

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
50th meeting
held on
Friday, 30 November 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 50TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 39: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF
PEACE (continued)

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

Statements were made by:

Mr. Baleta (Albania)
Mr. Kunda (Zambia)
Mr. Chan Youran (Democratic Kampuchea)
Mr. Camps (Uruguay)
Mr. Eilan (Israel)
Mr. Musharraf Hossain (Bangladesh)
Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia)
Mr. Wanyoike (Kenya)
Mr. Troyanovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

UN LIBRARY
UN/SA COLLECTION

* 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-3520.

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.50
4 December 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 39 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE
(A/34/29, 45 and Corr.1, 357, 542)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in its report (A/34/29).

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. PHAM NGAC (Viet Nam): My delegation wishes to make clear a specific point on the draft resolutions now before this Committee.

My delegation has always supported the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. It shares the concern of many countries of the region regarding the presence of foreign military bases and warships, which are threatening the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries as well as the peace and stability of the region as a whole.

(Mr. Phan Ngac, Viet Nam)

My delegation, however, considers that the notion of the so-called "great-Power rivalry" mentioned in preambular paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A is both inaccurate and misleading, for it fails to reflect reality and clearly lacks objectivity regarding the situation in the region.

Apart from this shortcoming, the two draft resolutions contained in document A/34/29 are constructive and in the opinion of my delegation would promote the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolutions A and B.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): On behalf of the Nine member States of the European Community, I propose to make a statement by way of clarification of our vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/34/29.

The Nine members of the European Community abstained in the vote on the resolution on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in 1978. In explaining their vote, the Presidency noted the support which the European Community traditionally gave to regional arms control initiatives. I wish again to place on record the Nine's continuing support for such initiatives. The Nine also share the wishes of the States in the Indian Ocean area to further the peace and stability of that region.

The Nine followed the course of the recent meeting of littoral and hinterland States with interest, and took note of the Final Document adopted at that meeting. We believe that the meeting marked an important stage in the development of the proposal on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. But we noted that the Final Document was not adopted unanimously, and that a number of States had reservations about elements of the document. In their explanation of vote last year, the Nine member States also expressed reservations concerning in particular the lack of a clear and agreed definition of the area of the Indian Ocean peace zone, and the activities to be excluded from it. The Nine member States emphasized the need for firm assurances that freedom of navigation by sea and air would be guaranteed to all nations and that the provisions of the law of the sea would not be contravened. We believe it would be premature to move to a conference until those questions

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

have been resolved.

The Nine member countries of the European Community have therefore decided to abstain on draft resolutions A and B submitted this year. But in so doing, they wish to make clear that such an abstention does not prejudice their attitude towards the enlargement of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and participation in its work.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to give its views on the occasion of the vote on the draft resolution relating to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace which was explained in detail by the representative of Sri Lanka, Ambassador Fernando, at the meeting of the First Committee on 12 November.

The Soviet Union, like most States Members of the United Nations, is in favour of the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean which would make that ocean a zone of peace. That is due to the policy of principle followed by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union starts from the premise that the fundamental tenet for the creation of a true zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is the elimination of all foreign military bases in the region and the refusal to create new bases. Of course, when giving practical effect to the idea of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, the norms of international law on freedom of navigation should not be jeopardized. Nor should scientific research in that region be hindered since it is of paramount importance for the economy and security of many States. That is our position of principle concerning this question.

We view with understanding the interest expressed by the coastal States of the Indian Ocean and believe that on this question their interests and ours are in agreement. However, after studying carefully the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the Soviet delegation wishes to state that it will be compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A. In fact, it contains elements with which the Soviet Union could not agree. I am referring, first, to the so-called "great-Power rivalry"

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

as a source of tension in the Indian Ocean region. The Soviet delegation has explained on more than one occasion why it was not possible for it to accept that formula. "Great-power rivalry" presupposes that all those States, including the Soviet Union, bear responsibility for the tension prevailing in the Indian Ocean. In this connexion certain delegations, as the work of the recent meeting of the littoral and hinterland States shows, have interpreted that term to mean that the main cause of tension in the region is the military competition or rivalry of two Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union.

Is that assertion well founded? In the Indian Ocean basin, the Soviet Union like other States, possesses certain interests as we have said quite frankly on more than one occasion. Practically the only sea lane open throughout the year which links Europe with the Far East passes through the Indian Ocean. What is also important for us is to ensure the national security of the Soviet Union in view of the fact that the waters of the Indian Ocean are in direct proximity to the southern frontiers of our country. However taking account of natural, legitimate interests, the Soviet Union does not threaten anyone or anything in the Indian Ocean. Quite the contrary, we are in favour of the broadening of détente in the region and the cessation of the arms race there as elsewhere. The Soviet Union has not installed in the Indian Ocean region any launchers of strike weapons and does not carry out large-scale manoeuvres there. Our country does not use naval forces for military manifestations in the Indian Ocean or near those countries seeking to assert and affirm their independence. Nor does the Soviet Union seek to establish military bases in the region of the Indian Ocean or to form military contingents designed to interfere in the internal affairs of States in the region or elsewhere. There can therefore be no question whatsoever of rivalry or competition.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

What would it mean for the Soviet Union to consent to the thesis of rivalry as a source of tension in the Indian Ocean? It would simply mean a readiness on the part of the Soviet Union to share with the United States the blame for the aggravation of the situation in the Indian Ocean. We cannot accept this, nor will we accept it.

There is another element in draft resolution A concerning which we believe it essential to give our views. The draft contains an appeal by the General Assembly to the United States and the Soviet Union to resume without delay the talks on the limitations and reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean, and an expression of regret that those talks have been interrupted. We understand very well the profound concern of the littoral and hinterland States in view of the fact that the Soviet-American talks have not been resumed. The success of the talks would reflect practical results in regard to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Furthermore, as emphasized in the statement made by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, agreement on the limitation of weapons in such a vast region would have very clear effects on the international situation as a whole. Why is it that the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union have not been resumed? At first they went quite well. Some progress was made, and we saw the outline of a possible agreement beginning to emerge, which the Soviet delegation reported in due course to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. However, the United States broke off the talks and, in spite of our repeated proposals, it is refusing to agree to the resumption of the talks. At the summit meeting held in Vienna between Mr. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and Mr. Carter, President of the United States, agreement was reached that the appropriate representatives of both sides would immediately meet to discuss the question of the resumption of talks. Such a meeting took place. However, the United States side, once again, did not agree to establishing

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

specific dates for the resumption of talks. Furthermore, recently the United States has taken a number of steps to escalate its military presence in that region. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, its position remains unchanged. The Soviet Union is still ready to continue the Soviet-American talks responsibly and in a positive spirit.

Those are the facts which we believe should be reflected in the draft resolution. However, the relevant paragraph of the draft resolution is worded in such a way that it is impossible to determine who is to bear responsibility for the fact that the Soviet-American talks have been broken off, which side is not agreeing to their resumption. We cannot agree with such an interpretation of the situation with regard to the Soviet-American talks.

The points I have set forth make it impossible for us to support draft resolution A on the Indian Ocean. However, this fact in no way changes the position of principle of the Soviet Union with regard to the idea of transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. It is impossible to achieve this without broad and constructive co-operation between the littoral and hinterland states of the Indian Ocean on the one hand and the other States that make broad use of that Ocean on the other. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is ready to extend such co-operation. An objective basis for this exists, inasmuch as both the States of the Indian Ocean and the Soviet Union have a profound interest in the strengthening of peace and security in that part of the world.

Furthermore, at the stage when the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is being implemented, the combined efforts of States to attain this goal become immediately and urgently necessary.

On the basis of these considerations, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution B on the Indian Ocean.

We are authorized to state, in this regard, that the Soviet Union is ready to approve the proposals in that draft resolution and to join the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which has been entrusted with the Preparatory Work for the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean and the preparation of an appropriate international agreement.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

There is no need to go into any great detail in explaining that this decision of the Soviet Union is of great international significance. The readiness of my country immediately to participate in working out an agreement to transform the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace very clearly demonstrates its adherence to the idea of peace and disarmament.

We should like to assure all the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean that in joining that body the Soviet Union will do everything in its power to see to it that that Committee achieves success in its work. We realize that there interest in certain circles in preserving international tension in inter alia the region of the Indian Ocean and in doing everything possible to hinder such co-operation between the Soviet Union and the countries of the Indian Ocean. To those ends they are making active use in particular of the unjustified argument about the rivalry of the great Powers as the major source of tension in the region of the Indian Ocean. Therefore, in our view, it would be appropriate in the future to abandon that doubtful position, which reflects a baseless political approach and might hinder the implementation of decisions upon which depends the idea of transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Poland has consistently expressed its support for the idea of the establishment of zones of peace in various parts of the world as an important measure of regional military detente which should contribute to the strengthening of the security of States within such zones and of international security in general. In particular, Poland welcomes the idea of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, provided of course its establishment would not infringe the generally accepted norms of international law concerning the freedom of navigation of ships of all States on the high seas. Moreover, it has always been the view of my delegation that the elimination of all military bases from the Indian Ocean is of key importance for the successful implementation of the Declaration in question.

NR/mtm

A/C.1/34/PV.50
14-15

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Poland follows with interest the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. We strongly support the proposal to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981 as envisaged in draft resolution B contained in the latest report of that Committee.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to announce that Poland, as one of major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, is interested in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and in the preparations for the Conference on the Indian Ocean as a measure of implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Having said that, I cannot but express my delegation's sincere regret that draft resolution A embodied in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean contains some formulations which are evidently not in keeping with the existing realities in the area or are just unfair to some States.

First of all, we cannot accept a general thesis on "great-Power rivalry" as a source of tension in the Indian Ocean without differentiating between those Powers which are really stepping up their military activities in the region, particularly by setting up new military bases there, and those which are not doing so. We believe that inclusion of such formulations in the draft resolution does not help in the development of constructive co-operation among all forces genuinely interested in the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

My delegation considers also as unobjective those provisions of draft resolution A which, while regretting the suspension of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation and subsequent reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean, create an impression that both sides are responsible for the suspension of the talks.

In these circumstances, while fully supporting the idea of establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, the Polish delegation will abstain from voting on draft resolution A and will vote in favour of draft resolution B.

Hr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): The People's Republic of Bulgaria has from the very outset lent its support to the idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, as well as to all efforts aimed at its speedy and full implementation.

Our interest in this idea is prompted by several considerations.

First of all, it is starkly obvious that the creation of a zone of peace in a region comprising one-fourth of mankind would be conducive in a most undeniable way to the strengthening of world peace and security. This is a goal which is actively sought by the over-all foreign policy activities of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Secondly, the Bulgarian Government is well cognizant of the situation, and nurtures heartfelt sympathy towards the yearning of a number of coastal States of Asia and Africa to have their security guaranteed and to see the creation of favourable conditions for their socio-economic development.

Thirdly, the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean corresponds to the immediate national interests of my country. As a maritime nation, Bulgaria actively uses the sea lanes of the Indian Ocean. Its economic relations and trade turnover with many States of that region are constantly on the increase. A stabilization of the situation, cessation of the arms race and elimination of the hotbeds of tension in that region would assist the further development and expansion of our co-operation with those countries.

Lastly, may I also recall that the Bulgarian Government has been actively involved in the work of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which is another reason for our interest in regulating the status of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

My delegation takes the view that the principles elaborated on the zone's creation correspond to the goals set in this respect. Along with that, we consider that some formulations need to be defined more accurately and exhaustively. It is of particular importance that all formulations should be substantiated by a precise assessment of the military-political situation in that area.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

In this connexion, I join the previous speaker in submitting that the thesis of "great-Power rivalry" embodied in the Final Document of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, as well as in draft resolution A in document A/34/29, paragraph 21, is not conducive to revealing the genuine causes of the military tension in the Indian Ocean region. Quite the contrary, this thesis is apt to conceal the real causes of the existing tension and of leading to incorrect political conclusions.

My delegation supports the convening of an international conference for the implementation of the General Assembly Declaration on the Indian Ocean. In this connexion, we consider highly pertinent the proposal to entrust to the Ad Hoc Committee the work on the preparation and convening of that Conference. At this juncture it is very important that the Committee take up the task of drafting appropriate arrangements for a future international agreement for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Keenly aware of the complicated and multifarious practical work which has to be carried out, my delegation considers well-grounded the proposal, contained in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution B to enlarge the Ad Hoc Committee by the addition of new members. It has become evident that in order to ensure the success of future work it is necessary to unite the efforts of a large number of States concerned.

In this connexion, I should like to state that Bulgaria is interested in participating in the enlarged Ad Hoc Committee in order to make its contribution to speedily turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, in close and sincere collaboration with all interested parties.

For the aforesaid reasons, my delegation will abstain from voting on draft resolution A, but will vote in favour of draft resolution B.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): In connexion with the draft resolutions now before the Committee on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, I will first address my comments to draft resolution A.

Australia has traditionally voted for draft resolutions on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and is pleased to do so again this year. This draft does, we believe, reflect the views of the member States of the Ad Hoc Committee and the results of its meetings this year. We can accept the references to the results of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean as contained in operative paragraph 2, but wish again to make it clear that the Final Document of that Meeting contained important elements which were unacceptable to Australia. As a consequence, Australia was unable to accept that document, which could not therefore be adopted by consensus.

I wish now to turn to draft resolution B, which the Australian delegation will support.

Both at this year's session of the Ad Hoc Committee and at the meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States, Australia expressed reservations about a date being set this year for the convening of a conference for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. It has been our belief that before a conference can successfully be held it will be necessary to resolve those fundamental difficulties which the Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States demonstrated still exist between the States of the Indian Ocean region. We are, however, hopeful that this can be achieved, and as a consequence, are willing to accept the principle of a conference being held during 1981.

It will, however, be necessary for the permanent members of the Security Council to participate, both in the work of preparation for the conference and in the conference itself. Without such participation, a meaningful conference could not be held. In this respect, the Australian delegation urges all permanent members of the Security Council that have not already done so to accept the invitation to serve on the expanded Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. BEKER (Israel): Israel supports all efforts to promote peace and stability in the region of the Indian Ocean. This attitude stems not only from our general policy, but in particular from our close proximity to that region and our concern for the safety of the maritime routes there, which are vital to the security and economy of Israel.

Therefore, my Government has followed with considerable interest the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the proceedings of the meeting of the Group of Littoral and Hinterland States, held in New York in July 1979, with which it wishes to be associated.

I would like to recall the letter of the Permanent Representative of Israel of 29 June this year, in which, inter alia, he stated the following:

"The General Assembly, in its resolution 33/68 of 14 December 1978 on the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, decided that Member States 'which have participated or have expressed their willingness to participate in the work of the Committee could attend upon the invitation of the Committee'.

"On 10 October 1977 the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean sent a letter to the Permanent Representative of Israel acknowledging the latter's letter of 3 October 1977. He also informed the Ad Hoc Committee at its 48th meeting of the contents of that letter which, in addition, was circulated as Conference Room Paper 4/77 of 5 October 1977. Its willingness to take part in the meetings of the littoral and hinterland States having been recorded in this manner, Israel indisputably falls into the category of Member States referred to in operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 33/68.

"The failure to invite Israel is, therefore, not only a breach of the spirit of a resolution of the General Assembly, but is also in complete disregard of Israel's geographical qualification as one of the hinterland States of the Indian Ocean.

"The absence of Israel from the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean will, therefore, necessitate a thorough examination by its Government of all decisions adopted at the meeting".

Israel, therefore, has no option but to abstain on draft resolutions A and B in document A/34/29.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation fully understands the desire of the States concerned to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. We believe that the establishment of such a zone would contribute to the security of the countries in the region, as well as to the achievement of general and complete disarmament, provided that the following conditions are met. First, that it is approved by a consensus of the States concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States; secondly, that it does not undermine the peace and security of the region or of the world as a whole; thirdly, that it is accompanied by an effective safeguard system, including international inspection and verification; fourthly, that it is consistent with the principles of international law, including the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, my delegation wishes to endorse the idea of convening a conference on the Indian Ocean for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, but feels it necessary to point out, as it has always done on several occasions during the course of discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee, that not only the conference itself but also the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference should be assured of the full participation of all permanent members of the Security Council as well as the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean.

It should also be noted that during the discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee, some delegations, including my own, expressed their doubts regarding the desirability or the wisdom of deciding at this stage to convene the conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981. My delegation continues to believe that in order to ensure the success of the conference, it is absolutely essential that adequate preparations be made prior to its convening.

My delegation hopes that these considerations will be duly taken into account when fixing the precise date for the conference. Having made these remarks, my delegation will be voting in favour of the two draft resolutions on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, contained in document A/34/29.

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): The German Democratic Republic advocates the establishment of a zone of peace in the region of the Indian Ocean. My country supports all efforts directed at preventing the use and the threat of force against States in the region, and all measures, globally and regionally, intended to strengthen international peace and security. For my country, therefore, it is a matter of sound reasoning that from the very beginning it has taken a favourable attitude regarding the establishment of a zone of peace in the region of the Indian Ocean. Similarly, we are prepared to participate in the activities of the relevant bodies which can help transform the region of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Our indicated interest and preparedness result not least from the fact that the German Democratic Republic maintains friendly relations with the majority of littoral States of the Indian Ocean. A number of sea and air routes which are operated by my country cross through that region. The stable development of these friendly relations and unhindered communications require a climate of security and co-operation. In addition, such a climate would provide for the best conditions to resolve pending problems of the region in a constructive manner.

The draft resolution before us meets with our approval on account of the objectives and technical provisions contained therein. Instead of the wording in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A on the causes of tensions in that region and the resulting dangers, we would wish to see a statement that would do justice to the realities. We believe that the complex process of developing heterogeneous relations among States should not be reduced to some superficial formula. Recent developments in the region have underlined the topicality of an examination of the situation which will verify that the thesis of "great-Power rivalry" is indeed indefensible. That is why my delegation cannot vote in favour of draft resolution A but will support draft resolution B.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): My delegation is grateful for the opportunity to state its views on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean contained in document A/34/29, which is now before the First Committee. At the outset I wish to express my delegation's profound appreciation of the dedicated efforts made by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador B. J. Fernando, who skilfully guided the work of the Committee as well as that of the meetings which the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean held in New York from 2 to 13 July 1979.

Pakistan is gratified at the significant progress made towards the goal of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean following the adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in its resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971. The Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, held last July, was an important landmark in that endeavour, since it was able to develop the basic principles underlying the concept of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. The outcome of that meeting was endorsed by the Summit Conference of the non-aligned nations in Havana. That endorsement signifies the approval of those principles by the great majority of the world community. The Pakistan delegation acknowledges that the Final Document adopted without a vote by the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean does not fully meet the requirements of a consensus. However it is our earnest hope that in due course of time the positions of all the States concerned will be harmonized on the principles of agreement identified in the Final Document, which would facilitate the fulfilment of the common aspiration of all the nations of the Indian Ocean region for the creation of a zone of peace in that region.

Among the principles of agreement identified in the Final Document of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, my delegation attaches special importance to those relating to the reduction and elimination of outside military presence in the region, the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes, the strengthening of security through regional and other co-operation and the denuclearization of the entire Indian Ocean region. In our view the acceptance of those principles constitutes an indispensable prerequisite for the creation of a zone of peace in the region.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean contained in document A/34/29 has focused on two principal aspects of our future endeavours. First, it has recommended that the General Assembly decide to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981 at Colombo for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Secondly, it has recommended that the General Assembly invite the participation in the Ad Hoc Committee of the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean with whom the Committee had previously held consultations and who were not represented on it. According to the report, the enlarged Ad Hoc Committee would also serve as a preparatory committee for the proposed conference on the Indian Ocean. My delegation is confident that the proposed conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981 will bring within reach the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, which can ensure genuine peace and stability in the region and strengthen the stability of all the States of the region, enabling them to devote their energies and resources to the progress and welfare of their people. My delegation is also greatly pleased that this important conference will take place in Sri Lanka, the country which pioneered the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and with which my country enjoys close ties of traditional friendship and co-operation.

Without international co-operation, particularly from the great Powers and the countries whose interest in the Indian Ocean has been acknowledged by the States represented on the Ad Hoc Committee, the pursuit of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean will remain elusive. In that regard we appreciate the fact that the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee has made contact with the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States with a view to seeking their participation in the Committee. We have noted that in their respective communications addressed to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, those two Powers have not raised any objections in principle to the idea of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean or to co-operating with the States of the region for the implementation of the idea. In that connexion my delegation welcomes the positive assertion just made by the Ambassador of the Soviet Union. It is our hope that the Soviet Union, the United States and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean which have been invited will be able to participate in the enlarged Ad Hoc Committee and make their vital contribution to the progress of its work. We also believe that the implementation of the Declaration will be greatly facilitated by an early resumption of bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Union on the limitation and eventual discontinuation of their military activities in the region.

In conclusion permit me to make a few comments regarding the preparatory work for the convening of the proposed conference on the Indian Ocean. The enlarged Ad Hoc Committee will undoubtedly hold detailed discussions on the modalities of the establishment and maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. It is our hope that the Committee, while considering the appropriate arrangements, will give serious thought to the suggestion implicit in paragraph 14 (a) of the report regarding the conclusion of an international agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka in his capacity as Chairman of that Committee at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 12 November 1979. The draft resolutions recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and contained in document A/34/29 are draft resolution A appearing on page 7 and draft resolution B appearing on page 9 of the document. These draft resolutions have financial implications which are contained in document A/C.1/34/L.53.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A.

A recorded vote has been requested on both draft resolutions.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,

Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution B.
A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand,

* Subsequently the delegations of Guinea and Seychelles advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstentions: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution B was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Guinea and the Seychelles advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. de La GORCE (France)(interpretation from French): The French delegation fully associates itself with the declaration of the presidency of the European Communities on the subject of the vote which was just taken. We should also like to recall that France was represented at the inaugural Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. In so doing the French Government wishes to stress the importance it attaches to the regional approach to certain problems of disarmament. Indeed, it is by placing ourselves in a regional context that quite often we can perceive and understand threats to security as they may be felt by the States concerned, and that we can hope to secure the most effective measures and the necessary consensus to apply them. In this regard, France takes pleasure in the fact that on Sri Lanka's initiative for eight years now a certain number of coastal and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean have been striving to define the conditions for preserving that region from war. The grave events that we now see taking place only serve to confirm our attitude. However, France felt it necessary to abstain in the vote on the two draft resolutions.

Indeed, we are convinced that the 1971 Declaration and some of the conclusions reached at the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States are not in keeping with the criteria of international maritime law or with the criteria of the equilibrium of rights and duties of all the countries concerned with the preservation of peace in one of the most sensitive areas of the world. The concept of zones of peace as it has been advanced hitherto is not internationally accepted; nor has any precision been given to the limits of such a zone as applicable to the Indian Ocean or the nature of the activities that should be excluded therefrom.

The balance sheet of the activities and negotiations in the past cannot, therefore, be categorically positive; but, as a coastal country of the Indian Ocean - and for some centuries now that has been the case - France is aware of its responsibility and the need to contribute to the

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

search for the establishment of greater security in that region. In this regard, we are ready to consider in a most constructive spirit any invitation that might be extended to us to take the place that properly belongs to us in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

Mr. WINN (United States of America): The United States abstained in the vote on the two draft resolutions prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean because we have never agreed with certain basic aspects of the Committee's mandate and because we cannot associate ourselves with a firm decision to call for a conference on the subject in 1981 - or, for that matter, even at some later date - until it is clear that a promising basis exists for a consensus to emerge at such a conference.

In our statement on 2 July at the special New York Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States the United States explained in some detail our difficulties with the Committee's mandate. Briefly summarized, we are not prepared to agree with explicit or implied abridgements of the right under the United Nations Charter of individual or collective self-defence, or with the idea of eliminating great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean or eliminating the logistical support facilities for those forces.

On the other hand, we recognize the legitimate desire of the members of the Committee to involve the permanent members of the Security Council and other relevant maritime countries in an attempt to find out where areas of consensus may lie and to see if there is a basis for a successful conference. If we were to join in this preliminary work in a manner that reflects the fact that we are neither a littoral nor a hinterland State, we wish to make clear at the outset that we would insist on modest and realistic goals, such as regional military restraint and improved regional pacific settlement measures.

In this same connexion, it is important that the Committee appreciate the great importance that we attach to the principle of consensus being adhered to in the Committee's preparatory work for a conference.

(Mr. Winn, United States)

Finally, our attitude towards participation would be very much affected by that of others. For the results of a conference to be seen as meaningful, we believe that the participation of all the permanent members of the Security Council would be required.

We look forward to consultations with the Chairman, Mr. Fernando, and the members of his Committee in the coming months to attempt to find ways to deal with these difficult problems. For our part, we intend to approach those consultations in a spirit of accommodation.

Mr. REBELO de ANDRADE (Portugal): In the past Portugal has always supported the concept of zones of peace in which it sees a realistic means of promoting détente and thus the necessary conditions for achieving general and complete disarmament. For this reason, last year Portugal voted in favour of the resolution concerning the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

However, we believe that at the present stage it will not be possible to make further progress in that direction without a common understanding among all the nations concerned on the main issues involved, and in particular without the agreement of the permanent members of the Security Council on the characteristics of the proposed zone.

My delegation notes that the final document of the July Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States was adopted without consensus and, furthermore, that the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding their military presence in the Indian Ocean have been interrupted.

In these circumstances, Portugal decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

With reference to draft resolution B in the said report, I should like to say that Portugal supports the objective of a conference on the Indian Ocean, but thinks that a date for such a conference should not be set without reasonable guarantees of a successful outcome. For that reason Portugal abstained in the vote on that resolution also.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolutions in document A/34/29.

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)

Mr. BALETA (Albania)(interpretation from French): The representatives of several countries sincerely concerned about the danger posed by the policy of hegemonism have been among those who have participated in this debate. According to their political opinions, they have made efforts towards and contributed to the clarification of the meaning of the term and the concept of hegemonism and to the identification of the characteristics of the policy of hegemonism.

With the same desire in mind, the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania wishes to make its own modest contribution by offering in this statement some considerations on agenda item 126 and explaining its views on the problem of hegemonism.

To begin, one might venture to assume that before the beginning of this session, representatives with previous experience of the First Committee were trying to guess the guise in which the demagogy of the Soviet social-imperialists would appear this year. And, once curiosity was satisfied by the revelation that item 126 was to be entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations", it became imperative to tackle this problem in accordance with the interests of the peoples of the world and not with the desires of the hegemonists. We thought therefore that it was the duty of this Committee to seek in the course of the debate answers to questions which have already been publicly asked or which are circulating privately among us.

We are firmly convinced that the proposal to include item 126 on the agenda of the present session was not at all motivated by any concern that a serious and useful examination be undertaken of so disturbing a problem as that of hegemonism, or by the desire to bring out the truth about hegemonism. The imperialist super-Powers have for many years attempted to prevent discussions which might reveal their policies and designs. It is no accident that, last month, in one of the introductory statements - which are no doubt strictly in keeping with the argumentation worked out by the Soviet social-imperialists - the latter's proposal was described as "consisting of the adoption of a political resolution".

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

Misleading propaganda has always been the other side of the coin of the aggressive and hegemonistic policy of the imperialist super-Powers. At the present time they want to use the deliberations in this Committee to try to create a storm in a teacup against hegemonism, thus throwing dust in the eyes of peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples and States. They would like in this way to succeed in diverting the Committee from an in-depth analysis of the problem and from the specific events and facts which would expose their hegemonism. They would like, above all, to prevent others from posing certain simple but important questions, such as: Who are today's hegemonists? Why should such an odious phenomenon as hegemonism continue to exist in international life in spite of changes which have taken place and in spite of the principles which outlaw it? What are the manifestations of the policy of hegemonism and how may it be prevented and combated?

The Soviet social-imperialists are trying to demonstrate, with ill-concealed and very clear-cut ulterior motives, that hegemonism is nothing but the desire of certain States to dominate other States, in which case it could not even be a policy, as it is called in the title of agenda item 126. Every attempt is being made in order to create a false idea that hegemonism can be a constituent of the policy of any State whatsoever, whatever its nature, and regardless of the economic and social system of that State and of the role that that State plays or might play in the international arena. But, once again, certain questions cannot be avoided, namely: Why does this desire to dominate others appear in certain States? Why does this desire become so irresistible that certain States go so far as to use aggression and the most barbarous means to satisfy their desires?

We really do not have to break our heads to understand the truth. There are objective causes and factors which underlie the policy of hegemonism. There cannot be any question of mysterious or inexplicable desires or motives. Hegemonism is the effect of real events in specific conditions and phases of historical development. It is a manifestation of specific political interests.

In our view, it is not enough to say - indeed, it is very much an understatement - that hegemonism is a departure from the principle of the sovereign equality of States. Hegemonism, particularly as now pursued

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

by the imperialist super-Powers, is the opposite, the very negation of this principle: a complete and brutal negation.

This is why hegemonism, both as a policy and as a practice, is not only inadmissible in international relations, but reprehensible, barbarous. Hegemonism is an odious phenomenon, like imperialism, social-imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and Zionism. Is it sufficient only to say that these phenomena are inadmissible and stop right there?

Previous speakers have spoken of the consequences of hegemonism in the past. But we have heard certain inadmissible speculations on historical events and the past. It is too ironical and cynical that the Soviet social-imperialists cite the policy of the Soviet Union when it was a socialist country, the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, as well as the glorious events of the struggle against German Nazism in order somewhat to embellish their current hegemonism. Their policy is none the less hegemonistic for their ceaseless repetition of outmoded slogans on "détente", disarmament, non-use of force, and so on.

The proposal to include on the agenda an item on the inadmissibility of hegemonism is also due to the fact that the hegemonists are engaged in a ruthless competition in the field of propaganda. The Soviet social-imperialist formula "inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism" had to be invented as a counterpoise to the "anti-hegemonism clause" used by the Chinese social-imperialists. But in neither case can verbiage disguise intentions and acts.

It seems to us illusory to hope that hegemonism can be fought successfully through the adoption of resolutions or the issuing of urgent appeals to everyone without distinction to undertake to renounce hegemonism. Such appeals, unfortunately, can only have the effect of a voice crying in the wilderness. For our part, we would have preferred to make it quite clear in the documents who the hegemonists are, and to condemn them for their dangerous policy, which is against the national freedom, independence and sovereignty of peoples and other States. But it seems to be practically out of the question for us to see the names of the hegemonists in any document that might be adopted after this debate.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

In our view, it is most important is to identify as clearly as possible the principle partisans and protagonists of the policy of hegemonism in order best to serve the struggle against that policy. It is the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and, for some time now, the Chinese social imperialists who pursue the policy of hegemonism, who burn with ambition and work feverishly to establish their domination not only over certain parts of the world, but over the whole planet.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

Hegemonism is part of the very nature of imperialism and social imperialism, just as are war, aggression and exploitation. Hegemonism has always been and remains a fundamental feature, a constituent element, an objective and a method of the imperialist policy of the great Powers and the super-Powers. At the present time hegemonism has assumed most dangerous manifestations and proportions in the policy and activities of the Soviet Union, the United States and China.

The means adopted by the capitalist countries to become major imperialist Powers and the path they have chosen to follow to become imperialist super-Powers with hegemonistic ambitions have been different.

The capitalist system emerged from the Second World War severely shaken, its equilibrium destroyed. The capitalist countries found themselves on the threshold of revolutionary upheavals. The Socialist system had scored important victories, the former colonial empires were foundering, and many peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America were becoming independent.

Unlike the other imperialist Powers, the United States emerged from the war even more powerful than it had been when it entered it. It took advantage of that to mobilize its economic and military potential, to save world capitalism and reaction and to attack socialism and the national liberation movements. American imperialism contributed to the rehabilitation of capitalism and world reaction, and became a leader in the movement in order to develop its own neo-colonialism. Thus it became an imperialist super-Power pursuing the objectives of world hegemony. To achieve that the United States used two methods: aggression and direct intervention by force, and political and ideological subversion. Depending on its global strategy for world domination, the United States created the aggressive NATO bloc and a whole system of other military alliances around the world; it set up military bases and stationed armed forces in all continents, sending its navy to all seas and oceans. It organized numerous coups d'état in other countries and established and maintained any number of reactionary cliques in power. The United States carried out interventions and massive armed aggression almost everywhere in Europe in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. It committed massacres and caused destruction in Korea and in Indo-China, and established hotbeds of tension in the Middle East, Cyprus, and elsewhere.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The hegemonism of the United States is based upon the method of intervention and aggression. It is sustained by a gigantic war machine and by vast capital investments abroad. The United States is not only not relaxing, as its friends in Peking would have us believe, but actually stepping up and diversifying its efforts to maintain and consolidate its advantages, to acquire others and to regain its grip wherever it has been loosened and extend it even further -- in a word, to promote its policy of hegemonism. It is striving above all to consolidate its existing aggressive blocs and alliances and to establish others so as to compete more effectively with social imperialism. The hatred of and revolt against American imperialism that is increasing everywhere provide the best proof of its aggressive nature and the danger of its actions.

The most striking evidence of this is the gunboat policy, military blackmail and threats of an economic blockade that the United States is using against Iran in order, as a hegemonistic super-Power, to impose its will upon that country. But the provocations and the blackmail of the American imperialists will never succeed in bringing the Iranian people to their knees.

Following the transformation of the Soviet Union into a revisionist and social-imperialist State, another imperialist super-Power made its entry into the international arena, pursuing an expansionist, neo-colonialist, hegemonistic policy, just like the American imperialists, by competing with them and co-operating with them to dominate the world and to divide it up into zones of influence. The global strategy of the Soviet Union is the strategy of an imperialist State seeking to extend its hegemony over all continents. The Soviet social imperialists have taken advantage of their policy of hegemonism and the economic, technological and military potential created by socialism. They make use of socialist phraseology in order to camouflage that policy and their designs.

Their hegemonism is most clearly manifested in their intention and their attempts politically, economically and militarily to integrate the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. The theory of limited sovereignty has made hegemonism an official part of the political system of the Soviet Union. It was in order to achieve such hegemonistic objectives that the Soviet Union converted the Warsaw Treaty group into an aggressive military bloc like NATO. And that is why the

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

Soviet Union has established on the territory of other States military forces that differ in no way from armies of occupation. It is for that reason that it continues to militarize its economy, to increase its arsenals of all kinds of weapons, to organize offensive military manoeuvres and to maintain great fleets in various seas and oceans, and so on. The Soviet social imperialists are seeking to achieve their hegemonism under the cover of so-called aid and support for the national liberation and revolutionary movements and the young underdeveloped countries.

At present, another major State, China, is striving feverishly to achieve its dream and plan of becoming a super-Power. To attain that objective it first needs to acquire the necessary economic and military potential, which it lacks at present. That is why it is trying to get aid and credit from all sides, and money, technology and arms. At the present stage, social-imperialist China is bending most of its efforts towards consolidation of the alliance with American imperialism, which it has chosen as its principal support, in the knowledge that that imperialism possesses the greatest economic and military potential. But China is also working to create, still in the shadow of the United States, a new imperialist alliance in the Far East and to strengthen its links with the other capitalist and imperialist States.

Another major objective of the efforts of China to become a super-Power is to take over the leadership of what it considers to be the third world, cherishing the hope that one day it will be easier for it to oppose the Soviet Union and the United States and to have a greater voice in the various disputes and the bargaining that goes on in order to divide the world up into zones of influence. The policy pursued by the Chinese social imperialists both inside and outside their country most clearly reveals that the strategy of China consists in establishing hegemony over the world.

That is why the Chinese social imperialists have undertaken a pragmatic and profoundly reactionary policy, made common cause with international reaction, become the zealous champion of American imperialism and encouraged and sustained militarists, revenge-seekers and fascist cliques. All this, in the language of the Chinese social imperialists, is motivated by the formula that Soviet social imperialism is enemy number one and the most dangerous enemy, and that anything is justified provided it is aimed against that enemy.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

They use the same argument to justify their support for NATO, a united imperialist Europe, the pursuit of the arms race, preparations for war and the intervention of imperialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America. It is with this kind of imperialist logic pushed to the limit that they have become ardent champions of world war and above all of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries. The hegemonism of China was publicly and totally exposed at the beginning of this year by the barbarous aggression against Viet Nam and the theory of "giving lessons".

Of course, China is still a long way from possessing all the means and resources it needs in order to play a role equal to the roles of the two imperialist super-Powers in the struggles for zones of influence and hegemony. But its ambitions are not to be minimized for that reason, and it is proving very active in trying to shuffle the cards better in the game of the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers. The Chinese social imperialists are therefore just as dangerous as the American imperialists and the Soviet social imperialists.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

There are thus many destabilizing factors on the international scene and the probabilities of confrontation between great Powers, the possibilities of local conflicts and the threat of a major world confrontation are increasing. The international situation is becoming ever more tense and explosive because of the many activities engaged in by the imperialist super-Powers in order to preserve the status quo and the existing alliances and relationships in certain regions, or to create new balances and new alliances between themselves in other areas.

Now that China has embraced the global strategy of American imperialism, the United States is hastening to derive the maximum advantage and to assure itself of a dominating position in the threefold game among the imperialist super-Powers. They are striving most effectively to play the Chinese card, but without doing too much to aggravate the contradictions between it and the Soviet Union.

The Soviet social imperialists are of course not indifferent and are not remaining idle. They ceaselessly recall to the United States and the other capitalist countries that they should not be too enthusiastic about the Chinese overtures or too eager to disrupt the existing equilibrium. They are profiting from the Chinese-American flirtation to derive advantages from the point of view of propaganda, to mislead Soviet and world public opinion by arguing that they are obliged against their will to continue the arms race and preparations for war. In a word they are finding it profitable to use this as a pretext to justify their own aggressive policy.

As long as the Chinese-American alliance remains in the honeymoon stage, China showers blessings and encouragement on the idea of a united Western Europe and counts on its support to assert itself as a super-Power and use it today against the Soviet Union and tomorrow against the United States. But we should not lose sight of the fact that we should not be surprised by sudden changes in Chinese policy. China may one day adopt the tactic of peace on both sides and then revert once more to its old position, announcing that American imperialism has once again become more dangerous and that Soviet social imperialism must again be counted on to oppose it. Events have proved that that is a real possibility.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The hegemonistic policy of the imperialist super-Powers, the United States, the Soviet Union and China, poses great dangers to the peoples and the sovereign States of the world and to general peace and security.

In his book entitled Imperialism and Revolution, the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, in analysing this hegemonistic policy and the clash of imperialist interests in the struggle for a new partitioning of the world, emphasizes the following:

"It is precisely these interests and this struggle between the super-Powers that is prompting each of them to use all the available forces and means to weaken its rival or rivals until these clashes become so bitter that they resort to armed confrontation."

Two draft resolutions have been presented to this Committee: A/C.1/34/L.1 by the Soviet Union and A/C.1/34/L.8 by China. The Soviet and Chinese social imperialists hope to mislead us by setting out certain already familiar principles and formulas on two separate sheets of paper. What counts for us is not what they say but what they do. It is for that reason that we are not going to base our attitude on the fine words which they have put on paper. We think that we should take a stand in the light of the policy actually pursued by the authors of these drafts and the objectives which they pursue. It is sufficient for us to note that these two draft resolutions have been presented by the hegemonists themselves in order to be sure that they cannot serve the struggle against hegemonism.

Having said this, we should like to state that if the two draft resolutions are put to a vote the Albanian delegation will vote against them. By that negative vote we intend once again to assert our opposition to the misleading policy and tactics of the super-Powers. We wish to stress once again that we find it inadmissible that the hegemonists should use this body to attempt to camouflage their hegemonism.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): The question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations could not be more pertinent for discussion today by the United Nations and, in particular, in the First

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

Committee. It is indeed unfortunate that this question has been neglected for such a long time, in spite of its relevance for discussion and debate by this body.

Hegemonism has been defined, inter alia, as a desire or striving for world dominance, for domination over other countries and peoples. By definition, hegemonism can only be exercised by those States that possess the instruments to effect or cause domination over those that have comparatively less power to withstand such pressure. A cursory glance at the landscape of international relations indicates that the new nations of the third world, for example, are always reeling under the shadow of hegemony by big Powers that crave spheres of influence.

Zambia attaches great importance to all attempts designed to arrest hegemony. My delegation regards the current debate on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemony in international relations as one such effort. Zambia is aware of the gruesome implications of the policy of hegemonism because it has been a victim of it in the form of imperialism. We expressed our abhorrence of hegemonism in the form of colonialism and imperialism by fighting for our national independence as a people. Since the attainment of our independence we have continued to pursue our ardent opposition to imperialism and other forms of domination wherever they prevail, especially in southern Africa, where minority racist régimes still oppress the Africans who form the overwhelming majority.

Zambia's defeat of colonialism and imperialism did not spell the end of its suffering at the hands of those that seek hegemony in other forms and manifestations. Because of our commitment to the struggle for majority rule in southern Africa, the racist minority régimes and their backers have unleashed unprovoked military attacks on Zambia. In consequence, many innocent Zambians have perished and property after property has been destroyed. Only recently the racists launched an abominable wave of destruction of Zambia's infrastructure in the form of the bombing of bridges, to isolate the people of Zambia from the rest of the world.

That form of military hegemony has been the basis of the policy of the racist minority régimes in Salisbury and Pretoria vis-à-vis independent

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

African States. Consequently, other front-line States, particularly Angola, Botswana and Mozambique, have been victims of military attacks as well just because they support, as does Zambia, the cause of genuine majority rule, freedom and independence in southern Africa.

Zambia will continue to support the cause of genuine independence and majority rule in Zimbabwe and Namibia until victory is achieved. At the same time we shall continue, without yielding to intimidation and blackmail, to call for meaningful change in South Africa with a view to bringing about majority rule in that country.

Another heinous manifestation of hegemony that needs scrutiny is the acquisition of arms by States for offensive purposes. During our debate relating to disarmament we have heard many representatives alluding with immense regret to the increase in the military budgets of the world community from \$256 billion in 1969 to something like \$450 billion by the end of the First Disarmament Decade in 1979. The consequences of this sustained militarization have all been negative, to say the least. One such consequence is the denial of funds for civil uses, if not the diversion of funds from civil uses to military uses. Furthermore, the excessive acquisition of arms has led to certain States' beginning to exercise undue influence in their areas of operation. That also leads to an arms race.

This form of hegemonism manifests itself in political hegemony in a given area when the most powerful partner surrounds itself with those that are less powerful. That policy unfortunately negates the principle of the sovereign equality of States. If anything, it exacerbates political hegemonism and adds fuel to hotbeds of conflict.

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

To avoid the development of hegemony in this regard, we need to redouble our efforts in the area of détente through disarmament. We have also an obligation to avoid the furtherance of hegemony by our own strict observance of international law as defined in the United Nations Charter in regard to peace and security, respect for territorial integrity and the sovereign equality of all States.

My delegation is also concerned at the use of economic pressure as a means of dominating other countries. In their relentless struggle to bring about a New Economic Order, the third-world countries have indeed met the most powerful opposition from the economically viable countries. The opposition to the New Economic Order has been prompted by the fact that the envisaged order calls, among other things, for equality among States in the area of international economic relations. Economically powerful countries have also been known to use economic blackmail in third world countries. For example, some countries have been known to withdraw certain services from third-world countries with a view to paralysing the economies of the latter. This situation is untenable, to say the least.

Hegemonism, in whatever form, is futile. History is replete with examples of the futility of hegemonism. Imperialism and colonialism represent a case in point. The majority of us assembled here were at one point in time under the yoke of colonial and imperial oppression. Eventually, we overthrew colonialism and imperialism. Today, I am pleased to say, the membership of the United Nations is approaching universality, thanks to our common abhorrence of colonial and imperial hegemony.

Another classic example of rejection of hegemony is that of Hitler. Hitler initiated the Second World War as a result of a misguided idea of dominating the entire world. Like other manifestations of hegemony, Nazism was defeated.

I do not want to overburden the Committee with more and more examples at this State. All I can say is that the only lesson we can draw from hegemony's hazardous road is that we should not, in the first place, waste our time by involving ourselves in the pursuit of hegemonistic policies.

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

Many delegations have already referred to other forms of hegemonism in addition to those I have briefly referred to in my intervention this afternoon. Those are cultural, ideological and strategic in nature, in addition to the other forms of neo-colonialism. As a non-aligned country, Zambia is extremely concerned at the advent of the multifaceted manifestations of the policy of hegemony because hegemony is the direct antithesis of the policy of non-alignment.

I do not think it would be preposterous to say that we all recognise the imperative need for world peace and security. Given that imperative, my delegation wishes to call upon all States to make a significant and meaningful move, away from a mere rhetorical commitment to end hegemony, to a practical demonstration to end hegemony.

Mr. CHAN YOURAN (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French):

The fact that we are discussing today the question of hegemonism clearly shows that this new form of imperialism may be regarded by the international community as the greatest danger to world peace and security. At a time when colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism are on the decline as a result of the unrelenting and unceasing struggle of oppressed peoples to regain their freedom and their right to self-determination, a new form of world or regional domination seeks to replace them and even to supersede them. This new phenomenon has in the past ten years acquired the name of hegemonism, the main manifestations of which are the following: use of political, economic and, above all, military force to intervene in the internal affairs of States, through agents infiltrated into those States to carry out acts of subversion, sabotage, assassination of the leaders of the country and coups d'état with the criminal designs of destabilizing and overthrowing the existing Government and replacing it with a puppet régime, and, if all these subterfuges fail, the use of armed and blatant invasion and aggression under the cover of a puppet organization created entirely for that purpose.

Hegemonism seeks to destroy the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, to subjugate them, to dominate them and to control them in all fields, including the political, economic, ideological military, cultural and other fields, and to place them within one's sphere of influence, leaving these vassal States only a formal kind of independence, limited to its lowest expression.

There is in fact no difference between colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, zionism and apartheid, it will be agreed since they all trample underfoot the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, the principles of non-alignment and the laws governing international relations. That is undoubtedly true, but in our view, it is desirable to emphasize three specific traits of hegemonism which distinguish it from other phenomena of domination.

First, at the end of the twentieth century, when almost all the subjugated peoples have recovered their freedom, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity after an arduous and unrelenting struggle of national liberation, hegemonism seeks to call into question all the fruits of that struggle and place those liberated peoples under a new form of servitude.

Secondly, hegemonism does not exclusively belong to a great world Power, It can also be practised by a country recently freed from imperialism, a country of the third world which has aims of regional expansion and the will to place under its domination its smaller and weaker neighbours in the region, although it may itself be poor and suffering the aftermath of the war it waged to shake off the yoke of imperialism and colonialism. This regional hegemonism, in order to carry out its ambitions, seeks support from world hegemonism, whose objectives are, if not identical, at least complementary to its own. Providing world hegemonism helps it to extend its influence over others that are smaller than itself, regional hegemonism does not hesitate to place itself within the orbit of the former.

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

Thirdly, hegemonism uses such slogans as peace, security, international détente, solidarity and special friendship, but actually practises aggression, annexation, expansion and genocide. It perfidiously attributes to its victims the crimes it itself has perpetrated and arrogantly scorns world public opinion. As such, it represents the gravest threat to international peace and security.

For several decades now, Kampuchea has constantly been struggling to defend its consistent policy of independence and non-alignment against regional hegemonists and expansionists. Those hegemonists, who practise a bloc policy, have infiltrated Kampuchea with many fifth-column agents, who are carrying out sabotage, subversion, and attempted coups d'état, and have succeeded in killing many thousands of our cadres and patriots who were too independent for them. This has been done in order to destabilize the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, to replace it by a puppet Government and to absorb Democratic Kampuchea into their bloc. They have always used threats of all kinds and resorted to armed force; they have even gone so far as to launch the present war of aggression and extermination against Kampuchea, which everyone is acquainted with. In an effort to stifle the desire for independence of the Kampuchean people and Government and to break the resistance of the Kampuchean people, which is determined not to live under their subjugation, the regional hegemonists and expansionists have resolved to exterminate Kampuchea by massacring its people, using all kinds of weapons, including toxic chemicals, as well as a deliberately created famine. Embroiled as they are in the popular war of resistance being waged by the people of Kampuchea, they continue to pour reinforcements into Kampuchea to bolster the more than 220,000 soldiers of their army of aggression. Just like the Nazis who massacred the Czech population of Lidice in 1941 and the French population of Oradour-sur-Glane in 1945, these invaders have created throughout Kampuchea hundreds of Lidices and Oradour-sur-Glane. In addition, again like the Hitlerite fascists who created crematory ovens to exterminate the Jews, they have deliberately created famine and have turned Kampuchea into one great crematorium to exterminate the people of Kampuchea.

More than a million Kampuchean have already perished as a result of massacre and famine and hundreds of thousands of other Kampuchean are dying

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

daily. Hundreds of thousands of Kampuchean people have already been obliged to seek refuge in Thailand, and their tragic situation has shocked world public opinion. The war of aggression waged by the regional hegemonists and expansionists against Kampuchea and its people is thus no mere classic colonialist or imperialist war: it is more cruel, more barbarous, because it is a war of genocide designed to exterminate a whole people, a whole nation, the entire Kampuchean race. In all the history of mankind, no people has suffered such a tragedy. Oblivious to world-wide opposition and condemnation, those regional expansionists and hegemonists are pursuing their acts of extermination against the Kampuchean people, nation and race.

On 12, 13 and 14 November last, the General Assembly considered the situation in Kampuchea brought about by the war of aggression and extermination waged by the regional hegemonists and expansionists. The overwhelming majority of United Nations Members expressed strong feelings at the plight of the Kampuchean people and deep concern at the grave situation produced by that war, which may well spread throughout South-East Asia. By 91 votes to 21 they adopted resolution 34/22, appealing for increased humanitarian assistance for the people of Kampuchea threatened with extinction. They demanded that the regional hegemonists and expansionists cease their aggression against Kampuchea and withdraw forthwith all their troops from Kampuchea so that the people of Kampuchea might decide its own destiny without any foreign interference, through elections under the supervision of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In this connexion, it is worth emphasizing the expressed opposition to that anti-hegemonist and anti-expansionist resolution on the part of the very promoters of hegemonism, who have taken the initiative of seizing the United Nations of the question of "the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations", while currently spending \$3 million a day to assist the regional hegemonists and expansionists in massacring and exterminating the Kampuchean nation and people. That attitude unmasks the hypocrisy and treachery of the hegemonists, particularly the regional hegemonists, who are past masters of the art of blaming their crimes on the victim and of making

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

lies, slander, distortions and gangster logic, cloaked in progressive slogans, a code of conduct for international relations. Moreover, by declaring our Assembly's vote of 14 November last "a farce" and "illegal", the regional hegemonists once again have insulted all the peoples and Governments of the world that love peace and justice and have shown that all they know is the law of the jungle and that they are imbued with the logic of gangsters.

My delegation believes that at present, in the face of the growing threat to peace and security in South-East Asia and throughout the world and to the independence and territorial integrity of all States, especially the small and weak countries of the world, the most urgent task incumbent upon the world community is to take appropriate measures to compel the regional hegemonists and expansionists to put an end to their policy of hegemonism in South-East Asia and to implement General Assembly resolution 34/22 without delay. In this regard, authoritative voices have been raised ever more strongly and in growing numbers, advocating political, diplomatic and economic pressure to compel those regional hegemonists and expansionists to implement that resolution - in other words, to respect scrupulously the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of non-alignment, and the laws and standards governing international relations.

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

The Kampuchean people and their Government consider it necessary and indeed urgent to send to Kampuchea observers or United Nations forces to ensure the direct distribution of humanitarian assistance to all the people of Kampuchea and to supervise the withdrawal of all foreign troops from that country. The international community thus will have taken effective measures to make world or regional hegemony recede and the United Nations, in keeping with its noble task, can save the people of Kampuchea from extinction while at the same time restoring peace and stability to South-East Asia, preserving international peace and security and sparing our peoples the tragic fate which the people of Kampuchea now face.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): In discussing the item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations", we find ourselves once again analysing the causes which engender and continue to engender international tensions. After more than 30 years we are still considering the factors which led the international community to establish this Organization. Those factors caused it to pursue an essential objective - namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. To achieve that objective, it was agreed that the Organization should be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

Because of the untold suffering wrought on mankind by the two World Wars, the means was sought to bring lasting peace to the world in order to preserve, as laid down in the preamble to the United Nations Charter, future generations from the scourge of war.

The bitter experience acquired from those two events alerted the people of the world to the dangers of power politics and the desire for conquest. To that end, it was felt that the adoption of collective measures directly oriented towards the maintenance of international peace and security would put an end to the aggression implicit in the practice of policies of hegemonism. It was

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

felt that the intentions of certain nations to exert influence and control over others could be thwarted.

Experience having proved that imperative to be the most sensitive aspect it was in order to respond to it that the whole text of the United Nations Charter is a condemnation of the policy of hegemonism and an instrument aimed at restricting its practice.

The States which met in San Francisco 34 years ago and adopted our Charter solemnly undertook unreservedly to observe its provisions. The same undertaking was assumed by all those who later joined the Organization.

Unfortunately, we note with regret that this peace-seeking injunction was not observed by some States. Despite the solemn undertaking to abide by the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of its bodies, power politics still exist and seriously endanger international peace and security.

Thus, during the years which have elapsed since the creation of this Organization, many armed conflicts, flashpoints of tension, violence, and so on, have occurred in the world. We have also witnessed the unbridled race for armaments, including nuclear weapons. The technological progress achieved in this field was such that it prevented hegemony being gained by conventional methods, in other words, by the usual forms of attack. Therefore, a more subtle means of achieving this end was sought. Conquest is now to be achieved by bringing about radical changes in the political, economic and social systems of countries.

To this end, subversion against established Governments is encouraged; terrorist movements are supported in various ways and are even created; infiltration into the internal organization of countries is practised; campaigns aimed at destroying the prestige of certain countries are organized, distorting the true situation in many States in order to isolate them; the economies of States to be brought under domination are undermined; propaganda programmes are broadcast in order to disrupt the established order, and so on.

These actions are now commonly employed to achieve conquest by indirect means. The result of such actions, save for limited exceptions, are the

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

flashpoints of tension and violence emerging in various parts of the world. Insecurity and instability are fertile ground for States seeking to exert influence and control over others.

The signing of the Treaty on the limitation of offensive strategic weapons between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the debates in this Assembly and the decisions adopted on international security and disarmament, indicate that the predominant trend among the great Powers is towards détente.

We consider that these are significant factors since their aim is to prevent the risk of a world war that would endanger the very survival of the human race. But at the same time a careful analysis shows that the trend towards détente is only partial. On the one hand the great Powers have shown no sign of their willingness to recognize that international peace and security and the economic and social development of peoples are indivisible.

On the other hand, so long as there is no absolute awareness of the fact that until these hegemonistic practices to which we referred earlier cease, and until the peoples of the world are allowed to develop freely and to achieve their economic and social progress, international peace and security will be threatened.

For these important reasons, we believe that the discussion by the Assembly of the item on hegemony is timely, despite the fact that, as we said at the beginning of our statement, the very text of the United Nations Charter implies condemnation of the policy of hegemonism and is an instrument aimed at restricting this practice. But we also believe that the title of the item, namely, "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" is inappropriate. The "inadmissibility" of such a policy is already laid down in the Charter. We therefore believe that the title should be different. For example, and for the reasons we have given in this statement, it might have been more pertinent to call it "Consideration of the policies of hegemonism practised by States". Thus, it would have been possible for us to identify the new forms of power politics, and even to single out those practices.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

This should be done through a comprehensive rather than a selective study since the latter would imply taking a political position towards particular countries. It should be a peace-seeking venture aimed solely at promoting the maintenance of international peace and security.

Lastly, we wish to state that we shall support any draft resolution directed towards the objective we have mentioned, that is to say, the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, pending completion of a comprehensive study on the subject, we shall be unable to vote in favour of those which imply taking a political position towards specific countries.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I wish to address myself to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52. The First Committee until very recently devoted itself to two main subjects: disarmament and international security. The submission by Iraq of anti-Israel resolutions, both last year and this, introduced for the first time the Middle Eastern issue into the Committee's deliberations on disarmament. Now draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 goes further by including Zionism in the draft resolution that deals with hegemonism.

There is no such word as hegemonism in recognized general and political dictionaries, However as a code word used in contemporary international politics it may have served a certain specific purpose, but the introduction of Zionism into this draft resolution adds a novel and sordid dimension to an exercise in semantic absurdity.

The malicious and unwarranted addition of Zionism to it makes it look more and more like the automatic slogans which are adopted with monotonous regularity at meetings of parties of a certain political orientation. Ever since the shameful resolution on Zionism of 1975, describing it as a form of racism, the slogan "Zionism" has been used by Arab States and their friends in this Organization in connexion with every evil existing in the world, with all the social and economic ills that beset the third world, the world's arms race and what have you. If a draft resolution were ever to be introduced in one of the Committees of the General Assembly advising the world of the dangers of cigarette smoking, some Arab Members and their friends would no doubt find a way of attributing the dangers of smoking to Zionism.

When the Arab States were invading Israel in 1948, a certain representative expressed surprise in the Security Council at:

"...the position adopted by the Arab States in the Palestine question, and particularly at the fact that those States - or some of them, at least - have resorted to such action as sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine."

(S/PV.299, p. 7)

The representative who spoke those words was the present Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, and the national liberation movement to which he referred was the Zionist movement, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

That statement, since it came from the lips of its imperial master, merits particular consideration by Cuba, one of the sponsors of this draft resolution and a country which has of late done so much for world peace and security.

Israel is going to oppose draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52.

Mr. MUSHARRAF HOSSAIN (Bangladesh): My delegations considers this debate on hegemonism important and relevant in the context of contemporary international relations and the over-all objective of evolving a stable, peaceful and equitable world order.

I need hardly emphasize the stake non-aligned countries have in this debate. It was only a short time ago that the great political and economic issues of our time, issues of war and peace and of the destinies of entire peoples were decided in a handful of capitals. This is no longer so because millions of people in the resurgent continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America and in other regions have come into their own and asserted their determination that decisions involving them, whether concerning war and peace or the direction of their own social, economic and political development, could only be made by them and in their own country. That was the substance of non-alignment. It gave credence and meaning to the fundamental premise of the Charter of the United Nations - the sovereign equality of all States and the preservation of genuine independence - principles that are the bed-rock of every constitution in the world, national or international.

The essential contribution of non-alignment to international politics was represented by the desire of those newly-independent States to preserve their hard-won independence through an alternate option, a path independent of policies that had polarized the world into blocs and alliances and one which would allow them instead to promote peaceful and equitable relations among all nations, irrespective of size, power and ideology. They were determined that their respective territories should not be used for the subjugation of other people, or for subversion, intimidation or coercion, however subtle their forms. That was the motivation that fuelled their unrelenting struggle against colonialism, imperialism, racism and its more covert manifestations. That was the objective that led to their flat rejection of all forms of dependency, interference, intervention, direct or indirect, and of all pressures, whether political, economic, military or cultural, in international relations.

It is within that context that they viewed and condemned the policy of hegemony. For the essential constituents of hegemony are an antithesis of the principles of the Charter and a threat not only to the principles of the sovereign equality, territorial integrity and political independence of States, but to the very maintenance of peace and security. What then do we perceive to be the elements of hegemony? Hegemony is an attempt to dominate, to control, to subjugate politically, economically and militarily, not only States but regions of the world; it seeks to perpetuate unequal relations among States and the maintenance of power and the privileged status quo: it is manifested in the use of force and intervention, seeking to limit the freedom of States in determining their own political systems and in the pursuit of economic, social and cultural development without let or hindrance. The continued manifestation of hegemony, as indeed of colonialism and its evils, constitutes an insurmountable barrier to the achievement of that universal community based on co-operation, equity and peace which is our common objective. In order to endure, a world order cannot be imposed by the strong nor built on the domination of a given culture, sector or ideology; it can only succeed and survive when it draws its strength from global diversity and the undoubted recognition of our interdependence.

That is why Bangladesh is a supporter and sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.52.

Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): We welcome the inscription of this agenda item and the debate on this very important problem, which is proof of the positive evolution in political thought and practices in the world. Less than a year ago, the mere mention of the word "hegemonism" used to provoke various kinds of resistance and misgivings, as it was erroneously supposed that this concept applied only to various forms of unequal relations within one group of countries, whereas imperialist and colonialist forms of domination, for instance, were supposed to apply to group of countries of the other social system.

Numerous factors have contributed to the maturing of consciousness concerning the need to examine the problem of hegemonism more thoroughly, to identify its protagonists and sources, to determine its manifestations, to throw light on its dangers and to underline the need for banishing it from international relations. This maturing has been made possible by better comprehension of the complexity of international relations and the variety of links among international subjects of unequal strength, by a better understanding of the evolution in the character of social forces in the world and the effects of unequal international economic relations and, finally, by a more thorough comprehension of different trends and of the socio-historic conditions in which the struggle for changing the historical position of nations and peoples is taking place. Hence the increased awareness that the new forms of subjugation of peoples arising from the existing system of international relations cannot be either explained by or identified with either the classical framework and purport of imperialism - whose nature has not changed, but whose power and influence are on the wane - or with those of colonialism, which has disintegrated or completely disappeared as a world system.

Consequently, it is becoming increasingly clear that subjugation and exploitation are the common denominators of all forms of domination, regardless of the fact that the ways in which this is achieved may differ. Actually, there is a higher degree of awareness of the fact that what is involved are diverse phenomena stemming from the crisis of the existing system of international relations and from the conflict between the forces that are endeavouring to maintain the status quo and those fighting for the creation of a new system of political and economic relations.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

There is no doubt whatsoever that any form of hegemonistic relations poses a direct threat to the independence and free development of countries and peoples and, consequently, to world peace. It would therefore be dangerous to underestimate this threat, to treat it as a passing phenomenon or as only a secondary by-product of the "faults of subjective forces," of inherited objective conditions or "need" for a temporary solving of contradictions by recourse to the use of force, by "just" interventions and the like. On the contrary, hegemonistic relationships are much more frequent and varied today, in a period when the influence of imperialism in its classical form is decreasing under the weight of the great anti-imperialist revolution for independence, and when it is yielding its place to more "up-to-date" but not, for that matter, less dangerous forms of usurpation of rights of peoples and countries.

Under conditions of ever-more diverse relations among countries and peoples, of ever-greater interdependence but also of increasing inequality, of an ever-more universal process of radical changes and strategic adaptations of social forces in the world and an ever-vaster arsenal for the use of force, attempts are made to impose various forms of relations of dependence which sometimes appear in subtle and less visible forms and ways of influencing the development of countries, but which are always accompanied by a more or less brutal use of force. All this makes it imperative to follow this phenomenon closely, to consider it, to study it, to unmask it and to eliminate it from international relations.

Hegemonism - as an attempt to establish supremacy and to transform it into a permanent system of relations - is in various forms immanent in every epoch and phase of development of the society, whether it manifests itself in the form of various phenomena of classical imperial annexations or domination, or their universalization through imperialist expansion, colonial occupation and neo-colonial exploitation, or in the shape of contemporary attempts at establishing a system of global "super-domination" by one or several centres of power. All such attempts have always been based on military and economic power and on classical or insidious use of force, and this whole arsenal is now being modernized through various co-ordinates of indirect or direct political and ideological action.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

It is obvious that on the whole, the great or military and economically strong Powers dispose of such might. Primarily, they can be the protagonists of hegemonism because they dispose of all the instruments of power. Regardless of the different position of small, medium-sized and underdeveloped countries in various social systems, these countries are actually most frequently the object of pressure. Their participation in the decision-making process is unequal and limited, their sovereign rights are constantly curtailed, their economic resources are exploited and, not infrequently, they are the victims of aggression while their social development is as a rule "directed". All this finds further expression in a system of international relations characterized by attempts of centres of power to monopolize and legitimize the right to regulate the situation in the world by means of a constant expansion of spheres of interest.

The policy of non-alignment defines hegemonism within the context of defence of independence and sovereignty of countries and peoples and the negation of any form of subjugation or dependence, interference or exertion of political, economic, military or ideological pressure. The non-aligned countries consider that hegemonistic and imperialist pretensions, along with all their manifestations, are an obstacle to the political, social and national awakening of peoples.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

They have affirmed, as one of the basic principles of non-alignment, the struggle against hegemonism, placing it on the same plane with the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, all forms of racism, exploitation, power politics, inequality, aggression, intervention, occupation and all forms of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. The struggle against hegemonism has been raised to the level of a fundamental principle, in the same way as the elimination of imperialist and hegemonistic policies has been proclaimed to be one of the substantive objectives of the policy of non-alignment.

Briefly, both in the theory of the policy of non-alignment and in the practice of non-aligned countries, hegemonism is treated as one of the forms of oppression of peoples and countries, whereas the forces of hegemony are treated as forces striving to perpetuate relations of inequality and privilege acquired through the use of force. The struggle against hegemonism is qualified as a contribution to the strengthening of peace in the world and to the liberation struggle of peoples in all of its aspects, as well as to the establishment of a new order in which every people will freely determine its national, social and economic development.

The immediate causes of hegemonism in contemporary conditions should be sought first of all in the existing system of international relations based on the outdated doctrines of balance of power and policy of division of the world into blocs and spheres of interest in which the actors strive to gain, through direct rivalry or through the strategy of so-called "indirect advance" advantages, most frequently to the detriment of the independence of small, medium-sized and developing countries.

Furthermore, hegemonism stems from attempts to solve international contradictions by force, from the unabated arms race, threats of nuclear war, incitement to or waging of limited or local wars, military interventions, imposition of neo-colonial relationships and foreign social models of development, and so on. Consequently, it is not infrequent that social transformation, struggle for national liberation or problems arising in mutual relations between individual countries are used for imposing hegemonistic relationships and for rivalry in shifting the borders of spheres of interests.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

From the character of these causes derive also the manifestations of hegemonism which are complex and numerous, but always constitute an impediment to the independent development of peoples and countries. Without pretending to establish a precise nomenclature of all the manifestations of hegemonism, we would say that every-day practice shows that the most numerous and conspicuous aspects of hegemonism are the policy of use or threat of use of force; foreign domination, intervention and interference; maintenance of unequal relations, privileges and monopolies; various forms of limitation of the sovereign and legitimate rights of peoples and States in any field of their activities - political, economic, cultural, religious, racial or ideological; violation of the right to self-determination, free national development and choice of socio-political and economic system; tendencies to impose foreign models of social development and various doctrines and systems of relations designed to serve that purpose; various forms of preventing or restricting the participation of States, on a footing of equality, in the solving of international problems and attempts at preserving in this respect the monopoly of militarily and economically strong Powers and blocs; perpetuation of unequal economic relations and prevention of States and peoples from preserving and exercising sovereign control over their natural resources; attempts at depriving peoples of their cultural identity and imposing alien cultural values; perpetuation of monopoly in the field of information, mass communications and dissemination of news, and so on.

Today, the struggle against hegemonism is one of the most important battlefields for the universal implementation of the principles of active and peaceful co-existence among all countries, irrespective of their social system, size or level of development. At the same time, it is a struggle for the democratization of international relations, which implies a system of deep and constant changes in the sphere of political, economic and other relations; for equal participation in the solving of problems and taking of decisions on crucial issues in the world; for equal security for all countries; for independence, all-round national emancipation of all countries and peoples and their inalienable right to independent social development; for the right to economic development, and so on. In brief, it is a struggle for the establishment of a new system of international political and economic relations.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

With the emergence of the Non-Aligned Movement there appeared a real force as an alternative to the existing system, which was developing in the sense of conservation of unequal relationships and the drawing of small and under-developed countries into a new system of domination. The action of non-aligned countries has resulted in the creation of more favourable conditions for the struggle for independence, equality, development and progress.

Therefore, the expansion of the area of non-alignment, the strengthening of the Non-Aligned Movement as an independent global force, the implementation of the principles and achievement of the goals of the policy of non-alignment, the lending of support to peoples under foreign and colonial domination in the struggle for their national liberation, the rejection of bloc policy and overcoming of the division of the world into blocs constitute the most effective barrier to hegemonism. All the greater is the need for such a united, independent and strong non-aligned movement as a new element in the world balance of forces. Therefore, non-alignment has never been conceived as a transient phenomenon, but as a world factor and world strategy for the establishment of new relationships. Consequently, there can be no more effective way for rejecting and fighting hegemonism than the implementation of non-aligned principles and objectives, because non-alignment itself as a force, concept and movement, as well as its programme, are by their very nature anti-hegemonistic.

The draft resolution before us, of which my country is a sponsor, provides answers to all the indispensable questions regarding the causes, nature and manifestations of hegemonism. I believe, therefore, that it is a very important document which will become an essential instrument in the struggle against this real, acute and extremely dangerous phenomenon in international relations.

Mr. WANYOIKE (Kenya): My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52. In doing so we shall be stating our position once again, that is, Kenya's total opposition to actual, manifest or intended deliberate tendency to control, dominate and subjugate politically, economically or militarily other States, peoples or regions of the world.

We take this unequivocal stand because in it we see the real possibility of humanity learning eventually to move away from the path of conflict and fighting that has brought untold suffering to the world. We do so because we believe that nations at harmony with one another stand a better chance of success in promoting détente, and as a nation we are fully committed to that goal. Kenya does not and will not interfere in the internal affairs of any nation. We continue, as we have done in the past, to respect the territorial integrity of all nations. We abhor and are opposed to ideologies that minimize and impose unbearable burdens on fellow human beings just because they happen to have a skin of a different colour.

(Mr. Wanyoike, Kenya)

In this connexion, we want to refer specifically to the evil and sterile political ideology of apartheid. This is a system of government which has brought untold suffering and humiliation to its own nationals just because they are black. We condemn it unreservedly and find it indefensible.

Apartheid is hegemonistic as an ideology and is a close historical ally of nazism. We all know the depths to which nazism sunk and how it consequently left in its hour of greatest shame a tragedy that no human being, then or now, could erase from human history. We ask those who continue to support this evil system of apartheid to learn from history before history catches up with them, for those who refuse to learn from history will themselves be condemned when history repeats itself. It was not an accident that one of the architects of apartheid, the former Prime Minister of South Africa, was detained by his own Government when it was felt that he openly and enthusiastically supported the other architect of racism, Adolf Hitler. It is also sad to note that the people who fought so courageously to rid the world of the cancer of the doctrine of racial superiority and hegemonism should now find themselves in sympathy with apartheid. This makes their verbal opposition to apartheid look hollow and hypocritical, especially as they continue to give economic support to sustain the very system that they profess to oppose.

The continent of Africa has suffered very much from the hegemonistic designs developed and hatched outside the continent to exploit it. Over 10 million blacks were carried away into slavery over a period of more than three centuries. As if this were not enough, we are passing through a historical period of colonialism with its attendant evil of exploitation. This phase in our history is by no means complete: thousands upon thousands have been killed and continue to be killed in southern Africa for no reason other than their active opposition to systems of government that deny them their humanity and self-respect. We call on all nations that are arming those régimes to end their economic and military support.

The subject to which we are addressing ourselves is a serious one, and we ask that it be treated with the seriousness it deserves. None of the super-Powers can honestly claim innocence with regard to hegemony. If they try to ignore this fact, we must tell them, as the Bible tells us, to "cast out the beam of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye".

(Mr. Wanyoike, Kenya)

A Roman general is quoted as having said, "I came, I saw, I conquered". That was a military and economic conquest which took place more than 2,000 years ago, but since that time nations have continued to march across their own borders to conquer and subjugate other nations. If they do not do this militarily, they do it through the might of their economies.

Hegemonism is a negative concept in all its manifestations. It is an enemy of peace and of the genuine and legitimate freedom of expression of peoples in choosing their social, governmental and economic systems. Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.1, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.8, submitted by China, and the recent draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, submitted by Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia, all condemn resolutely the practice of hegemony in international affairs. This rejection of hegemony is common to all of them and it is because of this commonality of purpose that I hail the move of the representative of China, who agreed this morning to support draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, thus not insisting on a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.8. In my opinion, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 incorporates the best of the three drafts, and should, I hope, enjoy a consensus among all those who sincerely reject hegemonism in all international relations.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union notes with satisfaction that consideration of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations is at the forefront of the work of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. We are deeply convinced that this is in keeping with the primary task of the United Nations, that of ensuring international peace and security.

The initiative of the Soviet Union in raising the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism at this session as a matter of urgency and importance is further evidence of the line it has persistently pursued: the line of restructuring international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence, the development of mutually advantageous co-operation among States with different social systems and the strengthening of international peace and security and friendship among nations.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union has given warning of the danger of the policy of hegemonism. It did so as early as before the Second World War and in the League of Nations it raised the question of adopting effective measures against hegemonistic claims. Unfortunately, the League of Nations proved incapable of taking such measures and the peoples of the world had to pay dearly for that in the Second World War. Our Soviet people alone gave 20 million lives in order to defeat Hitler's plans to establish world supremacy and in order to bury hegemony in its fascist incarnation.

Continuing its struggle for international peace and security, the Soviet Union once again brings up the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism, a policy which is an obstacle to the deepening of the process of international détente and its extension to the whole world. The proposal for the condemnation of the policy of hegemonism supplements the efforts of the socialist countries to merge political détente with military détente and opens up one more important area of activity for the United Nations in the process of the strengthening of international détente.

It is a matter of satisfaction to us that States Members of the United Nations are expressing the virtually unanimous view that the time has come to proclaim for all to hear the special danger of the policy of hegemonism in current conditions and to call for measures to halt this danger. In the statements of participants in the discussion, deep concern - indeed alarm - has been apparent over the fate of the world, which is threatened by hegemonism: this alarm is totally justified. The discussion of this question in the United Nations has once again confirmed that the ambition for world supremacy and domination of other countries and peoples - precisely the essence of the policy of hegemonism - is meeting with the unconditional resistance of the world Organization.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The appetite for expansion, imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism in all its forms, apartheid and great-Power chauvinism and, indeed, everything that is organic and inherent in hegemonism has undergone the most severe criticism. In the statements of representatives of the most varied Member States it has quite rightly been pointed out that hegemonism leads to a serious threat to international peace and security and menaces the sovereignty and independence of States. All this points convincingly to the need to condemn hegemonism in all its forms and manifestations and the need for a clear-cut and unambiguous declaration by the General Assembly that States or groups of States should in no circumstances, for any reason whatsoever, pursue a policy of hegemonism in international relations or attempt to occupy a dominant position in the world at large or in any particular region of it.

In putting forward this proposal the Soviet Union based itself also on the view that discussion of this question would make it possible to confirm the need to strengthen the principles stipulated in the United Nations Charter, primarily the principle of the sovereign equality of States. We note with satisfaction that in this Committee clear-cut expression has been given to the idea that hegemonism is a denial of equality in co-operation among States, a denial of the right of States and peoples independently to decide their own internal affairs and to base their relations on the principles of mutual advantage and mutual respect. Naturally, the representatives of the non-aligned and the developing countries are those who have expressed particular concern in this regard. They have taken an active part in the discussion of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. That is entirely understandable, because hegemonism threatens primarily the small and medium-sized countries. It is precisely the developing countries that have experienced at first hand the pernicious effects of various manifestations of the policy and practice of hegemonism, aggression, occupation and intervention in their internal affairs by those forces that are seeking to perpetuate unequal relations and the privileges of the epoch of colonialism.

Those countries are coming out ever more categorically in defence of their sovereignty and independence and their right to determine their own political, social and economic systems without any outside interference. They repudiate the

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

policy of the threat or use of force, intervention or pressure, and they favour strict observance by all States in their international relations of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The policy of hegemonism has a most adverse effect on international relations. It engenders conflict situations and international crises and it stimulates the arms race. Today we see that the danger of hegemonistic ambitions is made a hundred times worse if we take it into account that nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction can be placed in the service of hegemonism. The primary task of all who cherish peace is to prevent that. Precisely for that reason we have heard many representatives in their statements stressing the highest priority task of the United Nations, namely that of promoting the strengthening of international peace and security on the basis of strict compliance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

By taking a decision unreservedly to condemn the policy of hegemonism, the United Nations would be placing in its path a most significant political and moral barrier.

The Soviet delegation wishes to express its gratitude to those delegations that have taken a positive part in the consideration of this question, which is of such great importance to the cause of bringing about peace and ensuring international security.

A discordant note was struck by the delegation of China, which attempted to reduce this important matter to mere routine attacks upon the policy of our country. The Soviet delegation could, of course, say a great deal in reply to these provocative onslaughts. However, our approach to the discussion of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations is one of the utmost seriousness and responsibility. It is a question on which the Committee has yet to take a decision, and we consider it wrong to distract its attention by fruitless polemics.

We should like to express particular gratitude to the delegations of Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia, which have adopted a highly responsible approach to consideration of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations and whose constructive efforts have made it possible for the First Committee now to adopt an important decision of principle condemning the policy of hegemonism.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Desiring to accommodate the wishes expressed by the non-aligned countries that have sponsored the draft resolution, the Soviet delegation does not object to the adoption of their draft resolution alone, and therefore it will not insist upon a vote being taken on its own draft.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee had before it three draft resolutions on agenda item 126, numbered A/C.1/34/L.1, L.8 and L.52. The representatives of the Soviet Union and China have agreed not to press to a vote their respective drafts, L.1 and L.8. Consequently the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations". That draft has eight sponsors, and it was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the forty-seventh meeting of the First Committee, on 29 November 1979. The sponsors are Bangladesh, Cuba, Guinea, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia.

I shall now call upon representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I should like in the name of the nine member States of the European Community to offer our observations on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, introduced by Sri Lanka, entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations".

The Nine have followed the debate under agenda item 126 but have refrained from participating in it. Frankly, we do not understand the special emphasis placed on this subject within this Committee at this stage. This Committee has been engaged in an attempt to prohibit what is already prohibited and to condemn what is already condemned. Furthermore, discussion of this item has introduced an unwelcome polemical note into the work of a Committee whose principal task we believe is to bring about progress in disarmament.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

That objective has certainly not been assisted by the debate on this item. Nor has the debate contributed to any clearer political understanding of international relations. In the course of the debate we heard many widely diverging views on the theme involved.

It goes without saying that our delegations have the strongest objections to the references in the text to Zionism. Apart from this clearly unacceptable element, which of course ensured that consensus would be impossible, there are various other points in the draft resolution with which many of us could not agree. But, in saying this, I must pay a tribute to the non-aligned delegations for their efforts to find a compromise text. We can support many of the positions expressed in the draft resolution.

We would emphasize, however, that what is required in this area is not the elaboration of new resolutions but rather the implementation of agreed decisions and above all respect for the clear principles of the United Nations Charter. By introducing a concept into our debates for which there exists no internationally accepted definition, we risk embarking upon polemics and friction instead of strengthening the possibilities for further mutual understanding.

In these circumstances, we have no alternative but to abstain in the vote.

I should like, however, to avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate once again the desire of the Nine to contribute to more just international relations, better preservation of the independence and equality of States, more fairly shared prosperity and increased security for all.

They originally reiterated these principles at the Copenhagen Summit Meeting of Heads of State or Government on 14 December 1973 and reaffirmed them at the Rome Summit Meeting on 17 July 1975, adding on that occasion that they would work to ensure that the United Nations achieved its aims, particularly as regards the maintenance of peace, the peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts, the furtherance of social and economic progress the defence of human rights and humanitarian actions.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.52.

On this occasion, we wish to commend the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on its initiative, as other delegations have already done. That initiative led to a fruitful exchange of opinions on the substance and the manifestations of hegemonism. That exchange helped to clarify the content of the term. This in turn was an important prerequisite for the clearer definition of the tasks and the goals of efforts to combat hegemonism. This is all the more necessary since time and again attempts have been made to cause confusion. Only this morning, we witnessed such an attempt. One must indeed be hit deeply to resort to such tirades and calumnies.

The draft resolution before us identifies the manifestations of hegemonism and in the seventh preambular paragraph states what has been corroborated in thousands of instances in the past and present, namely that hegemonism is a serious threat to international peace and security. Consequently hegemonism in all its manifestations is sharply denounced in the operative part of the resolution. That includes the rejection of any attempt to arrogate the right to take punitive action against other States. The draft resolution, however, goes beyond mere condemnation. It also points to the alternative, which, indeed, can only be that all States strictly adhere to the principles of the United Nations Charter. This is particularly true as regards respect for the sovereign equality of States and the right of people to self-determination. No State, whatever its reason may be, can be allowed to seek dominance over other States and peoples.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is convinced that the adoption of the draft resolution before us will help strengthen peaceful coexistence and the progress of détente

Mr. WINN (United States of America): The position of the United States on the effort to equate Zionism with racism is well known to all members of this Assembly. We find this allegation repugnant and totally unacceptable. For that reason we shall be obliged to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52. If this unacceptable reference were deleted,

(Mr. Winn, United States)

the United States would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 because we do not believe that an attempt to define hegemonism is a worth-while exercise in which the United Nations General Assembly should be involved at a time when serious and meaningful problems confront us. We appreciate the earnest effort that the sponsors of this resolution have made to find a basis for consensus. Nevertheless, the Charter of the United Nations clearly defines the rights and obligations of Members. It does not refer to vague abstractions like hegemonism, for obvious reasons. We do not see how the attainment of important goals of collective security, peaceful settlement and disarmament will be furthered by the attempt to draft precarious definitions of hegemonism.

In addition, we are concerned about certain aspects of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 that might be considered to redefine or limit the United Nations Charter. We do not wish to see abridged the rights of States to pursue individually or collectively the legitimate measures that are foreseen under Chapter VII and Chapter VIII of the Charter.

Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 on agenda item 126, regarding the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations reflects different views. It is an exhaustuve text and we support it for that reason and should like to express our gratitude to its sponsors.

I should like to take this opportunity to state that the reference to Zionism in this draft resolution is based on many things and particularly General Assembly resolution 1904 (XVIII), which declares that it is necessary to put an end to all forms of racial discrimination, laying stress on the fact that any doctrine of racial superiority is false and morally and socially reprehensible. We know that the Zionist entity bases itself on the theory of racial superiority and has created a State based upon racial and religious discrimination.

Moreover, the General Assembly in resolution 3151(XXVIII) condemned, inter alia, the unholy alliance between the racist régime of South Africa and the Zionist.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

régime. I would also refer to the Mexico Declaration of 1975 on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace. Within the framework of the World Conference of the International Women's Year held in Mexico, that Declaration stipulates that international co-operation requires liberty, independence, the elimination of colonialism neo-colonialism, Zionism, apartheid and racial discrimination in all their forms. The Declaration also stipulates that it is necessary to recognize the right of peoples to self-determination. I should also like to refer to a resolution of the Summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity held at Kampala in 1975 in which it was stated that the racist regime in occupied Palestine and the two racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa had similar imperialist sources and constituted one entity which sought to deny human dignity. Surely that should be considered racial discrimination.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

I would add that the Conferences of the non-aligned countries have affirmed in their numerous declarations, in particular in the Havana Declaration, that zionism is a racist movement. The Declaration of the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries held in Lima in August 1975 condemns zionism as a threat to international peace and security. All States were asked to oppose that racist theory.

Secondly, at its thirtieth session the General Assembly, in resolution 3379 (XXX) on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, stressed the fact that zionism is one of the forms of racial discrimination. Consequently ~~it~~ it appears that zionism is one of the forms of racial hegemonism that have been condemned regionally and by the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations. This is sufficient response to all those who do not want us to make reference to zionism in this draft resolution.

I would add that this draft resolution reflects the current situation in the world and diagnoses a malady from which mankind suffers today. That is why we cannot remedy part of the evil while leaving the rest. We have to deal with the whole disease if we do not want the whole body of mankind to wither away. Zionism exercises hegemony over all those who practise Judaism in the world and demands that they be loyal to the Zionist entity and not to the countries in which they live. Zionism puts Jews into a different category; consequently we must oppose zionism and condemn it.

Mr. THIEMELE (Ivory Coast) (interpretation from French): In keeping with the statement my delegation made on the question under discussion, I wish to state that we have no difficulty in supporting draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, which has been proposed by a number of non-aligned countries. We find in it the essence of the points that we regard as fundamental with respect to the policy of hegemonism and therefore we shall vote in favour of the text. However, we wish to express specific reservations on two paragraphs in that text, the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5, both of which contain notions that the Ivory Coast cannot accept. We reject the equation of zionism with racism.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Israel has requested that a separate vote be taken on the expression "including zionism" found in the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome, and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Bhutan, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela

The words "including zionism" were retained by 65 votes to 22, with 24 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela

* Subsequently the delegations of Burma and Democratic Yemen advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour. The delegation of Belgium advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 was adopted by 87 votes to 4, with 24 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): Hegemonism, as the term indicates, is a result of the will of a strong State to dominate weaker ones, which are thus deprived of the free exercise of a fundamental right deriving from the principles of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-intervention as laid down in international law and custom, the United Nations Charter and the relevant documents and resolutions which have been adopted since the inception of the United Nations.

Opposition to the practice of hegemonism, which is the object of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, cannot but be supported. How could anyone raise objections to most of the provisions of this draft, especially those which condemn domination, aggression and occupation and those which advocate respect for sovereignty, the United Nations Charter, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the obligation to resort to peaceful procedures for the settlement of international disputes? That is why we voted in favour of the draft resolution, thus stressing our support for its basic ideas.

We wish to state, however, that we have a series of important reservations concerning some of the provisions of the draft resolution. Thus we feel that the definition of hegemonism has been rather hastily drafted and that, instead of being confined to its true limits - in other words, those normally ascribed to it - it has been given, in the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5, a conceptual meaning that goes beyond that which our practice and intellect generally ascribe to it. The best is generally the enemy of the good, and those who support the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 have not appreciated the value of that adage.

* Subsequently the delegation of Democratic Yemen advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

However, our reservations do not stop there. In our view, the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 9 go too far. We recognize that no text can keep its initial value forever, because we live in a world where everything changes and everything vanishes, just as we do, but the fact that the world is in constant evolution makes necessary the scrupulous preparation of documents on the basis of concepts which, under the Charter, have been accorded general and repeated acceptance.

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

The problem is not hastily to dismantle and replace all the United Nations institutions but to ensure respect for them. Meanwhile there is a body competent to revise the Charter, which has long been seeking a solution, which we agree is desirable and perhaps inevitable in the long run.

Hence we regret that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, who worked so hard and enthusiastically, felt unable to accept certain suggested amendments put forward by various parties. Had they been able to do so, it is likely that we would have had before us a text that could have been adopted by consensus.

But, as I said at the beginning of this explanation, the principle of the draft being so important in the opinion of the Greek delegation, we voted in favour of the draft, while expressing the important reservations to which I have just referred to the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5, which we voted against.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. PHAM NGAC (Viet Nam): My delegation decided not to speak on this item, since we have already expressed our views in many documents distributed in this Committee, such as documents A/34/553 and A/34/541, to cite but two. We share the views of many delegations that spoke on the subject of hegemonism and expressed this hope that our Committee would be able to work smoothly, without engaging in polemics.

However, this morning the Chinese representative chose this occasion to attack Viet Nam, the very victim of the policy of hegemonism and expansionism of the Peking leaders. Their familiar slanders can in no way whitewash their policy of hegemonism and expansionism or cover up their true nature as dangerous enemies of peace and national independence.

My delegation rejects all those slanders. To us, China is the only hegemonistic Power in Asia. It has launched a dirty and barbarous war of aggression against Viet Nam. The draft resolution adopted today by this Committee condemns just that.

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

China's leaders, for decades, have pursued this policy of hegemonism and expansion against Viet Nam, Indo-China and South-East Asia and against all its neighbours. For the benefit of this Committee, I wish to quote one or two statements of the Peking leaders in this connexion.

In 1963 Chairman Mao Tsetung declared in Wu Han:

"I will be the Chairman of 500 million poor peasants, and my armies will march on South-East Asia."

Is that not regional hegemonism?

And in August 1975 Chairman Mao Tsetung again reaffirmed, in a meeting of the Political Bureau of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee:

"We must by all means seize South-East Asia, including Sout Viet Nam, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia and Singapore. This region is rich in raw materials - it is worth the costs involved. After seizing South-East Asia, we can increase our strength in this region. And we shall be strong enough to confront the Soviet-East European bloc. The East wind will prevail over the West wind."

Is that not global hegemonism?

Would the Chinese representative challenge all these statements of a clearly hegemonistic nature, both global and regional, made by his own leaders? The documents from which I have read are but a few examples.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to state that I did not ask to exercise my right of reply to the representative of zionism so as to repeat the allegations and untruths to which he resorted when he referred to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism. I asked to exercise my right of reply to unmask that representative's manoeuvres to divert this Committee's attention and prevent it from dealing with the substance of the matter under discussion, as is his custom.

The Zionist representative says that Iraq has submitted a draft resolution against Israel which diverts the First Committee from its real work on disarmament and international peace and security.

Is it not the duty of this Committee to consider Israel's nuclear armaments? Does the Zionist representative wish to accuse the members of this Committee and its officers of ignorance in examining draft resolutions and the procedures to be applied?

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The Zionist representative tries to be amusing when he speaks, saying that Iraq, some of the other Arab countries and certain countries friendly to us attempt to accuse zionism of all the evils in the world and that, if ever a draft resolution against tobacco were submitted, Israel would be accused of having discovered tobacco. The Zionist representative forgets that the peoples of the world represented here have condemned zionism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid. That condemnation will be repeated year after year, both within this Organization and outside it.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The peoples of the world will continue to fight alongside the Palestinian people to put an end to all these disgraceful manifestations, and I refer in particular to racial discrimination, apartheid and zionism. We are part of that section of mankind that seeks the well-being of all the peoples of the world. The Zionist representative should have explained why he did not vote in favour of this draft resolution. He should have said that his country is among those countries which practise hegemony, particularly since it occupies Palestine, as well as the territory of other Arab countries, by force, with the assistance of its ally, the United States of America.

The United States representative said that the link that has been established between Zionism and racial discrimination is unacceptable. My reply is that the United States position is well known. The United States assists zionism and similar régimes in Africa and other continents. His remarks strengthen our conviction that the United States is the only country that supports the Zionist entity in the Middle East.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): I cannot help being surprised at the language used by the products of the ghetto, in particular the Warsaw Ghetto, with regard to those whose lands they have usurped, thus making it possible for them to establish themselves as a country with a right to speak in this body. They are a people which throughout history has been given refuge. These are people whose memories are shortened by a feeling of military strength. That is what causes hegemony, of which zionism is one of the most dangerous aspects.

The CHAIRMAN: The list of speakers on agenda item 46 will be closed at 6 p.m. on 4 December. I urge delegates who plan to take part in the debate on that item to inscribe their names as soon as possible and to look in the journal for information as to when our next meeting will be held.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.