



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 49TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 126: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL  
RELATIONS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)  
Mr. Harmon (Liberia)  
Mr. Thiemele (Ivory Coast)  
Mr. Lai Yali (China)  
Mr. Marinescu (Romania)

\* 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.1/34/PV.49  
4 December 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 126 (continued)

INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (A/34/243;  
A/C.1/34/L.1, L.8, L.52)

The CHAIRMAN: We have more than a quorum, but the representatives whose names are on the list of speakers for this morning either are not present yet or, if they are present, are not prepared to speak first. I shall wait for two minutes more and then, if none of the other speakers listed for this morning arrives, I shall call upon the first of those who are here and who are due to speak, even though he is not scheduled to speak first.

I call on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): As there is no one else ready to speak at this time, perhaps I may make an introductory statement.

I should like to bring out the meaning of the word "hegemony". According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica and Webster's Dictionary, which are in agreement on this, hegemony is leadership or predominance, especially that of one State or nation, in a league or confederation. It implies a group of nations that are particularly akin in relation to other nations. Some State among them takes predominance, and that is called hegemony.

I shall give an example from ancient Greece. In Ancient Greece there were the city states, and both Athens and Sparta claimed hegemony over them. Their antagonism was different from that involved in the conflict between Persia and Greece, in which Greece was attacked in an attempt at conquest by Persia, an altogether alien nation. Hegemony has always been associated with a group of nations that stand together, but one of which exercises hegemony. In ancient Greece hegemony caused terrific destruction. Greece was destroyed not by any of the wars with Persia, which were occasions for heroism and valour in war, and we still know today of Thermopylae, Salamis and Marathon - great examples of such heroism and valour. But the war that was fought for hegemony in Greece was the war that destroyed Greece, because a war of hegemony is a war of division, and the moment you have division you have all the evils of a partitionist situation. The Peloponnesian War was the war for hegemony between Sparta and Athens, and that brought about all the evils of division.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Therefore it is justifiable to take all steps to prevent hegemonism in the case of our present United Nations - first of all because hegemonism is contrary to the Charter, which calls for the equal sovereignty and independence of States. There should be no question of hegemonism, either regional or global. My delegation is in agreement, and supports the draft resolutions, which are entirely in favour of getting rid of the divisionist elements of hegemonism, whether in a region or in a group of nations or any kind of association between States within the concept of the United Nations. We therefore support the draft resolution as condemning hegemonism, which is one of the most divisive and destructive elements in world politics.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): Addressing itself to the question of hegemony, after much thought and consideration, the Liberian delegation is led to ask this question: how big, and how much, is the scope of hegemony?

If by hegemony is meant domination, we in Africa do not need anyone to give us guidance. In any case, the fighters in the legitimate African liberation movements prefer guns to books in their hands. Even if they threw the books at the heads of their adversaries, they would find altogether too restrictive the standard definition: "especially the predominant influence of one State over another".

Today the appetites for power are demonstrating a great greed. The apartheid Republic of South Africa is now engaged in carving out a sphere of influence in the dimensions of an empire which covets no less than the whole of southern Africa or, more than that, one third of the entire continent. As events there are coming to some sort of a climax, the picture is becoming clear as to how Pretoria has played the hand of hegemony through Rhodesia and South West Africa - and I am using the colonial titles - and now in the so-called constellation of the adjacent small States, even in brazenly sustained open acts of aggression, as in Mozambique, Zambia and Angola, seeking an empire under the blazing umbrella of a developing nuclear bomb.

I wish to assure the Committee that I do not intend to go into a discussion of political issues of Africa or of any of the other areas of hegemonism we see bulging on virtually every continent in each hemisphere.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Seemingly we are now in the midst of a veritable hegemonistic epidemic, one hegemony infecting or begetting another in an escalation that must be stopped or it will consume the world and, instead of United Nations commissions for peace, the world will see regional organizations for war, and, while the two world wars had a kind of integration, the third war will more resemble the personality of an all-encompassing octopus, each tentacle with its own power, but all stemming from the single monstrous head of hegemonism.

That is why the Liberian delegation welcomes the Soviet initiative in proposing the draft resolution entitled, "The inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations". It is an adequate title engrafted on a more than adequate presentation of substance, as we shall point out later. But for us the most striking feature of the proposal is that it comes from a big Power, for it is the big-Power rivalries for spheres of influence that are the main roots of the hegemonistic precipitation so rapidly changing the climate favourable to the mad jostling on the part of the small Powers for retention of their new-found sovereignty and in some cases for their national existence. In another arena of the big Powers there is the strategy of retaining or recapturing lost territories in the new net of neo-colonialism, while these, using the wolf they have ousted for a mini-hegemonism of their own. Of them it could be said that they who think they have the wolf on a leash will find that his teeth are still sharp.

Striking also is the timeliness of the proposal, which comes at a time when hegemonism is at flood tide, threatening to overflow the bounds of safety. The waves are mounting high in Indo-China, and who can tell today what will be the regional impact of the developments in Iran? There may be a scramble for shifting power, which is already manifesting itself in the manoeuvres for strategic oceans - the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean with its gulfs and seas, and the Caribbean.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

In the light of these destabilizing events, the resolutions before us urgently call on us for unanimous or close to unanimous support for the mitigating influence they may have in the short term and the moral influence they will undoubtedly acquire in the long term.

We opened our statement with the question how big - and how much - is the scope of hegemony? It is not surprising that our natural tendency would be to think of the issue mainly in political terms. We have already outlined in the most sketchy way the current political dimensions. But even if these, by some midnight magic, were solved by the end of this session, the chains of domination would still bind the world.

The forces of imposition do not rule by guns alone. The great navies, the mighty air forces, the strategic missile systems - appalling as they are - are only a fraction of the world structure of domination. Unused, they are mainly standby forces, functioning more as threats than in action. Except in local outbursts, they virtually do not touch the every-day lives of the hundreds of millions, even the billions, of people in our world. Let us put it this way. If all these military and political bids for power were to disappear, only a few of the clouds of enslavement would have blown away, leaving a world still engulfed in the darkness of domination.

Domination today carries bigger implications to an almost unlimited degree. By the irrational course of history, a virtual handful of nations controls the wheels of the world economy, its terms of trade, its banking and monetary systems, its food and industrial production, its science and technology. Here is a domination more powerful than any army with banners, while the nations of the rest of the world are doomed for decades to come to a kind of subcontractor role of one kind or another.

Much is made of the sovereign rights of nations to self-defence - a mere euphemism for the small nations who depend for the new and more effective weapons on the whim of the super-haves who, by their own timetable, are determined to retain, for at least the next two decades their overwhelming ratio of advantage in domination.

When the current horizons of hegemony are so vast and when the few dispose of so much and the many of so little, we have a division that

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

strikes at the very heart of the concept of democracy. A world of hegemony automatically affronts - if it does not abolish - centuries of precious democracy.

The spread of domination is so great that, as most representatives may have observed, even the word "gap" is disappearing from our documents as obviously too diminutive and too un-descriptive of the almost timeless span which we confront. Not daring to face up to the vast outer spaces of inequality we have adopted comforting time-tables of wishful thinking. We have made a Utopia of the year 2000. Do we really believe that at the present rate the developing nations will by then enjoy 25 per cent of the world's gross national product, or that their dependency on technology will be completely eliminated?

We ask these questions not in a spirit of pessimism, but in realistic appraisal of the reactions of the mighty developed nations to the great effort to right the imbalance through the New International Economic Order. We appreciate other efforts, such as the narrowing of the cultural gap in the restitution of colonially-acquired cultural property, and the excellent work of the International Law Commission on the succession of States, and on treaties safeguarding their fledgling sovereignty. But this is merely filling the potholes of the bigger problems which, with the lack of will still stubbornly there, makes little dent in the two worlds of the dominators and the dominated.

In one Assembly after another, we have sought to attune our minds to this new empire of power that, in the 34 years of the post-war period, has completely altered the world we knew. A new world has been ushered in, of new nations and new Powers that no historian of the world could have predicted. Historians have divided the past into ages: the Age of Faith, the Age of Reason and the Dark Ages. Unless we, who are closer to the future than any preceding generation, act now we shall sentence ourselves to the Age of Hegemony. That is why the Liberian delegation repeats its concept of the importance of the Soviet initiative at this time, and of the various resolutions stemming from that initiative. For

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

our part we shall study them but it is obvious to us after having read them that the six-Power draft resolution, A/C.1/34/L.52, best expresses, in our opinion, the comprehensive view that could be taken on this issue.

In conclusion, I wish to underline one more point. What is really, and I may say chiefly, involved is not only the relationship of the strong and the weak nations, but the struggle for hegemony among the strong. It is that rivalry for predominance that brought about the First World War. It is that struggle that brought the world to the disaster of the Second World War.

As I close these remarks, let me emphasize that in those two terrible lessons, we learned that hegemony is the inevitable road to war, and that what is involved in the decisions we are about to make here, at this time in history, is world peace itself.

Mr. THIEMELE (Ivory Coast) (interpretation from French): It is a good omen that we are considering item 126 of the agenda under the chairmanship of the representative of a small country, the Bahamas, a country which, like so many others represented here, needs the backing of the United Nations to assert its political independence and its sovereignty and particularly to bring about economic and social development, which alone can guarantee that their recovered liberty will be maintained. Therefore we are delighted to see you guiding the proceedings of the First Committee.

Since their accession to independence the countries formerly under foreign domination have ceaselessly denounced the inequities in the relations which have prevailed and continue to prevail in the world in every field: political, economic, cultural, military and others. This quest for equality in international relations has prompted most of those countries to organize themselves in order to have their claims heard by the most important and largest countries on the earth, former colonial Powers or new imperial Powers.

Politically, the peoples of the third world, after the now historic Bandung Conference in 1955, have regrouped themselves in order to assert their identity and to beat a new and authentic path in the world of today. Non-alignment is thus a direct and positive response to the realities of our time. The liberation of these peoples, a task to which our Organization has contributed so much, should not be transformed into a parody of sovereignty but into a truly independent existence in a world where every nation must respect the others. Concerning military matters the third-world States, for the most part poor and without sizable material resources, have declared themselves against military alliances and blocs which serve to promote the policy of the great Powers aimed at dividing the world into spheres of influence or to impose their domination. On economic issues, the developing countries advocate a fundamental change in international economic relations through the establishment of a New International Economic Order which would permit the peoples of those States to benefit fully from their natural resources. On the cultural level, the third world is trying to make the former Powers recognize that all human societies have made and are making a decisive contribution to world civilization.

(Mr. Thiemele, Ivory Coast)

This many-sided struggle has not always enjoyed the support of the great Powers, which most of the time have opposed it and refused to recognize its legitimacy - by strengthening existing military alliances, by maintaining unjust economic relations or even by the development of new forms of domination, sometimes insidious and refined, sometimes brutal and direct, but always very effective. Therefore, at a time when attempts are being made to make us accept outrageous notions such as "spheres of influence", "zones of nuclear protection", "limited sovereignty", "internationalist solidarity" and so on, how can we not take pleasure in the fact that one of the super-Powers, and perhaps the foremost in terms of the accumulation of weapons of all kinds, is taking the initiative to have the policy of hegemony, that is to say, the quest for domination, pre-eminence and supremacy at the expense of the weak, clearly and solemnly condemned.

The Ivory Coast delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Soviet delegation for opening this breach, which, I am sure, will make it possible not only to denounce the use of a term which some are pretending to have just discovered, but also to identify the essence of this phenomenon, to assemble all its various manifestations and thus to limit it for the benefit of the small nations which form the majority of the international community. For us it is not a question of détente or of disarmament. It is essentially a matter of peaceful co-existence among scores of States with different resources, different ideologies, different religions, different socio-economic systems. In this world we do not wish, at any price, a favourable position, whether political, economic or military, to be exploited by the beneficiary to the detriment of others. It will be easily understood that for us hegemonism is not confined solely to the practice of the great Powers but to the practices of any State entity, whatever its political system or its size, which by its conduct in international relations is clearly seeking to impose its objectives and goals, as well as the means of attaining them, on States weaker than itself. This is the policy of hegemonism, essentially based on the desire for power, arrogant diktat, irrepressible paternalism and inability to accept the independence and sovereignty of others.

(Mr. Thiemele, Ivory Coast)

That is how we view the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemony in international relations.

Just as power can take different forms, so can the desire for power manifest itself in different ways and at different levels. Thus, the world at the end of the 20th century is dominated demographically by five great countries, China, India, the Soviet Union, the United States and Indonesia; from the military standpoint by the Soviet Union, the United States, China, France and Great Britain; from the economic standpoint by the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany. I shall not go into the matter of the political influence of some of those countries. While each of those Powers, depending upon its resources and methods, exercises clear domination over most of the members of the international community, they are not the only ones that wish to impose themselves on others in one or more of those areas so essential to the life of the peoples of the world. Other Powers, either directly or deviously, are directing their national policies towards the search for a preeminent position as compared with the weaker States in order to satisfy their insatiable appetite for supremacy or, more ignobly, to serve as instruments for the policy of a protector Power. Examples are not lacking, for they are numerous and obvious, particularly because, since they do not have the means to conduct such a policy, these mini-Powers with hegemonistic ambitions resort to a scenario which makes a mockery of the fundamental principles of relations among States and destroys their credibility on the regional and international levels.

Unfortunately, hegemonism - against which the international community has contrived to promote concepts which should make it impossible or should at least mitigate its effects by avoiding a return to situations of the kind that led to the Second World War - has left indelible traces within our very Organization. Indeed the San Francisco Charter, which established the United Nations on the principle of the sovereign equality of States, contains a number of provisions which, without entirely calling into question this fundamental principle, do in fact ensure preeminence for certain States.

(Mr. Thiemele, Ivory Coast)

That is so in the case of the composition of the Security Council, where the five great Powers that destroyed the Nazi régime enjoy the right to oppose individually any decision of that important organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security.

The same applies to the representation of certain Powers at the United Nations - representation which disregards customary practice in that area and strengthens the influence of those States. It is not our aim to judge the validity of those provisions, but merely to draw attention to their existence.

In the light of all the forms which the policy of hegemonism may take - only a few of which we can mention here - our Assembly should, above all, ask itself what is its objective in considering item 126 of its agenda.

In introducing draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.1, the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Troyanovsky, stressed that

"The policy of hegemonism is in flagrant contradiction to the principles of the United Nations, first and foremost the principle of the sovereign equality of States; ... the manifestations of such a policy lead to the creation of hotbeds of tension, complicate relations between States and destabilize the international situation."

(A/C.1/34/PV.5, p. 16)

Consequently, the Soviet draft resolution would have the General Assembly condemn the principle of hegemonism, of whatever form, as being incompatible with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

It could not be clearer. It is a matter not just of denouncing current hegemonistic tendencies, but of transforming the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism into a universal principle, and to that end the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union proposed that:

(Mr. Thiemele, Ivory Coast)

"It would be a good idea subsequently to couch the renunciation by States of a policy of hegemonism in all its manifestations in terms of a broad international agreement and to conclude such an agreement or treaty." (A/34/PV.7, p. 78)

In our view, the objective of this exercise is to look even further ahead and see to it that we succeed in eliminating hegemonism from inter-State relations, in all its manifestations and at all levels, so that international relations can be based on genuinely democratic principles and so that we can eliminate the tendencies which threaten the independence and sovereignty of the smallest and weakest States.

The delegation of the Ivory Coast is ready to join in an unequivocal condemnation of the policy of hegemonism, whatever its source and whatever its form.

My country will also support any solemn declaration calling upon all States, particularly the most powerful, to renounce all hegemonistic ambitions and scrupulously to abide by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, particularly the principle of the sovereign equality of States and the principle of their peaceful co-existence.

In our view, this initial stage should be followed up by others to cover all possible manifestations of hegemonism - bilateral, multilateral, regional and international - in relations between States in order to bring about the rapid elimination of that policy, which has already done so much damage to mankind over the past centuries.

The United Nations cannot but take the lead in such an effort which, if successful, must certainly strengthen its foundations and guarantee it the perennial life which has hitherto been threatened by the conduct of certain Members.

Mr. LAI Yali (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Hegemonism is the root-cause of all the turmoil, unrest and increasing war danger in the present world situation. The struggle against hegemonism is a major issue related to the maintenance of world peace and the security of all States and an issue bearing an over-all importance in international politics. When we are considering the serious question of fighting hegemony and defending world peace at this august forum of the United Nations, it is necessary to make an in-depth analysis of hegemonism, fully reveal the hegemonic acts and adopt the necessary measures to stop the hegemonist aggression and expansion, and it is impermissible for anyone to mix the spurious with the genuine so as to deceive the public and gain fame.

Global hegemonism has taken shape through an historical process. The international situation has witnessed great changes over the three decades and more after the Second World War. On the one hand, a series of Asian, African and Latin American countries have won independence one after another, while the old colonial system has collapsed in the main. The third world countries are waging unremitting struggles for the defence of their national independence and State sovereignty and against foreign interference and domination of all forms. On the other hand, as a result of the imbalanced development of imperialism, especially the emergence of social-imperialism, there came into being the super-Powers, whose strength greatly surpasses that of ordinary imperialist Powers. In quest of world hegemony, they both want to control the third world countries by various means and also dominate those developed countries which are inferior to them in strength, and to this end they are locked in fierce rivalry. Their activities threaten the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of a large number of small and medium-sized countries and menace international peace and security. In these circumstances, the third world countries stress the need to eliminate the policies of hegemonism and oppose all forms of foreign domination and hegemony while continuing to oppose colonialism and imperialism. Many small

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

and medium-sized developed countries also emphasize the need for unity to strengthen themselves and the defence of their national independence and State security. It is evident that opposition to the policies of super-Power hegemonism has become the common desire of the people of all countries, and the fight against super-Power hegemonism has become a common struggle of theirs.

Global hegemonism manifests itself in different forms. Generally speaking, it is characterized by its disregard of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, violation of the accepted norms guiding international relations and its attempt to interfere in the internal affairs and trample upon the sovereignty of other States with the help of its political, economic and military strength in particular, and to impose its will upon other States, regions and even the whole world by threats or inducements and whatever ways and means possible. To be more specific, it is characterized by the following:

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

First, the global hegemonists have been engaged in frenzied arms expansion and preparations for launching a new world war. That late-coming super-Power, in particular, has actively pursued the policy of "substituting guns for butter", with its military expenditures spiralling up year after year. In the short span of a decade or two, it has established the largest conventional arsenal in the world and a huge strategic and tactical nuclear arsenal, enhancing its war preparedness and combat strength to a level unprecedented in peace time. Obviously, this is not for its defence needs, but is geared to its so-called "historic offensive" and serving directly its policy of global hegemonism.

Secondly, they are contending for world hegemony by every possible means in accelerated pursuance of their foreign policy of aggression and expansion. They either carry out subversion in other countries and foster puppet regimes there, or come out into the open to engineer mercenary invasion for flagrant armed intervention against and military occupation of other States. They even claim to be the "natural ally" of the third world and the non-aligned countries and deceive the public in the name of "supporting the national liberation movement" and under the cover of treaties of "friendship and co-operation" in an attempt to bring other States into their own spheres of influence. In many parts of the world, especially in areas of strategic importance, from southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, the South Asian sub-continent and all the way to South-East Asia, they are carrying out infiltration and expansion, seeking to establish military bases, grabbing the strategic resources of other States in an attempt to control strategic sea lanes so as to facilitate their global strategic deployment, by which they could prevail over their rival and then dominate the whole world.

Thirdly, in order to make others do the work as a cover for itself, global hegemonism has in recent years often worked hard, as one of its important tactics, to foster its agents and wage wars by proxies so as to make them pull chestnuts out of the fire for its global expansion. To realize this dirty goal, it has spared no effort to give blood transfusion to its agents, aiding and abetting them in flagrantly pursuing regional hegemonism and national expansionism in their surroundings, wilfully carrying out armed invasion and military occupation of neighbouring States and practising the inhuman policy of genocide in the occupied areas.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

Fourthly, as a follow-up of its aggression, expansion, interference and control of other countries in the political and military fields, global hegemonism is bound to engage in ruthless economic exploitation and plunder aimed at bringing the economy of other States under its control. It tries hard to obstruct and undermine the efforts of the developing countries for the establishment of a new international economic order so as to maintain its monopoly as the biggest exploiter in the world.

The evil doings of hegemonism have aroused increasing resentment and resistance from the people of all countries, who are stepping up their struggle against hegemonism. It was under these circumstances that the Soviet Union inscribed in the agenda of the current session an item entitled "Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations". What is behind all this?

As is known to all, since the beginning of the 1970s, the Soviet Union has been strongly against any reference to hegemonism. Any such reference would make it nervous and furious. Even an anti-hegemony clause appearing in the bilateral documents of other States was not immune from its unreasonable accusation and interference. It imagines that by flat denial it could cover up its true feature of hegemonism, which is a target of world-wide condemnation, and thus make things easier for itself. But events have gone contrary to its will, and the more it tries to hide, the more it is exposed. Consequently, fancying itself clever, it changed its tactics by taking over the slogan of anti-hegemony and masquerading itself as a hero in this respect. Deceiving itself as well as others and parading itself as a person of honour, it camouflages itself under the signboard of anti-hegemony so that it can practise hegemonism even more unscrupulously. This shows that the deepening of the world people's struggle against hegemonism has forced the hegemonists to assume a hypocritical gesture of opposing hegemonism.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

What is hegemonism? There is a criterion based on objective facts. To discern hegemonism, one must not only listen to what a person says but watch what he does. The Soviet draft resolution neither specifies who is pursuing hegemonism, nor points out the various manifestations of hegemonic acts. It merely notes in a casual manner that the policy of hegemonism is "the desire of some States to dominate other States and peoples". Such a formulation is by no means an inadvertent neglect on its part, but a deliberate arrangement. The Soviet Union tries to whitewash itself with empty rhetoric while implying that hegemonism is being practised by many countries. In fact, Soviet hegemonic features have long been shown up by its own words and deeds, and it is futile to divert people's attention. Soviet leaders have repeatedly claimed that the Soviet Union has to "reckon with the state of affairs in virtually every spot on the globe," that it "bears special responsibility" in the world, and that Soviet armed forces "will defend Soviet interests in any part and any ocean of the world." Over the years, the Soviet Union has been accelerating its arms buildup and war preparations, setting up a military apparatus unprecedented in magnitude. Relying on its huge military strength, it has controlled Eastern Europe and threatened Western Europe. It invented, propagated and practised the notorious doctrine of "limited sovereignty", brazenly placing its ally under armed occupation and suppressing the local people who dare to resist. It has occupied large tracts of others' territories, stationed a large number of troops on foreign soil and deployed a million troops along the borders of China for military threats. It has also incited its agents to carry out armed intervention in Asia and Africa and openly supported the Vietnamese regional hegemonists in invading Democratic Kampuchea, propping up a puppet régime there and spreading the war of aggression to other neighbouring States. The above facts show that the Soviet Union is the most dangerous global hegemonist of our time and the main source of a world war. The evidence is conclusive and undeniable.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

Soviet hegemonism is accustomed to the trick of "a thief crying 'catch the thief'" and this time they are merely repeating the same old trick. As one may recall, each time when the Soviet Union initiated aggression and expansion by itself or used mercenaries and proxies for the same purpose, it followed up by putting forward things like the "Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", "Non-use of Force and Permanent Non-use of Nuclear Weapons in International Relations" and the "Conclusion of a World Treaty on the Non-use of Force".

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

Today when it is supporting regional hegemonism in launching armed invasion of a sovereign State and expanding its scope of aggression in south-east Asia in furtherance of the policy of hegemonism, the Soviet Union has come up with a new proposal entitled "Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations". Obviously, the aim of its trick is to use attack as a means of defence, to gain initiative from a passive position, to turn the accused into the accuser and cover up its criminal acts of real hegemonism with high-sounding words of anti-hegemony. This is in line with its habitual tactics of carrying out expansion under the signboard of détente and building up arms under the slogan of disarmament. This, of course, can deceive no one.

Here, I should like to offer a piece of advice to the hegemonists: if you really want to change your course, shun evil and do good, you should show your sincere desire by actual deeds. For instance, you could formally declare at this international forum that from now on, you would no longer pursue the policy of hegemonism in international relations; abandon all the occupied territories and return them to the owners; withdraw all your forces from abroad; dismantle your military bases and installations from foreign soil; undertake never to invade or carry out military threats against other countries; stop the arms race and reduce substantially your nuclear and conventional armaments; undertake never to use mercenaries to wage wars by proxies; end your support to the regional hegemonists in their aggression against Democratic Kampuchea and their threats to the South-East Asian countries; cease all the sinister activities of intervention, control and subversion against other States and so on. In a word, what is needed are actual deeds and not hypocritical statements. Your failure to do so will provide further proof that the so-called proposal of "Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations" is an out-and-out fraud.

China is a developing socialist country belonging to the third world. Over long period, China has been subjected to hegemonist bullying and havoc. We are deeply aware of the serious threat posed by hegemonism to the sovereignty and independence of various countries and to international security and world peace. That is why mutual sympathy and support have always prevailed between us and all the other victims of hegemonism in the world. We have consistently supported the non-aligned countries in their just position against hegemonism. We have always *joined all the peace-loving countries* in firmly opposing the policy of hegemonism in international relations. The Chinese people are dedicated heart and soul to speeding up their socialist construction, and we need a long-term international

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

environment of peace and stability. The Constitution of China explicitly stipulates, and Chinese leaders have solemnly proclaimed on many occasions, that China will never seek hegemony, or strive to be a super-Power. In our view, in order to oppose hegemonism and defend world peace it is imperative to stress the need to abide strictly by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter; observe scrupulously the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence; oppose the super-Powers' relying on their political, economic and military strength for infiltration, interference, control, subversion and even armed aggression against and military occupation of other States; call upon the super-Powers to stop arms expansion and war preparations, reduce substantially their nuclear and conventional armaments and carry out genuine disarmament.

It is in the above spirit that the Chinese delegation has put forward the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.8.

In view of the fact that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.52 submitted by Bangladesh and other countries has reflected the main contents of the Chinese draft resolution, the Chinese delegation has decided to support this draft resolution and will not ask for a vote on the Chinese draft.

The draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh and other countries points out that global hegemonism is a main threat to international peace and security and constitutes the main obstacle to the preservation of the sovereignty and national independence of all States and to the free determination of their political and socio-economic systems. It also rightly points out that it is imperative to oppose at the same time regional hegemonism which is supported by global hegemonism and serving as its accomplice, and that it is impermissible for hegemonism to subject other States to aggression, intervention, control and domination. All those points are important for guiding the international community in its future struggle against hegemonism and useful in enabling people to see more clearly the true features of those hypocrites who talk profusely about anti-hegemony but are actually doing their utmost to seek hegemony. Operative paragraph 7, in particular, calls for the withdrawal of all occupation forces back to their own territories, so as to enable the peoples of all States to determine and administer their own affairs. We consider this to be of practical significance. In the light of the objective reality of the current international situation, the people of various countries have come to realize more and more clearly the real danger of global and

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

regional hegemonism relying on their military strength in carrying out external aggression and expansion, and hence the urgent need to stop this aggression and demand the withdrawal of the invading troops. Conclusive evidence is to be found in the General Assembly resolution adopted recently by an overwhelming majority on the situation in Kampuchea,

Steadfastly siding with all the countries that love peace and oppose aggression, we shall heighten our vigilance, strengthen our defence, fear no intimidation, refuse to be duped, expose the true features of super-Power hegemonism, strive to upset its global strategic deployment, frustrate each and every act of its aggression and expansion. We are convinced that as long as they become further united and persevere in struggle, all the peoples who are victims of hegemonism will finally be able to defeat the super-Power policies of hegemonism and war and make positive contributions to the lofty cause of defending world peace and of human progress.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania)(interpretation from French): Romania considers that one of the fundamental trends in present international life is the forceful assertion of the will of peoples to live and develop in complete freedom and independence, to promote a new spirit in relations among States, one of complete equality among them, whatever their size, economic and military power, or their social and political system. At the same time, we are witnessing an intensification in the imperialist policy of force and diktat and the manifestation of the trend to maintain and apportion spheres of influence and domination.

The evolution of international life, characterized by the struggle between those essentially opposed trends, clearly shows that in our time peoples will no longer tolerate the practice of interference and attempts at domination, and they resolutely rise up against any attack on their independence and national sovereignty. In these circumstances, the tendencies and manifestations of hegemonism are such as to bring about grave international convulsions and constitute a permanent factor of instability, collisions and conflicts which are a threat to peace, security and international co-operation. That is why the abolition of the anachronistic policy of hegemonism, in all its forms and manifestations, is at present an objective need of great urgency and a primary requirement for all peoples of the world.

In the light of those considerations, we welcome the initiative of the Soviet Union in bringing to the attention of the United Nations General Assembly the subject of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations.

Romania, which by word and deed is firmly in favour of clearing the international political climate, considers the elimination of that policy as one of the main imperatives of our time, as a key claim for the affirmation and consolidation of a genuine international détente, for the just and constructive solution of major problems confronting mankind and for the strengthening of confidence and co-operation among States, for the benefit of the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In the report that he submitted last week to the Twelfth Congress of the Romanian Communist Party, the Secretary-General of the Party and President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, once again emphasized

"... that everything must be done to renounce completely the policy of force and diktat in international life, interference in the internal affairs of other States, the policy of spheres of influence and hegemony: resolute action must be taken to put an end to imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist domination and to promote a policy based on respect for independence and national sovereignty and on equal and mutually beneficial co-operation among States."

The need to eliminate hegemonism from international life is determined by the extremely harmful consequences of that obsolete policy on the entire international life as a whole, because of the serious danger it represents for international peace and security and because of the total incompatibility of the policy of hegemonism with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. Events that occurred during the last years have clearly shown that the policy of hegemonism, wherever it is practised and whatever form it takes - domination, political, economic or military pressures, interference to the point of armed interventions - is most detrimental to the international political climate. It prevents the development of relations of co-operation and mutual understanding among States and creates grave dangers for international peace and security. That policy is all the more fraught with danger since it goes hand in hand with tendencies to maintain and divide the world into zones of influence and domination - tendencies that endanger the independence and freedom of certain peoples, as well as peace in general, giving rise to conflicts, hotbeds of tension and new wars.

Hegemonism is the expression of an obsolete policy based on force; it is nothing other than a vestige of colonialism and one of the main forms of the manifestation of neo-colonialism. It is therefore totally incompatible with the requirements for democratization of international relations, participation on a footing of equality by all States in the discussion and just solution of international problems of common interest. This policy

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

seriously affects not only the peoples against which it is practised but also international life as a whole and, therefore, the interests and peaceful existence of all peoples. There is no denying that a people which does not respect the independence of another and allows oppression and domination of another people cannot itself be a truly free people.

As has been rightly stressed during this debate, too, the policy of hegemonism is in total contradiction with the generally accepted norms of international law. It is a truism that genuine national sovereignty does not confer on any State - whatever its size or power - the right to decide the fate of other States and peoples, or to ignore and violate the equally sovereign rights of other States, to use force or the threat of force in international relations, to act to the detriment of the legitimate national interests of other peoples.

Hegemonism violates international legality and the fundamental principles that should govern relations among States, in particular independence and national sovereignty, equality of rights, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. The policy of hegemonism represents a denial of the right of peoples to develop in complete freedom and independence and to decide for themselves the course of their economic, social and political development - an inalienable right which today is being asserted with unprecedented force. That is precisely why hegemonism, which seeks to dominate States and groups of States, and even the world, is completely unacceptable and is in flagrant contradiction with the United Nations Charter and the basic principles embodied in other international instruments of major importance, such as the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. That is why complete renunciation of this policy is an essential premise for establishing lasting peace in an atmosphere of détente, co-operation, confidence and mutual respect among all the nations of the world.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

As we have emphasized, Romania has always most energetically condemned all attempts to subordinate or dominate other States, to impose on them a particular way of life, the kind of internal or external policies they should adopt and the relations they should cultivate. We have been consistent in this policy and have never departed from it and, with unshakeable determination, Romania has spoken and acted against such a policy and in favour of the full affirmation of its antithesis - a policy of respect for sovereignty and national independence, equal rights for all States, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, the right of their people to develop freely according to their legitimate aspirations and interests. Romania's whole foreign policy is based on absolute respect for those principles in its relations with all other States without exception, and its central objective is to ensure the broadest application of those principles in international life.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

This policy finds its eloquent expression in the fact that these principles, along with all generally recognized principles and norms of international law, are reaffirmed in the treaties of friendship and co-operation, as well as in the solemn mutual declarations signed by Romania with more than 50 States in all corners of the world. It is this fundamental concern of the policy of Romania, which is firmly devoted to the principles and aims set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, that also led the Romanian Government to submit for consideration at the current session of the General Assembly the item entitled "Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States", the examination of which has just been completed in this Committee.

It is my country's unshakeable conviction that only the establishment and promotion of relations of equality, respect and esteem will make it possible to restore calm to the international climate, to eliminate the sources of discord and animosity, to stifle conflicts, peacefully to settle disputes, and to strengthen confidence and co-operation among States for the benefit of all peoples and of peace, progress and the flourishing of human civilization.

The Romanian delegation considers that the United Nations, with its historic mission of safeguarding international peace and security and ensuring in relations among all States a rigorous respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter and for contemporary international law, has the duty energetically to reject the policy of hegemonism in all its forms as being incompatible with the obligations assumed by States under the Charter.

We express the hope that the debate on this question in the First Committee and the resolution which will be adopted by the General Assembly will make a signal contribution to the efforts being made by the overwhelming majority of States throughout the world to eliminate all the trends and manifestations of hegemonism and thus to consolidate détente and friendly co-operation among all countries.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind representatives that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on agenda item 46 will be 6.00 p.m. on 3 December.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.