the Charter and the mission and vocation of the United Nations in the field of the maintenance of world peace.

Syria is a founder Member of the United Nations as everyone knows. We believe ourselves to be firmly and invariably attached to the principles of peace and justice in all parts of the world. President Assad over the last few years has taken several initiatives and paid several visits to a number of fraternal and friendly countries to promote the cause of international peace and security and to lay the foundations of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly those providing for the withdrawal by Israel from all occupied Arab territories and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination and the creation of an independent State on its own soil.

There is no doubt that a just peace, based upon respect for the principles of the Charter and international law and also on resolutions of the United Nations, will continue to be for us a goal which we shall seek to attain in complete dignity whatever the complications or length of our efforts and struggle. Here I believe it is my duty to point out that if some consider that devotion to the principle of law and the resolutions of the United Nations represents much too strict a position, we in Syria will nevertheless continue to respect United Nations resolutions and its Charter. We shall refuse to submit. We shall continue to defend our rights and to resist aggression without giving up an inch of our soil.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)  
(interpretation from Russian): Seven years have gone by since the General Assembly of the United Nations, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That important document became a moral instrument which has helped the peoples of the world to achieve further success in the struggle for the consolidation of universal peace and security.

Reviewing world events in the last year we note with satisfaction that peace is now more stable and more reliable. That has become possible as a result of the efforts of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and all peace-loving forces.

In the year of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution we must stress that from the first fundamental foreign policy document of Soviet power, the Leninist Decree on Peace right through to the new constitution of the USSR, the whole 60-year history of the Soviet State has convincingly demonstrated - to use the words of Comrade Brezhnev - that:

"The first State of victorious socialism inscribed forever on its banner the word 'peace' as the highest principle of its foreign policy and one which was in keeping with the interests of its own people and all other peoples on the planet."

The Soviet foreign policy of peace is indeed of vital significance for all peoples and the whole of mankind. At the present time in the nuclear missile age there is no more important goal than that of curbing the forces of aggression, averting the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe and achieving affirmation of the principle of peaceful co-existence as an immutable law of international life.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Kisilov, speaking at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in the proceedings to approve the new constitution of the Soviet State said the following:

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

"Our Party, our State, throughout the 60 years of Soviet power have consistently defended the right of all peoples to live in the conditions of peace proclaimed in the first Leninist decrees."

Perceptible, tangible results have already been achieved towards the consolidation of international security. The success of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the defeat of imperialist aggression in Indo-China, the collapse of the last colonial empire - the Portuguese colonies - the conclusion of a number of international treaties and agreements limiting the arms race in certain areas, all undeniably demonstrate how much has been achieved in the preservation of universal peace.

The path to reliable peace, to converting détente into a universal and irreversible process, of course, is not an easy or simple one.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Militaristic and aggressive circles of imperialism and reaction have been attempting once again to poison the international atmosphere and to cast doubt on the possibility of further consolidation of peace and the development of international co-operation. These circles have sowed the seed for a new twist in the spiral of the arms race, and this is demonstrated by the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering such weapons - neutron bombs, cruise missiles, and so on. These circles are preserving hotbeds of international tension, primarily in the Middle East and in southern Africa, and are attempting to create new hotbeds of tension, particularly in Africa. They are resisting the restructuring of international economic relations on the principles of equality:

"International relations are now, as it were, at a crossroads leading either to a growth of trust and co-operation or to a growth of mutual terror, suspicion, weapon stockpiling - roads leading, in the final analysis, either to a lasting peace or, at the very best, to a teetering on the brink of war",

as was said by Comrade Brezhnev in his report to the ceremonial meeting in Moscow on 2 November on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. He continued:

"Détente has made it possible to choose the path of peace. To lose this opportunity would be a crime. The most important and most urgent task now is to call a halt to the arms race which is flooding the world."

We are firmly convinced that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is a good basis for actions of States Members of the United Nations in the struggle for curbing the arms race, for the elimination of conflicts, and for the ensuring of lasting peace. They should be guided by the appeal contained in the Declaration to refrain from the threat of force or its use. And for this, efforts should be made to conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations on the basis of a draft treaty as proposed by the Soviet Union. Of great importance is the provision in the Declaration on the implementation of measures designed to call a halt

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

to and to turn back the arms race and the race in conventional weapons, the elimination of nuclear weapons and other forms of weapons of mass destruction, and to conclude a treaty on complete and general disarmament under effective international control.

The recent proposal of the Soviet Union on the simultaneous cessation by all States of the manufacture of nuclear weapons followed by the gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, right up to and including their total liquidation, and also a moratorium for a certain period of time on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, along with the prohibition of all tests of nuclear weapons, was a step in this direction, as it was stressed in the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR, when it was adopted on 3 November. It was a message to peoples' parliaments and Governments in all parts of the world that they should strive for the earliest possible just settlement of explosive conflicts and the elimination of hotbeds of international tension. This relates primarily to the Middle East and to southern Africa. Urgent joint efforts should be made to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples, and for the elimination of all remnants of colonial oppression and all hotbeds of colonialism and racism.

In this regard, I should like to draw attention to the increasingly intensive attempts recently undertaken by imperialistic forces and the forces supporting them to create instability on the African continent and in other parts of the world. They are trying to prevent the peoples from choosing a course of development which those peoples consider most appropriate for themselves. They are attempting to pit one State against another, to foment and sow hostility and differences, and to provoke disputes on problems which have been inherited from colonial times. This is a dangerous policy. It could lead to the outbreak of new international tensions. I should like to hope that the peoples of Africa and of other parts of the world will demonstrate the necessary vigilance with regard to these designs and manoeuvres.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Situated as it is in Europe, the Byelorussian SSR attaches great significance to the strengthening of peace and security and the development of co-operation in that continent. We support the proposals of the members of the Warsaw Treaty to conclude among the participants of the European Conference a treaty on the non-use of nuclear weapons, a treaty not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one another, and also a treaty not to expand by recruiting new members into the military and political groupings and alliances which confront each other in Europe. We should like to express the hope that the participants in the European Conference at the current meeting in Belgrade will produce further measures for the strengthening of security and the development of comprehensive co-operation in the European continent. If it becomes possible to solve the main problem, that of the consolidation of international security, disarmament and ensuring a lasting peace, this will open up new prospects for all the peoples of the world and will create the prerequisites for the solution to many vital, important problems, including that of overcoming the economic backwardness of developing countries which was engendered by colonialism, and ensuring that people have food, raw materials, energy sources, and that their environment is protected. All these problems must be solved by purposeful, agreed upon, concerted efforts among all States by means of broadly-based, constructive co-operation among all peoples and countries, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence among States with different social systems.

Since the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted, each year at its regular sessions the General Assembly has considered the problem of its implementation and has adopted positive decisions. We think that this is a positive phenomenon since such consideration makes it possible to draw the attention of world public opinion to the most vital problem of our time - that of the strengthening of peace and international security, which is of particular importance in our present nuclear missile age.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

At the same time, we cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that a certain group of States is demonstrating a tendency to avoid profound and serious consideration of this problem. I should like to point out that the task of ensuring international peace and security and of averting a new world war should be the business of each and every State and Government which recognizes its responsibility before the people of its own country and before mankind as a whole. For its part, the Byelorussian SSR believes, as is stressed in its answer to the questionnaire of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, that:

"... the efforts of all States should be directed towards the solution of current international problems, the development of equitable co-operation between States, and the achievement of the main goal of the United Nations, namely the maintenance of international peace and security". (A/32/165, p. 5)

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): Last year, when the item under discussion was introduced in the Committee by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, my delegation expressed its appreciation to the Soviet delegation and thanked it for the initiative it took in proposing a draft world treaty on the non-use of force. My delegation welcomed it as a further effort to strengthen the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter and as a supplement to the Charter rather than as a detraction from it. Nevertheless, during our intervention we had expressed the view that the draft treaty leaves sufficient scope for suggestions and improvements. I wish to reiterate that my delegation will unflinchingly support any move by any delegation which, in our opinion, strengthens the United Nations, strengthens international security and sanctions against interference in the internal affairs of a nation, and promotes sovereign equality among nations.

It is true that Article 2 of the United Nations Charter has explicitly laid down the principle of the non-use of the threat or use of force in international relations. In spite of the Charter of the United Nations, the international community has never ceased its effort to seek a solution to the question of the effective applicability of such a principle. There are numerous examples of such efforts before us. In 1955, the emerging nations of Asia and Africa adopted the famous Bandung Declaration calling on countries "to practise tolerance and live together in peace" and urging "abstention by any country from exerting pressure on other countries". The foundation of the non-aligned movement was laid upon two basic principles: the principle of abstention from the use of collective defence to serve the particular interest of any of the big Powers and the principle of coexistence and non-interference in the affairs of other nations. The Belgrade Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned Countries declared:

"The participating countries express their determination that no intimidation, interference or intervention should be brought to bear in the exercise of the right of self-determination of peoples, including their right to pursue constructive and independent policies for the attainment and preservation of their sovereignty".

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

All those Declarations have made positive contributions to the strengthening of the principles of the United Nations Charter and created a momentum towards evolution of the present atmosphere of comparative relaxation of tension between the super-Powers and the Power blocs. However, one may say that those were efforts made primarily by newly independent nations of the third world, and those efforts supplemented the principles of the Charter of the United Nations from outside the Organization. But then there are numerous other declarations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations itself. In spite of the Charter, the General Assembly adopted, among others, the Universal Declaration on Human Rights of 10 December 1948, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, resolution 2734 (XXV), and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States of 24 October 1970. All those Declarations have made a positive impact in areas touched upon by them. Adopted either by the normal proceedings of the United Nations General Assembly or in conferences outside the United Nations, they have their own merits and all of them have further elaborated the principles of the United Nations Charter and have contributed to the strengthening of the United Nations system. The contribution made by the non-aligned movement to the strengthening of the United Nations and to securing the universal character of the Organization and freeing the Organization from becoming an arena for the escalation of the cold war can hardly be exaggerated. My delegation, therefore, does not think that further elaboration of the principles contained in Article 2 of the Charter will in any way undermine the importance of the Charter. So, we must deliberate upon the draft treaty with a view to plugging loopholes in it and to improve where it lacks clarity and make suggestions with a view to making it as comprehensive as necessary and as effective as possible. With this objective in mind, I wish to make the following observations in a general way, because the Legal Committee will have an opportunity to discuss it article by article, when it will be the pleasure of my delegation to express its views on them.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

We have always regarded the United Nations as a body which not only should be engaged in maintaining peace but also should serve as a guardian of the freedom of small and powerless nations. In its effort to maintain peace and guard international security, the United Nations has to be guided by the fundamental principle of the sovereign equality of nations. Whenever this concept of sovereign equality is endangered in any part of the world, it immediately poses a challenge to the principles of the United Nations Charter. In order effectively to implement the provisions of the Charter, the United Nations must be strengthened in such a way as to inspire the confidence of small Powers and powerless ones as much as it may inspire the confidence of the powerful ones and curb the temptation of the strong to use force against the weak. The small and powerless countries, especially the developing among them, genuinely wish to be free from the burden of wasting their resources on defence instead of development. Only in conditions of international guarantee for their independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in their internal affairs, and only in conditions of security that their independence will not be tampered with for hegemonic purposes and for the purpose of creating a sphere of influence, exploitation of their national resources or exploitation for trade purposes, can the nations of the world breathe in a world of peace and justice.

Nobody will disagree with this observation but such principles, far from being observed, are being trampled upon every day by the mighty by their pressure against the weak. As long as sufficient mechanism is not created in the United Nations system to make the United Nations capable of acting in support of the aggrieved nation in case of violations of the principles of the Charter, and to halt the threat or use of force by nations, all these lofty principles will remain just tall talk. We should, therefore, like to see some elaboration of Article 42 of the Charter as well, to enable the United Nations to act effectively. The United Nations has powers to enforce its decisions under Chapter VII of the Charter. The United Nations must have sufficient option to enforce the provisions of the draft treaty on the non-use of force. If the treaty does not contain requisite provision to inhibit the occurrence of violation of the treaty, it will be ineffective in the face of the

threat or use of force. Such violations and the ineffectiveness of the United Nations have engendered disappointment and frustration among the small nations, gradually eroding their faith in the Organization.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

It may encourage bullyism, demoralize small nations and encourage gradual encroachment on their sovereignty by big nations. As long as the development of an effective mechanism for the implementation of United Nations decisions is resisted in the name of the sovereign right of a nation, as long as the so-called sovereign right of a nation remains a tool in the hands of powerful nations to subjugate and encroach upon the sovereign rights of small nations, and as long as a means to prevent the occurrence of such a situation is not developed, the violation of the Charter by the mighty to suppress the weak will gradually become the order of the day. It will give rise, ultimately, to the balance of power in favour of a few big Powers and create their condominium instead of a world based on the sovereign equality of nations.

Therefore we urge upon the Security Council to pay heed to General Assembly resolution 31/92 and begin serious consideration of the ways and means to develop the necessary mechanism to enable it to act positively and speedily to help the victims of the use of force, punish the user of force and thus ensure observance of and respect for the Charter of the United Nations.

We have welcomed détente and we believe in its great merit. We fully subscribe to the view that in the absence of détente there cannot be any progress in the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) or nuclear disarmament; in the absence of détente there cannot be any progress in the sphere of general and complete disarmament. We fully agree that parleys among nations are a prerequisite for understanding, and understanding among nations is a prerequisite for relaxation of tension.

If détente is only an awareness between two super-Powers of their destructive capacity and of the lack of a first-strike capacity that might wreak total destruction on the enemy, and that détente is to buy time to develop such a capacity, then God save us from such a détente. There are reasons for such scepticism. While super-Powers have engaged in SALT negotiations, their arsenals have been increasing with greater speed. The pace of negotiations is too slow compared to strides in the development of new weapons and manufacture and accumulation of others. It is,

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

therefore, up to the super-Powers to prove by their performance the validity of either of the theories of the origin of détente. The necessity of détente and the causes that gave birth to the concept will remain powerful factors either to appreciate détente or to inhibit its appreciation. It is also incumbent on the big Powers, the permanent members of the Security Council, to agree among themselves to inspire confidence in the nations of the world that no nation will be permitted to tamper with the principle of the sovereign equality of nations. As long as the use of force or threat of force is not eliminated and as long as the hegemonistic tendencies of strong nations against the weak remain, the small and powerless nations will remain sceptical about the usefulness of détente. As long as détente is not extended to all parts of the world and every nation on earth is not involved in the atmosphere of détente, it will run the risk of being interpreted either as an attempt to create a condominium or an attempt to institutionalize spheres of influence by the big Powers in collusion with the regional Powers. Therefore it is incumbent on the Members of the United Nations to extend the process of détente to all parts of the world. We say so because we believe in the positive interpretation of détente.

Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the USSR, while proposing the inclusion of the agenda item entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war" during the general debate, observed that the experience of recent years had shown that States were inspired by peaceful strivings and that this made them find a common language in setting about actions that would lead to a stronger peace. He said:

"Indeed the very improvement of the international climate in recent years has become possible because this was the common cause for a sizable number of countries and for political and social forces which in their world outlook and ideology often stand quite far apart but are none the less willing to co-operate for the benefit of peace."

(A/32/PV.8, p. 41)

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

Mr. Gromyko did not ascribe the origin of détente to negative factors like "balance of terror". We greatly appreciate also the view expressed by President Brezhnev that

"détente means willingness to resolve differences and disputes not by force, not by threats or sabre-rattling, but by peaceful means, at the conference table. Détente means a certain trust and ability to take into consideration each other's legitimate interests". (ibid., p. 38)

The definition of détente provided by one of the main initiators of détente is more than welcome to us. It contains many basic principles that are most necessary for the maintenance of peaceful and friendly relations among nations. What can a small nation like Nepal expect but to have stable relations, primarily with its neighbours and with other States, to resolve differences and disputes by peaceful means and to take into consideration each other's legitimate interests? If détente for super-Powers is an understanding between them, détente for a small country is primarily mature relationship with its neighbouring countries. The extension of détente to all parts of the world has to have, as one of its components, the institutionalization of peace in different parts of the world, on the basis of understanding and consideration of one another's legitimate interests among the countries of the region and subregion.

Finally, we come again to the same question. Is it the lack of declarations or principles that is an obstacle to the application of détente to all parts of the world? We are not against any declaration; in fact we believe that reiteration of certain principles from time to time is also a necessary process in the strengthening and development of such principles. But the time has come for us to address ourselves to the development of a mechanism whereby it is possible to remain vigilant to ensure that no nation, singularly or in collaboration with others, violates the principles, and those who dare to violate should not go uncensored for their deeds. This is a very important aspect, and my delegation will always co-operate with any delegation that takes the initiative to achieve this goal.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): Pakistan strongly endorses the principle of the non-use of force in international relations as enunciated in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter. This principle has been reaffirmed at various international forums, including the Bandung Conference, where the principles of peaceful coexistence were proclaimed, and came to be regarded as the positive elements of an agreement among nations to renounce the use, or the threat of use, of force. Despite these and many other declarations of intent regarding the non-use of force, the world has witnessed no abatement of conflicts among States, and we have observed the most distressing instances in which force has been used by one State against another for the settlement of disputes and the achievement of narrow national objectives.

Pakistan firmly believes that a fundamental reason for the continued use of force in international relations is the unequal size and potential of nation States, wherein the threat of force remains implicit even when force is not actually used. It is a matter of frequent historical record that powerful States have not hesitated to use or threaten to use force when it has served their interests.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

A second major cause of conflict in the present era is the widespread presence and existence of political, social and economic injustices that exist between States and the sometimes determined efforts pursued by some countries to undermine the sovereignty and independence of weaker States and to suppress the legitimate rights of peoples. International inequality and injustice, far from being redressed in response to the requirements United Nations Charter, are being further aggravated by the growing economic and military disparity between the nations of the world. Consequently, it is the belief of the Pakistan delegation that any effort, legal or political, aimed at promoting the non-use of force in international relations cannot be separated from the more important objective of fostering a transition to a more democratic and equitable world order than the one that exists at present.

Pakistan acknowledges that the initiative to outlaw the use of force in international relations has been motivated by a desire for peace. However, a treaty to ban the use of force can be effective only if it provides safeguards against the resort to force by the larger and more powerful States in the pursuit of their national objectives and only if the treaty can help to remove the injustices and inequalities which constitute the underlying causes of conflict.

In the view of the Pakistan delegation, therefore, the constitution of any treaty or convention regarding the non-use of force in international relations must include the following conditions if it is to be an effective instrument. First, it must secure the full compliance of all States with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the United Nations decisions; these constitute the best guarantee of international peace and security. Secondly, it must make it clear that the prohibition on the use of force is without prejudice to the fulfilment of the legitimate rights of peoples through all the means provided by the United Nations Charter, the resolution of outstanding disputes and conflicts in accordance with binding international decisions and the inherent right of self-defence as laid down in Article 51 of the Charter. Thirdly, it must provide effective machinery for the obligatory and

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

peaceful settlements of disputes and for securing compliance with the United Nations Charter and the binding decisions of the United Nations. Fourthly, it must expressly prohibit States from interfering in the internal affairs of other States. And, fifthly, it must commit Member States to transforming the existing unequal international relationships and to creating a more democratic and just world order.

Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): I should like at the outset to emphasize the close and intrinsic link between the three topical items under consideration, namely, the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force, the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and the deepening and consolidation of international détente and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war. In our view, the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force and the promotion of the process of international détente are the basic prerequisites for and the main pillars of international security.

My delegation has noted with appreciation the valuable contribution of the Soviet delegation, in having introduced those three items since 1970 in the General Assembly. We attach paramount importance to those three items, each of them having a direct bearing on the primary role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, each of them being of special concern to all nations. That is warranted by the development of the international situation whose main trends are, on the one hand, the extension of the process of international détente and, on the other hand, the continuing existence of focal points of tensions and crises in various regions of the world which constitute a danger to peace and security.

At the sixth meeting of this Committee on 18 October 1977 my delegation had the opportunity to express in detail its views on item 127: the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war. We emphasized then that the strict observance of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations is of particular importance for the promotion of international détente. The process of the relaxation

(Mr. Zolotarev, Bulgaria)

of tensions, while becoming the dominant trend in international relations, requires that an ever greater number of States should be involved in it both in terms of general policy and in treaty commitment. The process of détente calls for new initiatives in order to be extended to all spheres of international life and to all regions of the world. Greater involvement of all members of the international community and a more dynamic approach to the most crucial problems of the present-day world are needed in order further to promote a steady advancement and to exclude the possibility of succumbing to the undesirable inertia of the past.

Proceeding from that premise, my delegation is deeply convinced that the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations can furnish favourable conditions for the promotion of international co-operation, and thus create a climate propitious for the deepening and consolidation of international détente. Such a climate will greatly enhance international security and co-operation.

Of course we are fully aware that there are some who either display political nihilism or have difficulties in conceiving of the contemporary world without the use of force and who prefer to believe that its prohibition would almost create a vacuum in the international legal order. We are convinced that, in undertaking to elaborate a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, the United Nations would raise a tremendous obstacle to the manoeuvres of those forces which have stepped up their efforts to slow down and hinder the process of détente.

It is our considered view that the time has come to provide an opportunity for the United Nations to be instrumental in encouraging the treaty-making procedures for the elaboration of the ground rules for peaceful co-existence, and to root them irreversibly in the texture of international relations.

The conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations would, in our submission, be also an invaluable contribution to the cause of strengthening trust among peoples, for we are all living in an international community where the strict observance of the principle of the non-use of force

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

in international relations is still far from being a consistent practice. In fact, a number of hotbeds of tension continue to exist in the world. The risk that new focal points of crises and tensions may emerge cannot be excluded altogether. It is not material whether we call such hotbeds of tension local or limited conflicts or crises. Nor, perhaps, is it so material whether we, in dealing with them in the United Nations, tend to exaggerate or belittle their real gravity.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

What is material, in our view, is that every conflict or crisis is fraught with the danger of being inflated into global, full scale confrontation as long as the arms race still continues and critical international issues still remain unsettled. Therefore, if the use of force in relations between States is not eliminated, then future conflicts involving conventional weapons are likely to become more bloody and devastating. And, of course, while the thermonuclear arsenal of war is not destroyed, the assumption of a chain-reaction cannot be discarded, that is to say, the probability of a particular armed conflict developing into a thermonuclear conflagration cannot be ruled out altogether.

Thus the prohibition of the use of force is closely linked with the solution of the cardinal problem of present-day realities - the problem of disarmament as the basic prerequisite for international peace and security. Indeed, it is to be highly valued that the Soviet draft treaty envisages a provision whereby States

"... shall make all possible efforts to implement effective measures for lessening military confrontation and for disarmament which would constitute steps towards the achievement of the ultimate goal - general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control". (A/31/243, annex, p. 2, Article IV)

In our view, this is a provision of particular importance because it would constitute a further elaboration of the principles of the Charter.

In his letter to the Secretary-General my Foreign Minister pointed out that

"As a result of the obligations which States would assume under the future treaty, the prospects for successful settlement of the whole range of problems in the field of disarmament would be significantly enhanced. The confirmation in a single legally binding document of the obligation of all States, including the nuclear States, strictly to observe the principle of the non-use of force in international relations would unquestionably have enormous political and moral significance and would to a considerable extent facilitate efforts to achieve real progress towards the attainment of the final goal, namely, general and complete disarmament under strict and *effective international control*." (A/32/114, annex, p. 1)

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

In Article I the draft treaty explicitly stipulates that

"... the use of... any types of weapons, including nuclear or other types of weapons of mass destruction..." (A/31/243, annex, p. 2)

should be prohibited. Furthermore, the draft treaty under consideration would also open up the opportunity to outlaw aggression in strict conformity with the definition of aggression adopted by the United Nations. Besides, it contains a provision whereby States shall

"... refrain from any action which may aggravate the situation to such a degree as to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security and thereby make a peaceful settlement of the dispute more difficult". (Ibid., Article II)

It is our earnest belief that the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force would be an important factor in curbing aggression as such, including the use of force against the exercise of the inalienable rights of peoples to self-determination as well as their imprescriptible right to defend their independence, territorial integrity and their sovereign choice of the road to political, social and economic development. It has always been our understanding that there can be no reason whatsoever to construe the struggle of colonial peoples for self-determination and independence, the struggle for liberation of territories seized by force, as illegitimate use of force. Such a struggle, which as a matter of fact is defence against colonial oppression and imperialist aggression, is consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter. Moreover, the right to wage such a struggle springs from an impressive number of United Nations resolutions and decisions, in particular the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Programme of Action for its implementation and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the definition of aggression.

The Charter of the United Nations, being a universal code of conduct in international relations, provides the political, moral and legal basis for the formulation of legal instruments, including international treaties in the field of the maintenance of international peace and the strengthening of international security.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

The general principles laid down in the Charter three decades since the inception of the United Nations need to be expanded and developed. This is a task which stems from the provisions of the Charter itself. Article 11 empowers the General Assembly to

"... consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security... and... make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members..."

of the Organization. Article 13 provides that

"The General Assembly shall... make recommendations for the purpose of... promoting international co-operation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification..."

The entire 30-year history of the United Nations is there to prove that the development of the purposes and principles of the Charter has become a rule for the activities of the Organization.

We are therefore deeply convinced that the time has come for an endeavour to substantiate and thus enhance the principle of the non-use of force contained in the Charter.

The development of international relations requires taking a step forward in formulating a treaty on the non-use of force as a legal framework for the conduct of relations between States. It would, in our submission, have a positive impact on the strengthening of international security. And, last but not least, it would enhance the role of the United Nations as an important factor and instrument for maintaining international peace and security.

Much, if not everything, has been said for two sessions of the General Assembly to justify and commend the initiative of the Soviet Union, which has aroused great interest and met with a positive response from the States Members of the United Nations.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to suggest that at the current session the General Assembly should first adopt a declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente, which it should firmly adhere to and promote the implementation of the provisions of the Charter, and should facilitate the peaceful settlement of outstanding international problems in order to prevent the recurrence of situations which might endanger international peace and security.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

That would constitute implementation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and of important decisions of the Organization. Secondly, the General Assembly should put in motion the treaty-making capacity of the Organization in the working out of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): While the word "détente" has been borrowed from the French vocabulary, the very idea of it should belong to all and in the political conception of the world détente should replace the confrontation which for so long has characterized international relations. Given the possibilities of destruction which general armed conflict could bring, any policy which accepts the risk of war, having as its sole foundation a fragile balance of forces threatening one another, must be condemned.

Therefore, the French Government has endeavoured to place its relations with other countries at the level of détente.

By common agreement, Paris and Moscow have worked to dispel the atmosphere of tension which for too long was the hallmark of the so-called "cold war". The efforts of the two countries to make this new spirit prevail found its most recent expression in the joint Declaration made at Fambouillet on 22 June 1977 by the President of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. Leonid Brezhnev and the President of the French Republic, Mr. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. In the same spirit, we cannot fail to welcome with pleasure the principle of a declaration on the strengthening of détente within the context of the United Nations, whose primary reason for existence is to achieve understanding among States.

Détente was first conceived as establishing a fresh state of mind between East and West and its field of application was essentially the European scene, where for two centuries, unfortunately, wars have found a ready home. It was in Europe that détente registered its first major success, in particular on the conclusion of the agreement of the four great Powers to admit to our Organization the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and, later, with the holding of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe at Helsinki and the adoption of its final act, the implementation of which is being reviewed at Belgrade. That could give further impetus to an evolution which, precisely because it is necessary, requires the exercise of prudence and subtlety.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

In this progressive détente between East and West, much remains to be done, it is true, and new efforts must be made; we must further develop and increase the contents of the three Helsinki "baskets". But I believe that we are entitled to say that we are on the right course as regards our own ancient continent and that it will suffice to continue on that path.

But why limit our horizons? Détente should be world wide and should apply to all States of every continent in their relations with each other, as well as to their policies relating to States of neighbouring continents. As the Rambouillet Declaration states:

"France and the USSR consider it essential that all States intensify efforts to achieve international détente" and the Declaration reaffirms the necessity for both Powers

"... to adjust to the needs of détente in their action towards all States and in every region of the world."

The means of promoting world-wide détente was also specified in the same document. They are listed as follows: first, "to take decisive initiatives towards disarmament". The special session of the General Assembly on disarmament to be held in the spring of next year will give us an opportunity to do that; as is known, France intends at that time to make constructive proposals for effective disarmament; Secondly, "to act so that the spirit of détente will not be thwarted by considerations of bloc policy". In that connexion, I would point out that the allegiance to traditional alliances and friendships in no way contradicts this intention; it in no way excludes the legitimate role that they must play in maintaining international security, in accordance with Articles 51, 52, 53 and 54 of the Charter.

I do not wish to quote the entire Franco-Soviet Declaration, but two further propositions are worth quoting. The first is as follows:

"Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms by all States constitutes one of the bases for a profound improvement in their mutual relations."

(Mr. Leprette, France)

Thus we have reaffirmed that it is no longer possible for States in their relations to ignore the attitude of other States in regard to human rights. Without in any way infringing on the principle of the sovereignty of each State, each should work to promote human rights throughout the world in the true interest of détente.

A second proposition aims at the need "to take into consideration the legitimate interests and points of view of other States". That idea is of general character and I should like to apply it to a problem which no longer divides East and West but, if I may say so, North and South. I have in mind the range of economic questions. In that field, some years ago we experienced a paroxysm of opposition. In the view of my country, in this field also confrontation should give way to understanding and therefore to détente and it felt honoured to have been one of the initiators of the North-South dialogue which, I wish to emphasize, is vital for the advancement of universal détente. That understanding must be continued and renewed not only in a spirit of equity and because of a need for economic balance, but also because political balance and therefore international security is at stake.

We were pleased to note the close relationship between the joint Declaration signed at Rambouillet and the Soviet draft declaration on détente that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, presented in the course of the general debate of our Assembly in September last and which the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted to our Committee last month. Many expressions in the Declaration of last May are to be found repeated literally in the draft submitted to this Committee. While hoping for an improvement in the text in relation to certain new aspects, we have indicated our keen interest to the authors of the draft. Consultations on a new text have continued under the enlightened guidance of Mr. Hoveyda. It has not yet been formally submitted, but we are aware of the essential facts; an informal complete text has just been distributed and Mr. Hoveyda has indicated the spirit in which he has discharged his mission. It covers many different ideas. They are interesting and deserve

(Mr. Leprette, France)

consideration, although we do not always agree with the exact wording or its relevance to the item which we are considering. We shall continue this study, at the same time regretting that in the time available a more thorough and complete study was not possible, necessary though it is for the assessment of a text devoted to so important a question, which in our opinion because of its very nature cannot be settled other than by consensus. Indeed, is it conceivable that a declaration on détente within the United Nations context should have votes cast against it or even have abstentions? That would be a further confrontation, running counter to its very purpose. We whole-heartedly approve of what Mr. Hoveyda has done in seeking a general understanding and we wish to congratulate him on his efforts in that regard.

The second part of item 127 relates to the prevention of nuclear war. I should like to make a few remarks on the problem raised here. What we wish to prevent above all is war in all its forms, whether nuclear or conventional. No one is unaware that a generalized war would hardly be likely to remain conventional war. Therefore, to us it is not possible to deal with the nuclear threat by isolating it from the general risk of war. The conventional weapons race throughout the world, and in particular the constant technological improvement of those weapons, arouses our serious concern because of its destabilizing effect, similar to that of the nuclear weapons race. Is not the best means to prevent war, whether nuclear or not, to strengthen détente; and is not the second part of agenda item 127 not exactly tantamount to the first part of the item?

Détente, therefore, emerges as a major necessary undertaking. My delegation is pleased to have this opportunity to analyse its mechanism. We are prepared to contribute to this study, one of the most useful to which we could set our minds.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.