



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

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

Statements were made by:

- Mr. Troyanovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
- Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan)
- Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic)
- Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius)
- Mr. Sahak (Afghanistan)
- Mr. Hollai (Hungary)
- Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen)

\* 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

## AGENDA ITEM 126

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

The CHAIRMAN : This afternoon we begin deliberations in the First Committee on the item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations". This item was introduced by the Soviet Union as an "important and priority item" and it was subsequently allotted to the First Committee.

The Committee has before it document A/34/243, which is an explanatory memorandum of the Soviet Union on the subject, annexed to which is the Soviet draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. In addressing the current session of the General Assembly the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, put the struggle against manifestations of hegemonism, or "striving for world domination, for domination over other countries and peoples" (A/34/PV.7, p.77), in the wider context of the struggle for détente and peace. In its explanatory memorandum the Soviet Union emphasized:

"The policy of hegemonism leads to the creation of hotbeds of tension and destabilizes the international situation. It is particularly dangerous when means of mass destruction can be placed at its service." (A/34/243, p.1-2)

The Soviet Union urges that the United Nations condemn the policy of hegemonism in any form and emphasizes its incompatibility with the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and with the task of preserving peace and strengthening international security.

I hope that the deliberations on the item in the Committee will be constructive and assist in carrying out the primary objective of the United Nations, which is to maintain international peace and security.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The general political debate which has just concluded in plenary meetings of the General Assembly has demonstrated that, in spite of all the complexities and contradictions in the development of the present situation, the dominating trend throughout the world after all is one aimed at international détente. An important positive transformation in the lessening of international tensions has been greatly assisted by the adoption by the General Assembly of important decisions on the strengthening of international security and disarmament. In this connexion suffice it to recall the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples at the fifteenth session, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security at the twenty-fifth session, the resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition for all time of the use of nuclear weapons at the twenty-seventh session, the declaration on the deepening and strengthening of détente in international relations at the thirty-third session and a number of other important decisions. All these decisions by the General Assembly have set up a barrier which separates us from the past, from the period of colonialism and from the period of the cold war, and are producing premises for the strengthening of the bases for universal peace. Subsequent statements in favour of strengthening peace and strengthening and spreading détente throughout the world in the present circumstances must be supplemented by the adoption of practical measures in regard to military détente and in this area favourable conditions exist. The treaty signed between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Vienna meetings on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons is not only an important step in the development of Soviet-American relations but a measure which establishes more favourable conditions for making progress in other negotiations on the limitation of arms and on disarmament.

Moved by a sincere desire to proceed to genuine actions in the sphere of disarmament, the Soviet Union has come forward with new initiatives, which were presented in the speech by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Leonid Ilyitch Brezhnev, on 6 October of this year in Berlin.

These, briefly, are some of the positive moments in the present international situation which make it possible for us to hope that the existing premises for the solution of questions of disarmament and the guaranteeing of international peace and security can be realized.

The events of the past few years, however, show that the efforts to foster détente in international relations and its spread to all the regions of the world are being counteracted by forces which strive to reverse the development of international relations, to return the world to the period of exacerbated international conflicts and to keep it on the brink of war. In the modern situation, a new direction is being set in the struggle of détente in international tensions and for the strengthening of universal peace and the security of peoples.

That direction in the view of the Soviet Union, is reflected in the task of the elimination of the practice in international relations of the policy of hegemonism in all its forms and manifestations. The various types of aspirations to hegemonism in international relations are one of the sources of conflict situations and international crises. The danger of a policy of hegemonism, in our view, resides in the fact that it disregards the rights of peoples and, in the first instance, of peoples of small and medium-sized developing countries: it rules out democratic principles, upon which international relations are being built today; and it destabilizes the international situation and leads to the establishment of hotbeds of tension.

The building up of tensions in the international situation and the establishment of explosive situations in various parts of the world is precisely what hegemonism needs in order to promote its views and purposes.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It is also impossible not to see another equally dangerous aspect of a policy of hegemonism, and that is the policy aimed at the promotion of the arms race and the building up of military arsenals in order to implement hegemonistic purposes.

Thus it is that a policy of hegemonism is especially dangerous today when a weapon of its implementation can become the modern means of mass destruction, such as nuclear weapons. And this factor cannot be excluded, because as will be seen from the lessons taught us by history, hegemonism will stop at nothing in the achievement of its political purposes. It is precisely the policy of hegemonism in the past that has inevitably led to war, and if an appropriate barrier is not placed in its way, it can well precipitate the world into the abyss of a new war. That is why the task of protecting mankind from the threat which is contained within the policy of hegemonism acquires especial importance and urgency.

The United Nations, which has been called upon to keep watch over international peace and the security of peoples, cannot remain indifferent to the propensities of the opponents of peace, regardless of the form that such propensities might assume, including that of hegemonism. In our view, the duty of the United Nations lies also in the identification, in good time, of the threat weighing upon the world, the warning of the peoples and States against it and the adoption of effective measures to halt it.

The political essence of hegemonism, which is a definite threat to peace, is perfectly clear. It is the attempt to achieve domination over other countries and peoples, and, in some instances, world domination as well. Thereby, hegemonism emerges as the direct antipode to the equality of States and peoples and, in essence, implies the denial of the principles of the United Nations Charter and, in the first place, of the principle of sovereign equality of States.

The States Members of the United Nations cannot be reconciled to the idea that propensities to hegemonism in international relations should undermine this cardinal principle, namely, the principle of the equality of all peoples and States. They realize full well that, in those cases where hegemonist purposes are making their way, there can be no question of relations on an equal footing between States or the development of co-operation between them on a just and equal basis. And, conversely, where relations between States are based upon the principle of equality, mutual respect and sovereignty, there can be no room for hegemonism.

The United Nations, in attempting to carry out its basic function, which is the maintenance of international peace and security, is called upon to develop friendly relations between nations on the basis of respect for the principle of equality of rights and self-determination of peoples. In striving towards this noble goal, it has steadfastly defended, and continues to defend, the fundamental principles set out in its Charter and is trying to bring about their total implementation in the practice of international relations. The principle of sovereign equality of States, delineated in the United Nations Charter, has been confirmed in such highly important decisions of this Organization as the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the Declaration on the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States, the Declaration on the strengthening of international security and other foundation-laying documents.

In introducing for consideration at the General Assembly of the United Nations the question of hegemonism, the Soviet Union took into account the fact that States Members of the United Nations, in a whole series of documents, have already defined their negative attitude towards the policy of hegemonism. Suffice it in this connection to refer to such an important document as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The inadmissibility of striving towards hegemonism has been spelled out in that Charter among those principles upon which economic, political and other relations between States must be built. We took into account that it is precisely the countries which have thrown off the yoke of colonialism that are systematically and consistently trying to achieve the political and economic independence of States and the restructuring of international relations on the basis of a strict compliance with the principle of the sovereignty and the equality of great and small peoples.

In speaking consistently in favour of the strict implementation of the principle of the sovereign equality of States, not only in the sphere of political relations, but also in regard to economic co-operation, the States which have liberated themselves from colonialism have thereby rejected and continue to reject the policy of hegemonism and any aspirations on the part of some States to attempt domination over other countries and peoples. It is no accident that among the fundamental principles of peaceful co-existence, which were approved at the Cairo Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries in 1964, a special place was given to the proposition that the sovereign equality of States must be acknowledged and respected. At the fourth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Algiers in 1973, the participants were faced with the task of continuing to exert their efforts jointly with all the forces fighting for peace, freedom and progress in order to redirect international relations towards the achievement of democracy and equality on the part of all States. This proposition was further developed in the decisions of the fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo, where the task was set of "the struggle against unequal relations and domination which result from neocolonialism and other similar types of domination". At the sixth Conference in Havana the loyalty of the non-aligned countries to the principle of sovereign equality, and their resolve to struggle against all forms and manifestations of foreign domination and hegemony were reaffirmed. Lastly the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States members of the Group of 77, in the Declaration which has just been adopted by them, document A/34/533, again declared the need to put an end to hegemonism forthwith, because it is one of the principal barriers to the economic liberation of the developing countries.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It is characteristic that at the present session of the General Assembly, in particular in the statement during the general debate by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Genscher, there was condemnation of the hegemonistic propensities which have threatened the independence of States.

The proposal on the inadmissibility of hegemonism in international relations flows from the position of principle of the Soviet Union. From the very first days of its existence the Soviet State resolutely came out against the imposition of the will of one State upon other countries and peoples and against anybody acting in hegemonistic fashion and someone else being subordinated to the will of the first. In one of the first legislative actions of the young Soviet State, it was most strongly emphasized that the Soviet State, in its international relations, proceeds from the recognition of the total equality of both large and small nations. The realization of this principle was the refusal by the Soviet Union to honour the treaties of Tsarist Russia which were colonial or unequal in character, and its refusal to exercise the rights of extraterritoriality upon foreign territory. Instead of unequal treaties the Soviet State embarked upon the conclusion of treaties on the basis of total equality and respect for sovereignty. The first category of treaties included in particular the treaties with Persia, Afghanistan and Turkey of 1921 and also with China in 1924.

In the specific historical situation which was being created before the Second World War the Soviet Union, in the context of its attempt to ensure collective security in Europe, raised the question of the adoption of collective measures to counteract aspirations to hegemonism, and as early as in 1936, at the League of Nations, the Soviet Union uncovered the causes which produce the formation of hegemonism and the serious danger for the peoples of Europe that was connected with the implementation of hegemonistic designs. At the seventeenth plenary meeting of the League of Nations on 28 September 1936, the representative of the USSR emphasized the following:

"We must not close our eyes to the present thrust towards hegemonism, towards the hegemony of a chosen people, allegedly called upon by history to dominate all other peoples, proclaimed as not fully developed."

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Even the Soviet Union warned that failure to adopt effective measures collectively to repel the aggressor and to set up a real barrier to hegemonistic aspirations would lead to "such a bloody conflict between peoples the consequences of which we cannot even imagine".

History has confirmed that these warnings were justified and it is no fault of the Soviet Union that its persistent efforts to avoid the tragic consequences of hegemonistic aspirations were not crowned with success. The peoples of the United Nations had to make enormous sacrifices at the altar of victory over the forces which have attempted, by means of aggression, to establish their domination over the world. As was emphasized in the speech of the member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Andrei Andreievich Gromyko, at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 25 September, our people gave 20 million human lives in order to overthrow Hitler's plans to establish world domination and to bury hegemonism in its fascist form.

In steadfastly acting against any hegemonistic aspirations, wherever they may originate, the Soviet Union has constantly proposed that in international affairs we be guided by the principle of equality. In the new Constitution of the USSR, which was adopted two years ago, the principle of equality is included in the list of the most important principles on the basis of which the relations of our country with others are built. Sometimes we are asked what in fact is the essence and purpose of the proposal introduced by the Soviet Union concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations? These were already stated in the speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union at the plenary meeting on 25 September of this year, in his letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, document A/34/243, and they are also reproduced in concise form in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation and circulated in the First Committee.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.1 is clear in form and, as we see it, quite straightforward in content. In its preamble it is observed 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; also, it is emphasized that the manifestations of such a policy lead to the creation of hotbeds of tension, complicate relations between States and destabilize the international situation. The essence of the operative part of the draft resolution may be summarized by saying that the General Assembly should, in principle, condemn the policy of hegemonism - whatever the form in which it is manifested - as incompatible with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

However, in our opinion that would be insufficient to create a solid barrier to any aspirations to hegemony, either in the world as a whole or in any given region. We consider that the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism must be acknowledged as a universal principle in order to achieve that purpose. That is why we propose that the General Assembly, on behalf of the peoples of the United Nations, should clearly and unequivocally state that never, under no circumstances, and not for any reason whatsoever, should States or groups of States lay claim to hegemony in international affairs or seek a position of domination either in the world as a whole or in any of its regions. Such a decision by the General Assembly is entirely in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the purpose of strengthening détente in international relations and would promote the strengthening of international peace.

The Soviet delegation is convinced that a constructive and businesslike discussion of the proposal introduced by the Soviet Union would contribute to a further improvement in the international situation and a strict compliance by all States with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

I express the hope that all States which are in favour of the principle of the sovereign equality of States and peoples, in favour of strict and consistent compliance with the principles of the United Nations, in favour of détente in international relations and the strengthening of peace will support the proposal introduced by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Since this is the first time this year that I have spoken in the First Committee, I wish to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, and the most able members of the Bureau my sincerest congratulations and to wish you every success in guiding the discussions on the most crucial issues which confront the world today. They are war and peace, harmony and security in an age that can ill afford wars and must adopt an approach rejecting war as a means of conducting international affairs. Hence, this brief debate on agenda item 126 pertaining to "hegemony" is a prelude to the more tangible items on disarmament.

It is almost academic to attempt a definition of the term "hegemony", even though the concept is an old one but seems to have re-emerged in the debates of our world body in recent years. In essence, it means the striving by States or groups of States to place under subjugation, to exercise by covert or overt action undue and illegitimate overriding influence over the behaviour and decision-making processes of other States and peoples. It could take the form of imperialism, which had meant the continual physical expansion and annexation of other States and peoples. Concomitantly there was the phenomenon of colonialism, which is also the occupation of other States and peoples' territories, the exploitation of their human sweat and the cheap exploitation of their natural resources.

The Final Declaration of the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries which met in Havana in September 1979 contains, inter alia, the following:

"National independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, sovereign equality and the free social development of all countries; independence of non-aligned countries from great-Power or bloc rivalries and influences and opposition to participation in military pacts and alliances arising therefrom; the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism, and all forms of expansionism, foreign occupation and domination and hegemony" - and I do not believe that any impartial observer would dispute that Zionist Israel has been pursuing assiduously this reprehensible course against the occupied or dispersed Palestinian people -

(Mr. Museibeh, Jordan)

"active peaceful co-existence among all States: ... non-interference and non-intervention in the internal and external affairs of other countries; freedom of all States to determine their political systems and pursue economic, social and cultural development without intimidation, hindrance and pressure; establishment of a New International Economic Order and development of international co-operation on the basis of equality; the right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and alien domination and constant support to the struggle of national liberation movements; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; opposition to the division of the world into antagonistic military-political alliances and blocs and rejection of outmoded doctrines such as spheres of influence and balance of terror; permanent sovereignty over natural resources; inviolability of legally established international boundaries; non-use of force, or threat of use of force and non-recognition of situations brought about by the threat or use of force; and peaceful settlements of disputes."

Even the voluminous and diligently compiled Oxford Dictionary could not have spelt out in greater detail what the term "hegemony" really means, if only for lack of space; and yet the 95 States of the Non-Aligned Movement found it imperative to give such a detailed description. I need hardly state that their reason for doing so was not an exercise in semantics. It was a sincere and profound reflection of the state of affairs and the state of mind which evidently had relapsed into the acquiescence, acceptance and even declared advocacy of the policy of hegemonism and the old game of nations and power politics in conducting international relations.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

We had all been under the impression that the United Nations Charter, which laboriously and painstakingly formulated during a period of three months -- as General Romulo reminded us last evening in the aftermath of the catastrophe of the Second World War by the collective wisdom of great statesmen, had irretrievably replaced the abominable policies of expansion, occupation and hegemony. We have been witnessing, over the past quarter of a century, the glorious process of decolonization, and have always regarded its almost total achievement as a hallmark in the annals of the United Nations. We have been and are bracing ourselves for a process no less important in magnitude than the striving to achieve a more viable and equitable New International Economic Order.

And yet, as we canvass the panorama of world politics, we are witness to the frightening spectre of a steep retrogression into the ways of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth, when imperialism, colonialism, exploitation and hegemony were not only recognized norms of behaviour, but even a source of unbridled boasting and pride with the scramble for Africa and elsewhere, such anachronistic doctrines as the white man's burden, manifest destiny, and the civilizing missions, which not only dismally failed to civilize anyone, but merely brutalized man's vision of the world and his relationships with other fellow beings. It climaxed in two savage world wars in which untold millions perished and those who survived suffered immeasurably.

History is an indispensable teacher for any statesman, but so is an incisive comprehension of the frailties of human nature. Metternich's power game, the grandiose plans of Bismarck, other so-called statesmen geniuses of several nations, and finally Hitler's outright bid for racist hegemony were not only disastrous but were perpetrated within the survivability confines of the military capabilities which had prevailed in the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth.

Surely, present-day policy-makers must necessarily be reminded that the world is approaching the end of the twentieth century. The stark fact is that there is a difference in kind and not in degree, in consequence of

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

technological developments, which have for the first time in man's recorded history given him the capability of destroying himself and the world. A new chapter has been written which must sink ever more deeply into our consciousness and subdue even our subconscious instincts.

The world can no longer afford to play the unconscionable game of nations, interesting as it might be. As His Holiness Pope Paul II, speaking on disarmament at the General Assembly recently warned - and I am quoting not verbatim, but from memory - some day, someone, sometime, somewhere will be tempted to unleash the vast accumulation of nuclear and other weaponry to destroy the world.

Mr. Litvinov, the then Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union in the thirties, had given repeated warnings at the League of Nations against the dangers of policies of hegemonism. His words went unneeded; the Second World War was the consequence, and Abyssinia went down the drain. Indeed, President Woodrow Wilson in the aftermath of the First World War had preached, but to no avail, the humane fourteen points, which included the right of every people to self-determination - the very same points which are at present the cornerstone of non-alignment.

We all realize that human nature, with its gregarious as well as pugnacious instincts, cannot be easily altered or transformed. In fact, some people believe that human nature is immutable, although I do not agree with that analysis. And yet it must be transformed, considering that the world is literally, and not metaphorically, living in the shadow of impending death. Any crises, anywhere, in a world of interdependence, can by accident or faulty miscalculation ignite a terminal conflagration.

It is for this reason - not to mention all the moral foundations of what should be a friendly and equitable world order - that there must be a transmutation of consciousness on the part of all of us. We can either survive by scrupulously abiding by the rule of both law and morality or perish by the unprecedentedly sharp edges of the sword in the nuclear age.

(Mr. Museibeh, Jordan)

The item of hegemony has for the first time taken pride of place over armament and disarmament, even if only for a couple of meetings concurrently with disarmament. The Chairman's decision - agreed to by this Committee - to give it this early priority is deserving of our highest commendation. For what difference does it make - in a world living in constant tension, crisis situations, flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions and the substitution of the law of the jungle and physical force for the accepted norms of decent and lawful behaviour - if the world should perish from 1,000 nuclear ballistic missiles or from 10,000, which seems to be the present criterion of security?

Concerns for security are legitimate and understandable. Competing ideological systems aimed at influencing others also are understandable. I can testify from personal experience and reflection that some major States, several decades ago, had far greater influence in certain regions and over peoples, thanks to a mere handful of doctors, teachers and do-gooders, when the great arsenals of weapons which they possess today were not in existence.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

But I am sure that Members will agree with me that any nation can influence other nations far more by friendly and co-operative behaviour than by the diplomacy of the gun and the concept of war as an extension of diplomacy, which is one of the classic definitions of war and diplomacy.

It is my delegation's earnest hope that the policy-makers of the world, and particularly the major Powers, will not scoff at what they might regard as naïve preaching. But even if they do, it is in my opinion the only salvation for a turbulent world.

The Jordan delegation supports in principle the draft resolution presented by the representative of the Soviet Union. Of course, we shall be discussing this item in detail in the month of November, and I am certain that there are various modalities, and perhaps amendments, that may be introduced as we proceed in our discussion. But in principle we should all be terribly surprised if anyone were opposed to such a draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling upon the next speaker, I should like to state that, while I accept that there might be a very fine line of distinction between introductory statements and debate, this item is scheduled to be debated on 30 November. I wanted to bring that to the attention of representatives, and I should like them to take it into consideration as we proceed with introductory statements on agenda item 126.

Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the Committee's decision to assign priority to consideration of the highly important question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. That is entirely justified because the proposal of the Soviet Union is aimed at seeing to it that one of the key questions of international relations may be discussed properly and that it may be possible to define steps that would contribute to a solution.

This problem is very intimately linked with the struggle to foster the relaxation of tension, the cessation of the arms race, the struggle against colonialism and racism, the struggle for the self-determination of peoples, and mutually profitable economic co-operation on an equal footing.

(Mr. Florin,  
German Democratic Republic)

What is hegemonism? Why is the policy of hegemonism dangerous? According to the appropriate encyclopaedias, hegemony is "the possibility of one State exerting influence or control in regard to other States".

History gives us many examples of aspirations to hegemony and domination over other countries. It might be possible, starting with the Peloponnesian wars in ancient Greece, to draw a line stretching all the way to the armed interventions and aggressions of the present time. But never in history have such aspirations been as dangerous to people as they are today. In view of the close and intimate interweaving of international relations and the existence of huge arsenals of weapons, the policy of hegemonism - and this must be stated quite clearly - threatens the very existence of mankind. Whatever forms the aspiration to hegemonism might take, its purpose is always domination over other peoples and their enslavement and exploitation, and to that end, resort is made to political, economic and military means.

It is appropriate to recall that German imperialism, in the form of the fascist Hitlerite régime, engendered the most clearly expressed and cruelest form of enslavement and exploitation of other peoples. If German imperialism was in the First World War striving in the first instance to achieve the redistribution of colonies in its own favour, fascism, for its part, in resorting to the notorious slogan of the so-called Lebensraum in Europe, attempted the enslavement of the European peoples to subordinate the entire world to its will. From the very beginning, as a decisive means for the achievement of those purposes, war was planned. There were attempts by means of vicious lies concerning a so-called threat from the East to mask the official Government policy declared by the fascists in the desire to take over Eastern lands, a policy known as Drang nach dem Osten. We all know how that mad adventure ended.

On the side of those who were fighting for the freedom of peoples were the German anti-fascists. They defended the honour and the humanistic traditions of the German people. Loyal to their precepts, the German Democratic Republic has eliminated the roots of imperialist aspiration to domination. The securing of

(Mr. Florin,  
German Democratic Republic)

peace and co-operation among peoples in a spirit of equality is the most important aim of its foreign policy. Our own historical experience has given us a strong impulse towards solidarity with peoples fighting for freedom and self-determination. Our active policy against hegemonism is viewed by us as the carrying out of a historic responsibility and as the duty of a socialist State.

As a result of the victory over Hitler's fascism by the States of the anti-Hitler coalition, the Charter of the United Nations was created. The lessons of history were enshrined in legislative rules. That foundation-laying document in international relations constitutes, from the first of its provisions to the last, an unequivocal condemnation of hegemonism and domination over other peoples in any form.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

It is necessary to be ever mindful of the solemn obligations which States have assumed upon themselves, in particular under Articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations Charter. I should like to recall the purpose of the United Nations as it is formulated in the Charter, namely:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;" (Article 1, 2)

I should like to offer two more quotations:

"The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. (Article 2, 1)

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State ..." (Article 2, 4)

The United Nations is thus acting entirely in keeping with its own Charter and in pursuance of it when it condemns any aspirations towards hegemony. We are convinced that the people of the world would warmly welcome such a move.

The attitudes and relations of States on the basis of the equality of rights and sovereignty categorically require the strengthening and spreading of the process of détente. This must be deepened in Europe, where there was a movement away from the cold war towards an improvement in the situation. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference was a code of intergovernmental conduct. Its implementation will guarantee stable security upon our continent.

The conclusion of a whole series of multilateral and bilateral treaties concerning the limitation of the arms race, including limitation in the strategic sphere as well as the important decisions of the United Nations General Assembly concerning the strengthening of international security, are calculated to ensure a solid peace. Although towards the end of the 1970s we can state plainly that the world has become more reliable and a safer place altogether, further and more active efforts are nevertheless needed in order to guarantee the rights of people to live in an atmosphere of peace and security.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

The practice of international relations must be brought into line with the Charter. That is why it is necessary to censure and to arrest the policy of hegemonism and domination over other peoples.

The German Democratic Republic wishes to declare that it stands in solidarity with the appeal of the Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries in Havana calling on all peoples to take part in efforts aimed at the liberation of the world from war, from a policy of repression, domination and hegemonism, inequality, oppression and injustice. This appeal is highly timely because at present there is a definite intensification of aspirations towards hegemony against other States.

We must always be mindful of the fact that wars do not occur suddenly. They are prepared long in advance both in material and psychological terms. In this respect, the ideology of hegemonism plays an important role. We must not close our eyes to the fact that such concepts and slogans as "a leading world Power", "punitive action", "the defence of civilization", in the last analysis are, in a way, forms of the expression of hegemonism. One of the variants of the policy of hegemonism is represented by revanchism and the unwillingness to recognize existing inter-State frontiers. But first of all it is necessary constantly to fix one's attention upon the fact that the building up of the arms race in order to achieve military supremacy is predicated upon forcing one's own will upon other States and peoples. The policy of hegemonism constitutes a special threat when it is endowed with weapons of mass destruction.

Accordingly, the struggle against hegemonism includes the need to put an end to the arms race and to achieve disarmament.

I should also like to refer to the fact that aspirations for hegemony are one of the causes for the lack of willingness under treaty obligations to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations. The elaboration and conclusion of a world-wide treaty on the non-use of force in international relations would be an important step towards the elimination of any aspirations to hegemony.

A policy of hegemonism can have global or regional dimensions. The peoples of Indochina, the Near East and southern African are defending their rights against efforts to subordinate them to the authority of specific States

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

or to keep them within the chains of colonial domination. They deserve every support from us because they are fighting not only for themselves but also for the strengthening of the equality and independence of peoples throughout the world.

How do matters stand with regard to neo-colonialism? Neo-colonialism constitutes nothing other than the extension of colonial exploitation by economic, political, and also partly by military means. The peoples who are placed under such domination are being prevented from taking sovereign decisions concerning their social development and they are also deprived of the opportunity to dispose of their natural resources. In exploiting such peoples, an attempt is made to strengthen a set of economic relations whereby international monopolies would become even richer, while the exploited would become even poorer.

The policy of hegemonism should have no place in our world. It should be banished from the life of the peoples. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports the proposal of the delegation of the Soviet Union to adopt a resolution which would resolutely condemn the policy of hegemonism, whatever the form in which it may be manifested. My delegation expresses the hope that all States Members of the United Nations will vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Mr. Chairman, beloved Caribbean cousin, may I join previous speakers in expressing to you and to the members of your Bureau my warm congratulations on your respective unanimous elections. I assure you, Sir, of the full support and co-operation of my delegation.

The delegation of Mauritius will state its position straightaway on the item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations". We will vote for the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Indeed, we would have voted for it if it had been put forth by any other delegation, in the light of its paramount importance. There is no need to burden the clock and the Committee with a list of reasons in defence of our position. We would have to muster a brigade of lawyers to mobilize a convincing set of reasons for our Government, for our people and for our conscience if we were to take any other position.

Recalling the famous lines of the great Americans who penned the historic Declaration of Independence - "We hold these truths to be self-evident" - we can only wonder why this draft resolution was overlooked in the 34 years of the life of the United Nations Charter, a document with its own foremost self-evident truth: the **immutable** equality of nations. And yet it may be that history, with its sometimes keen sense of fortuitous timing, has seen fit that this draft resolution be reserved to emerge at a period in the world when the assault on the rights of nations has **assumed outrageous and intolerable dimensions.**

What nation is safe today when we are deafened by the noisy hoofs of a new version of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse?

First, there is the galloping steed of imperialism with its arrogant claim to rule the world: not, in our time, the limited world of Genghis Khan, or the smaller world of the Roman Caesars or the European world of Hitler, but literally the whole, round, global world, its seas and skies and oceans, not excluding a single latitude or a single longitude.

Then there is the horseman of colonialism, its goal to rule peoples, somewhat lamed by the obstacle course of freedom, but re-shod in the smithies of neo-colonialism and still strong enough to take the lives of tens of thousands of people.

Next there is the sphere of influence jockey who is content to stay a little behind, always hoping that in the final dash home he will take over the world.

Finally there is the fourth horseman, hegemony, who rides the winding track of domination: the domination of another country or region, domination of the peoples and their Governments.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

In a way, hegemony is the most dangerous of the four, eschewing the crudeness of the other three, often hiding behind the mask of friendship, as Iago did in Shakespeare's Othello, or of benevolence, disguised as aid which in fact aids the giver and enslaves the recipient, or operating by promises of protection - the Roman way; or by hypnotizing the victim to plead for domination; or by the Big Brother commitment to protectionism; or by a fraternal ideology or opportunistic alliances.

This is the most sophisticated methodology of the four deadly riders, mustering the subtle arts of trade, investment, transnational corporations, superior technologies, patented sciences, the Svengalis of the media, the misadventures of science and, finally, the kindly and gallant offer of the nuclear umbrella. All the virtues of altruism and generosity become the bait of the snare of domination, and even the idealism of human rights is used to ensnare with the theatrical genius of Tartuffe. But, as the draft resolution states, in whatever form it is manifested it is incompatible with the intellectual principles of the United Nations Charter and in the end - again as the draft resolution rightly asserts - will invariably lead to wars. This is inevitable, for in all the lessons of history we find no instance where it has been otherwise.

The danger of the policy of hegemonism - which disregards the rights of peoples and, first of all of those of small and medium-sized developing States, destabilizes the international situation and creates seats of tension - is greatly aggravated when modern means of mass destruction can be put at its service.

Happily - or unhappily - this draft resolution comes before us when the world is exploding with the time-bombs of domination. Like a world epidemic it encompasses every region of the globe: the Middle East, Africa, the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean, South-East Asia. I shall not mention the precise countries involved; many of them are the foremost items on our agenda, and in any case, we all know, as they say in the American baseball season, "what the score is".

My country, Mauritius, located in the waters of East Africa, is now the hegemonistic jostling area of a dangerous rivalry for domination of the whole complex of the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and the route to the south Atlantic. Therefore we think we have some understanding of what is involved. Living in the

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

which is even now being bandied about by the big Powers, in terms of military operations, military bases and naval manoeuvres. We see the whole scenario of how hegemony can lead to war. It is no accident that wherever the struggle for hegemony assumes fierce proportions it is in those areas that predictions of war rise up as warnings of the dangers of the intensified rivalry for hegemony.

Hegemony is no new manifestation of our time. The history of the world could be written under this single title. And always it is manifested in the components of the relationship of big Powers to their smaller and weaker neighbours. And so it is today. It is not surprising that in their mutual rivalries they have brought the issue of hegemony to the fore. Is it because they are indifferent to the concept of equality? Not at all. They know full well the supreme principle of equality, as we see now in their controversy over the importance of not falling behind the so-called equality of armaments.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

Rather it is in their relation to the small nations that they choose to debate the issue of hegemonistic domination. What shall we small and weak nations reply? Our reply should be that we are most happy that this issue has been brought up, for it is we, the non-big Powers, that are becoming the battleground for the big Powers' concern over where hegemony is leading them.

Hegemony is getting out of control, to the extent that it may undermine the Charter provision concerning the sovereign rights of all nations and peoples. The United Nations itself is being subtly eroded by the cancerous growth of hegemonism. It has been often stated that the United Nations has been able to prevent a third world war, has lessened the already crippled colonialism and has slowed down the drive for spheres of influence, perhaps because these activities manifested themselves in overt acts of aggression or through the resistance of peoples. However, hegemony does not always manifest itself with the obvious visage of force and violence. More often in our time it works through the process of slow erosion and by methods not always clearly banned in the Charter. That being so, hegemony, if permitted to go unbridled, could quite conceivably destroy the United Nations itself.

Accordingly we wish to add a word in regard to the charge made in the General Committee questioning the good faith in which the draft resolution was presented by the Soviet Union. On this we would make two points. First, candidly, if we were to question the good faith behind the draft resolutions presented in the United Nations, the United Nations would have to resign in the face of the imperfection of human nature and the double imperfection of States and nations. Secondly, we note that in the operative part the draft resolution "resolutely condemns" the policy of hegemonism and categorically admonishes States never in any circumstances to seek positions of domination either in the world as a whole or in any of its regions. To us this is absolute language and makes it supremely difficult for any Government sponsoring the resolution to deny or betray it at any future point in time. We are willing to gamble on the sponsor or any other big Powers that would present such a draft resolution. We firmly believe that the stakes are high enough to warrant such a gamble. As for us, the weak nations, to paraphrase a famous historic statement, we have nothing to lose but our chains.

Mr. SAHAK (Afghanistan) (interpretation from Russian): The struggle for peace, for social justice and for the easing of international tensions is complex and many-faceted and it is a phenomenon of our times. Much can be said about peace but in practice entirely different principles are followed. It is possible to speak a great deal but also, on the other hand, to make logical, carefully thought out, specific proposals which are truly designed to promote the cause of peace and the easing of international tensions. The maintenance of peace and the deepening of détente have so far been the result of tireless efforts on the part of all peace-loving forces. We all know that in future much energy, patience, perseverance and constant struggle will be required on the part of all progressive forces in order to achieve new results along this path, because in the world there are still forces which carry within them the threat of a new world war. These are the forces of imperialism which, because of their aggressive nature, are constantly creating hotbeds of international tension and conflict. They interfere in the domestic affairs of young independent States. They try to hold back the process of their development, and they do not stop at threatening direct aggression. Also at present we see Powers practising a policy of interference and repression with regard to other countries. All this is done under various trumped up excuses, but the purpose is always the same: the attempt to subjugate some State or group of States to their will and to achieve domination over them.

This trend towards world domination is growing dangerously, and that is why the importance and relevance of the subject now under discussion is beyond any doubt. The time has come to condemn hegemonism most resolutely and to block any attempts to apply the policy of hegemonism in international relations. Unfortunately, this negative phenomenon has taken hold of leaders of various nations at different times but at no time has it resulted in achieving any benefit for anyone. The attempt at world domination has always led to new world wars and to untold suffering for millions of people.

As a result of the foresight of mankind, the United Nations was created after the Second World War. The leaders of the principal countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition had come to the unquestionable conclusion that it was necessary to establish our Organization, and we should not shake the faith of the peoples of the world in our ability to prevent a new world war which would threaten

(Mr. Sahak, Afghanistan)

the very existence of mankind. Yet hegemonism does indeed offer such a threat to the world. It must be said that the policy of placating the hegemonists, which is being practised by certain countries, is a short-sighted one and in the last analysis one that is dangerous to those countries themselves. The lessons of the recent past give us convincing evidence for such a conclusion. Those who at one time attempted to direct the aggressive propensities of fascist Germany only against the first socialist state in the world were in the last analysis obliged to become allies with this State in order together to rescue the world from the Brown Plague. That should also not be forgotten now when the aspirations to world domination on the part of certain Powers have gone beyond all bounds and constitute a serious threat to peace throughout the world. The result of the policy of hegemonism in our time cannot be compared with the result of such a policy in the past. Now, when Powers have nuclear weapons, the policy of hegemonism could well bring the world to a nuclear catastrophe. Yet the duty to avert such a catastrophe is precisely the main task and purpose of the United Nations, and that is why the main responsibility for the prevention of the unforeseeable consequences of the policies of hegemonism lies squarely with the United Nations.

We must forget for a time our political divergencies and we must now unite our efforts and our struggle against this evil, so that in future the United Nations will not have to find itself confronted with a fait accompli. There is still time for cutting the roots of this evil, as long as the tree on which it is growing has not yet borne its abundant, yet bitter, fruit. That is our task and our duty to our own peoples and the peoples of other countries. In my own country, after the April revolution, which was the result of 30 years of class struggle, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan handed over authority to the workers and peasants, and our country has proclaimed as the basis of its foreign policy: independence, peaceful coexistence and positive and active non-alignment. That policy reflects the deep and genuine desire of our people to achieve peace and freedom.

In his recent statement at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the head of our delegation stated:

"The April Revolution of the Afghan people, being a victorious workers' revolution, by its nature calls for peace and peaceful co-existence, because in peace it can achieve its aims and objectives in the interest of the working people of Afghanistan, and for their ultimate emancipation from exploitation." (A/34/PV.14, p.26)

From this statement it clearly follows that, like all peoples on earth, the people of Afghanistan also needs a lasting peace and a guarantee for its security, both for the establishment of a society free from the exploitation of man by man and for the building of a life worthy of man. That is why the Afghanistan delegation, in reflecting the will of its people, is ready to welcome any initiative aimed at the strengthening of the peace and security of peoples. We are ready to join our efforts to those of all the peace-loving forces in a struggle against aggressive hegemonistic aspirations and against international reaction and imperialism.

Proceeding from this, we consider that the proposal by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Andrei Andreyivitch Gromyko, concerning the inadmissibility of a policy of hegemonism in international relations, is both important and timely. It is fully in keeping with the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and is aimed at improving the international situation and at eliminating hotbeds of tension. All those who really are attached to the attainment of a lasting peace and security will definitely support this proposal. It is necessary to restrain hot-heads in good time, for they are ready to plunge mankind into a new catastrophe. That is why the Afghanistan delegation supports the proposal of the Soviet Union concerning the inadmissibility of a policy of hegemonism in international relations and considers that the conclusion of an effective international agreement on this question is entirely in accord with the interests of the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of the security of peoples.

Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary) As my Foreign Minister has already stated in the general debate, the Hungarian People's Republic welcomes the initiative of the Soviet Union in proposing that the item, "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations," be included in the agenda of this year's session of the General Assembly. We consider this question a timely and important one.

Our age is characterized by a situation full of contradictions. On the one hand, the forces advocating peace and peaceful coexistence are growing and being strengthened, while on the other hand -- or perhaps for this very reason -- there is an increase, if not in the strength, at least in the activity, of those who are seeking a way out of the problems created by their own policies in stepping up the militarization of political life and imposing their will on others.

While the overwhelming majority of peoples and Governments are making increasingly greater efforts towards the democratization of international life and the establishment of international relations in conformity with the principles of sovereign equality, there are some who continue to reach out for mastery over others. However, time is slowly passing such a policy by, as the strict observance of the principles of provisions of the Charter establishes itself as a fundamental norm and a postulate of the international life of today. The history of the United Nations has given evidence that whenever this is not the case tension increases, the cause of maintaining peace is imperilled and even armed conflicts possibly break out. Such is the case when some countries fail to settle international disputes by peaceful means, when they not only threaten to use force but actually do use force, or when some countries attempt to dominate others -- for what is involved now is in effect domination, no matter how recent the word "hegemonism" may be in political parlance, and the substance of the phenomenon is of very old vintage.

In including the principle of sovereign equality of Member States in its Charter, the United Nations was guided precisely by this recognition, because the bitter examples of the past made it clear where unequal relations

and ambitions for domination -- or, if you please, hegemonism -- might lead. From the experience of their own past, the vast majority of Member States know and perhaps feel the effects upon themselves of unequal relations even today. How many Member States are there which in the past were forced to sign unequal treaties? And if today those treaties are up for revision, is it not the countries which in their day imposed such treaties that today make the most frequent references to international law, invoking the necessity of respect for treaties? Unequal treaties are of various kinds. There are countries which were forced to accept the presence of military bases on their territories or whose sovereignty is otherwise impaired, and there are those which suffer only material damage under the unequal treaties.

The overwhelming majority of Member States condemn the existing pattern of international economic order based on unequal relations. Under present-day conditions, they find it no longer admissible for a few score of economically developed countries to maintain their domination in the field of international economic relations. Ambitions to establish domination or hegemonism in political relations are equally if not more intolerable.

The principle of equal sovereignty of Member States was adopted and laid down in the Charter, but we are unfortunately a long way from giving full effect in practice to that principle in international life. Hegemonistic aspirations are still detectable in various forms. There is a country which, regarding itself as a leader of the "free world", justifies its assumption of the right to accept or not to accept the free electoral victory of one party or the other in another country, or of the right to decide the rate of increase of military spending in the countries belonging to its alliance system.

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

There are other countries which do not even rest content with this kind of more or less covert interference. They can get so indignant over the independent foreign policy of their neighbour, which may not be to their liking, that they do not even shrink from "teaching lessons" using force, in violation of the United Nations Charter. It must be noted that in such cases the cause of peace is served and the Charter observed not by those who out of political blindness or, worse yet, out of calculation, have refrained from condemning the aggressor to serve what they consider to be their short-term self-interest. History has proved more than once where such a policy is bound to lead.

In our age however, we can witness a favourable change in the international balance of forces. Those who use force and violate the Charter find themselves in a more and more difficult situation, as a significant role is played against them by the developing and non-aligned countries which have, in a number of important documents, laid down their commitment to build equal relations and to reject domination, whether in the economic or political field. The socialist countries agree with these endeavours and have supported them from the very beginning.

The time has also come for the United Nations to take a stand on the question of hegemonism, because this policy is directly opposed to the important principle of the Charter, that of the sovereign equality of Member States, and because it poses a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security as well. It can be seen both in theory and in practice that such a policy leads to tension, threats, impossible demands and then to the "teaching of lessons" by force of arms. We have it clearly in mind what threats any armed conflict and the risk of its escalation might imply for the whole of mankind in our age, the age of weapons of mass destruction. This is the main reason why we must demand a halt to hegemonism, why the prestige of the United Nations and of the General Assembly should also be used in condemning such a policy and any of its manifestations.

It clearly follows from what I have said that we are in agreement with the relevant draft resolution before us. We believe that adoption of such a position by the General Assembly would place another obstacle, although of a political nature, in the path of the policy of hegemonism, would be in

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

keeping with the principles of the Charter, and would promote the attainment of its purposes.

Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Mr. Chairman, may I at the outset extend to you our congratulations on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. We confidently look forward to the conclusion of our work under your wise chairmanship.

Almost every year a new item is added to the agenda of the First Committee. Almost invariably those items revolve around one general theme; namely the preservation of international peace and security through disarmament and development, and the relaxation of tension through detente and the democratization of international relations, as well as the promotion of friendly relations among States.

The item before us entitled "The Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemony in International Relations" certainly fits into this pattern. My delegation welcomes the inscription of this item, hoping that it will contribute to a better understanding among nations.

It is said that hegemony is the preponderance of one State among several, or the desire of one State to dominate other States and peoples. As such, the very idea of preponderance or domination is alien to the ideals and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. When, however, hegemony is actively pursued as a policy in international relations, it undermines the lofty principles for which the United Nations stands, for such a policy can only be predicated on the assumption that States are not equally sovereign and that interference in the internal affairs of States can be tolerated.

At a time when every effort is being made to deepen the process of detente and to expand its scope internationally, the policy of hegemonism in international relations must be resolutely condemned. Only last month, the sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement condemned hegemonism as a manifestation of the outdated policy of spheres of influence, a policy that always leads to conflict and war. In supporting the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.1 sponsored by the Soviet Union, my delegation would like to emphasize that hegemonism should be condemned on the international, regional and sub-regional levels. At the same time, political, economic, military and

(Mr. Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

cultural hegemonism should be included under this condemnation. Those who will suffer most from the policy of hegemonism are the less powerful and small nations, whose very survival depends on respect for the principles and purposes of the Charter.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded our work for this afternoon, but before adjourning I would like to remind representatives once again that the list of speakers for the general debate will close on Friday 19 October at 6.00 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.