

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records*



UN/CA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Tuesday, 4 December 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 51ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY.

- (a) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES
- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION

Statements were made by:

Mr. Gauci (Malta)
Mr. Sujka (Poland)
Mr. Marinescu (Romania)
Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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-3528.

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

79-74303

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/34/PV.51
6 December 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 126

INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
(A/C.1/34/L.52) (concluded)

The CHAIRMAN: Before taking up the item on our agenda for this meeting, the Committee will conclude its hearing of statements by representatives wishing to explain their votes on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, which was adopted on Friday.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The Australian delegation voted against the draft resolution on "Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations". Our vote was a direct result of the outcome of the separate vote taken on the references in the resolution to zionism. Australia voted against the retention of the references to zionism contained in preambular paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 5. The outcome of the vote was that those references remained.

The position of Australia on attempts to equate zionism with racism has been made quite clear on a number of occasions: we find them unacceptable. Quite apart from the merits of the draft resolution, the retention of these references in it made the draft resolution as a whole unacceptable to the Australian delegation. We therefore had no option but to vote against it.

Ms. SHARPE (Jamaica): The Jamaican delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 which was adopted by the Committee last Friday. However, we wish to reserve our position on preambular paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 5 in view of the references in those paragraphs equating zionism with racism, which we do not support.

Mr. d' La GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The common abstention of the countries of the European Community with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 was explained before the vote by the representative of Ireland. The French delegation wishes to add to that explanation a few brief comments.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism refers to a concept which is as old as human history itself, but it tries to introduce in the United Nations a new principle. It is correct to say that this concept is implicitly covered by the provisions of the Charter and we are, of course, in agreement with the goal sought. However, we consider that an initiative aimed at the formulation of a principle of this scope could have been more thoroughly prepared. We also consider that a resolution whose purpose is to define and to enshrine a principle can have the required authority only if it obtains a consensus.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

We were prepared to seek that consensus on the basis of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52. We recognize that in its fundamental points that document contains provisions to which we can wholeheartedly subscribe. But it contains others with respect to which we have objections and reservations, and we note that notions and objectives extraneous to the condemnation of hegemonism have been introduced into the draft resolution at the expense of its true purpose. In this connexion, we are thinking in particular of the position taken in favour of establishing a new system of international relations. The community of nations has available to it the system based on the Charter which, if fully applied, can meet the needs of that community.

The United Nations must make progress in implementing the provisions of the Charter in such a way as to ensure that responsibilities are shared by all. But in the difficult circumstances the international community is now experiencing it seems imprudent to us to question this system which is based on commitments to which we have all subscribed.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): It is well known that Japan is fundamentally opposed to the policy and practice of hegemony. My delegation wishes to make it very clear that Japan's position remains firm and unchanged in that regard.

However, as there were some elements in the preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, as well as in its operative paragraphs, which in our view are hardly relevant to hegemonism and on which Japan has to reserve its position, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): My delegation is pleased to have joined those other delegations that cast an affirmative vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 adopted by this Committee.

However, we abstained on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, as they were not consistent with our position on General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), adopted at the thirtieth session.

Mr. CALPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, in conformity with the position it expressed during the general debate on agenda item 126, Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations, was unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, because the amendment proposed was not acceptable so that the draft resolution in our view was selective.

Without going into the question of whether or not zionism constitutes the practice of the policy of hegemonism, we believe that its inclusion in a general draft resolution entitled "Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations", while not including examples of the practice of the policy of hegemonism, is to ignore the contents of the Charter of the United Nations, which condemns such practices.

Mr. JOHNSON (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish):

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, in conformity with its traditional policy of rejection and condemnation of any form of domination, subjugation, interference or intervention by a State or group of States against the sovereignty, independence or territorial integrity of any other State. Ecuador condemns and rejects hegemonism in the forms of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism or racism. It firmly believes that the policy of hegemonism, at any level and in any sphere, is an odious practice and, furthermore, constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

Lastly, on the express instructions of my Government, I should like to reiterate, as my delegation has done on past occasions, that Ecuador does not agree that zionism can be considered as a form of racism.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of agenda item 126.

AGENDA ITEM 46

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

- (a) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES;
- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the consideration of the last item on its agenda, Implementation of the Declaration of the Strengthening of International Security. For the purposes of this debate, members will have before them the following main documents: firstly, a report by the Secretary-General containing information received from 18 States concerning the non-interference in the internal affairs of States, A/34/192 and Add. 1; secondly, a report by the Secretary-General containing information and suggestions received from 21 States relating to the implementation of the Declaration to the Strengthening of International Security, A/34/193 and Add.1. Addendum 2 to this document, containing a reply from the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, will be issued shortly; thirdly, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54, sponsored by 14 States on the development and strengthening of the principle of good neighbourliness between States; fourthly, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55, sponsored by 20 States, relating to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; and fifthly, the draft declaration A/C.1/34/L.56, on the Inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. This draft declaration has not yet been circulated, but it should be available this afternoon at the latest.

(The Chairman)

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970. It solemnly reaffirmed the validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and called upon all States to adhere strictly to them in their international relations. The Declaration took note of the close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of nations. Since 1971 we have considered annually the international situation within the context of the Declaration. During the last three years, the traditional resolution on strengthening international security has been complemented by resolutions on non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Last year, two additional resolutions were adopted under this item: one was a Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace (33/73), and the second, related to the situation in Nicaragua (33/76). I express my sincere hope that the deliberation on this, our last, item will be constructive and contribute, along with our previous debates, all of which have been concerned in a real sense with the strengthening of international security, to the achievement of the noble purposes of the Declaration.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): One consistent theme emerging from the statements made in the general debate was the sense that the time has now come for the United Nations to proceed from words to action. This should be our commitment as we enter the decade of the 1980s. It is certainly very much the deep conviction of my own Government, as I have endeavoured to emphasize on so many occasions in the past.

Even as we uneasily sense that new dark clouds are already gathering on the international horizon, our actual experience in this Committee, year in and year out, provides us with undeniable evidence of a remarkable lack of progress in our yearly discussions on the substance of the items already before us. There is so much we still have to accomplish in order to reach targets we have already set ourselves, to which theoretically all nations have long been committed.

Three and a half decades of debate have now come to a close. We know that too many of the resolutions we have adopted have come back, largely unfulfilled, only to haunt us, with each succeeding year. This highlights our chronic inability to accomplish in deeds what we advocate in words.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

It should also bring us to the sober realization that we have been reaffirming principles so often in the past that we are beginning to run the risk of undermining the validity of these same universally accepted principles through endless repetition, in the face of recurring evidence that serious violations of one or more fundamental principles occur all too frequently, with our Organization remaining paralysed.

I recall, for instance, that the item we are now discussing was introduced in this Assembly with much fanfare on the auspicious occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. After lengthy negotiations we adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We have discussed this item ever since. Yet despite wholehearted endorsement of that Declaration, the practical "strengthening of security" that has actually taken place since the adoption of the Declaration has been characterized mainly by the insidious escalation of the nuclear and conventional balance of terror.

This frustrating phenomenon unfortunately has been and remains one of the consistent features of the policies of the nuclear-weapon States, spear-headed in particular by the two super-Powers, in an ever-escalating spiral in which other countries are inevitably dragged in. Even as we debate disarmament here, we can read concurrently and practically every day in reputable scientific journals early warning signals of a new round of escalation in lethal weapons systems.

Other new items were similarly introduced in this Committee in the intervening years. This year was no exception. In the letter of the Soviet Union introducing the item on hegemonism, for instance, on which my delegation gave some preliminary comments, we were correctly reminded that disarmament and the strengthening of international security are "prerequisites for consolidating and deepening détente and strengthening the foundations of universal peace" (A/34/243). I need not recall that we - that is, all the Members of the United Nations - were committed to disarmament and to international security long before we were committed to détente.

In addition, disarmament is much more specific and international security much more comprehensive than détente. Yet we are so often regaled with eulogies on the progress of détente as if to imply that those essential prerequisites had already been achieved - and we know that this is far from the case.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

We might also consider a new approach in the language of our resolutions. We have too much diffusion of ideas, too much vague recalling of previous resolutions we have long forgotten. I would feel that we stand a chance of making much better progress if we manage to agree by consensus every year, even on a few sentences which show definite prospects of being translated into substantive action. At the rate we are going, we are literally drowning in a sea of words on paper, which we forget as soon as the ink on the voting records has dried out.

In brief, we have to consolidate instead of diluting commitments we have already agreed to and, more importantly, we must concentrate from now on, not on new definitions, but on consideration of effective means to translate theory into practice.

In this approach it will be evident that the permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility, given to them by the founding fathers of this Organization. Those special privileges were, of course, intended to be used in the international interest, not abused in the national interest. The major Powers have so far failed to live up to their high responsibilities.

The historical record shows that domination and exploitation of weak States by stronger States has not been halted but has regrettably continued, even after the post-war period. In large measure this was due to the fact that whenever objective and impartial observers considered that acts of coercion had occurred, or were about to occur, differences of opinion among the permanent members of the Security Council in the evaluation of such acts more often than not paralyzed the Council.

Consequently, the full potential powers of the Security Council on behalf of the international community have rarely been utilized. In addition, certain doctrines have been advanced and spheres of influence have been identified, which have not helped the causes of justice, dignity and freedom, and have left a legacy of unresolved problems which confront us to this day, even if major conflict has been contained in the process. Among the most important of those issues are the questions of the Middle East, Palestine, Cyprus and Korea.

Not only have the major Powers failed to live up to their responsibilities, but they also look with suspicion or indifference at policies and suggestions which advocate practical proposals for peaceful change. The non-aligned countries have consequently had to assume a specific but very difficult role in order to fill the void left by the inaction of the major Powers. For instance, non-aligned countries have been urging the strengthening of the definition of the essential fundamental principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. On the basis of their varied historical experience, they have prepared a comprehensive code of conduct which would tend to eliminate the erroneous practices of the past.

The non-aligned countries are also pressing for a review of the Charter of the United Nations and its practices, including the use of the veto, and for strengthening the objectives of the United Nations by such measures, for instance, as the creation of zones of peace and co-operation. These seem to be the most fertile fields for collective work.

The time has therefore come for the major Powers to extend all necessary help to the non-aligned countries in these objective investigations. We should collectively determine what practical steps all of us, but particularly the privileged members of the Security Council with their special responsibilities for leadership and for the maintenance of peace, can undertake to remove the causes of fear.

We have resolutely to turn away from and reverse the process of automatic confrontation. We have to investigate methods to strengthen, improve and reactivate the mechanisms of the United Nations in the constant vigilance and co-operation which is essential to advance the freedom and dignity of peoples, and to promote peace and progress throughout the world.

In addition to these efforts in this Organization, there remain the equally important contributions of individual and regional efforts. My own country, to the fullest extent of its own capabilities, has already made its individual contribution. The odds against Malta's declared objective when it was first enunciated in 1971 could not have been more formidable, but we did not raise our hands in horror and say that it was impossible. We did not

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

succumb to the counsel of despair. With help from friendly countries, and over a phased time-frame, we tackled resolutely what others described as impossible and we have been rewarded with considerable success, in direct proportion, of course, to the challenge we set ourselves and to the efforts we expended.

In 1971 we had indicated openly what we had in mind. In each subsequent year we gave an account of the progress of our endeavours. This year I announced the historic achievement of our stated objective, which I have already had occasion to outline in detail in previous interventions at this session. I need not repeat these details now, except to say that what we did in our own country, exclusively by peaceful means, was of equal benefit to our region.

Even as we continue to strive for further progress at the national level, we are painfully conscious that there is much that calls for urgent action in our region. We know that the major present motive force for progress is the spontaneous homogeneity of the future, as opposed to the coercive hegemonism of the past in the policies of nations as together they pursue the popular desire for economic and social progress in a co-operative environment. The steady progress of the countries of the ASEAN and of the European Community are clear indications of the potential for concerted action to surmount enduring obstacles and instead promote regional progress.

There are, of course, other regions where significant progress can be achieved as a result of concerted action. Among the most promising is the Mediterranean. The existence of trouble spots in the Mediterranean should not be a deterrent but rather a spur towards practical efforts to overcome division and to derive benefit from the wealth of intellectual and material resources that endow the region, as also from the historical affinity of the countries bordering the Mediterranean.

Malta intends to play an active central role in these essential efforts without which the present serious situation can easily deteriorate, with alarming consequences for all. The Mediterranean can be turned, gradually but surely, into a zone of peaceful co-operation through the creation of a sense of identity, which recognises the advantages of Arab unity and the common interests and interdependence shared by European and Arab countries.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Many Mediterranean countries have already publicly declared their political determination to pursue this goal.

This challenging objective provides the momentum for an evolutionary process that will eventually become the best guarantee for the independence and security of Mediterranean countries, free from big-Power rivalry and in the interests of peace in the region and throughout the world.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The primary role in the search for comprehensive solutions to Mediterranean problems belongs to the countries of the region. The groundwork studies have already been carried out. On Malta's initiative, in February of this year - for the first time in recorded history - potential sectors of co-operation in specific projects in the economic, scientific and cultural fields were thoroughly examined among countries parties to or associated with the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE).

Despite divisive issues introduced from outside the region, many sectors of beneficial co-operation were singled out and new initiatives envisaged. These matters, as well as the over-all aspects of security, will be taken up at the next CSCE follow-up meeting scheduled for next year in Madrid. Malta is preparing for that meeting, in the expectation and with the insistence that it will be action-oriented, since even at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe the participating States have had a marathon two-year session of debate behind them, and therefore the transition from definition to achievement is already overdue.

My Government has accordingly already initiated a series of consultations among Mediterranean countries parties to the CSCE and those members of the Non-Aligned Movement so as to exchange views, in advance of the meeting in Madrid, and to single out practical proposals for regional co-operation which can be pursued. It is only in this way that we can ensure a successful outcome for the meeting through practical expansion of spheres of co-operation.

In conclusion, I would say that here in this Committee we inevitably harp on the divisions among us, on the problems that daunt us, on the obstacles that stand in the way. But we should not forget the vast reservoir of common interest that can serve as our inspiration and our hope. As we set universal goals, we must also find the most efficient means of attaining them. The national, sub-regional, regional and interregional approach has already proved its value. It also demonstrates the need for supportive mechanisms tailored to the special circumstances of particular regions. Where these exist, they have proved responsive to needs and are constantly in the process of evaluation and reform. Where they do not exist, they can be created, to serve as a visible focal-point of efficient progress.

It will be in the light of these considerations that my delegation will take its position on the draft resolutions submitted to this Committee.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Ten years ago, the question of the strengthening of international security was first inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly, and indeed it has been on the agendas of consecutive sessions. A year later, the Assembly adopted its historic Declaration on the subject and, ever since, Member States of the Organization have systematically informed the Secretary-General of measures they were taking in pursuance of the Declaration.

The Government of the Polish People's Republic has always shown great interest in consistent implementation of the Declaration. In our latest reply to the Secretary-General's note of 27 July last, contained in document A/34/193, we have pointed out again that:

"Action to consolidated international peace and security has been the basic guideline of the foreign policy of the Polish People's Republic throughout the 35 years of its existence." (A/34/193, p. 26)

Far be it from me to repeat in detail my Government's reply. I wish only to touch upon some of the aspects of the issue at hand which seem to us of particular importance.

During the last 10 years, considerable progress has been achieved in consolidating détente, especially in Europe. It should surprise no one why Poland attaches such great importance to the consolidation of international security. Twice in this century alone, our people has directly experienced the horrors of war. And what has been extremely important since the end of the Second World War is that only in an atmosphere of détente could we and can we create favourable conditions for our strategy of the peaceful socio-economic development of our country and people. Small wonder, therefore, that we have viewed the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in 1975 as a great beginning for a new political spirit paving its way through the complexities of present-day international relations. The most important question now is to enhance that new climate so as to have it followed by tangible measures in the sphere of military détente. It is constant view of my Government that without military détente the whole process of political détente, which has so successfully started, could be jeopardized.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

It goes without saying that the signing of the SALT II treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States last summer was an important contribution to the strengthening of international security and to the consolidation of the process of detente, as well as its universality.

In this context, we can only regret that the initiatives of the socialist countries in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, as well as the momentous proposals recently made in Berlin by President Leonid Brezhnev, aimed at the lowering of military concentrations and the reduction of armed forces and armaments in that part of the world have not yet met with the understanding of our Western partners or a readiness on their part to engage in proper negotiations. Instead, we are unfortunately witnessing plans of some NATO countries to deploy new kinds of missiles and new nuclear weapons in Western Europe which, if implemented, would spark a new spiralling of the arms race and seriously undermine the process of détente. That is why NATO's attempts to obtain an over-all military superiority over the Warsaw Treaty constitute a direct and serious threat to international peace and security at large.

May I recall at this juncture that, together with our socialist allies, we consistently maintain our constructive programme of measures which, once adopted, would undoubtedly contribute to the strengthening of mutual trust and military détente. They are contained in the Declaration of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, dated 27 November 1978 (A/33/392) and the Communiqué of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, dated 23 May 1979 (A/34/275).

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

What else is needed to consolidate international security? In our opinion, there is an urgent need to make every effort to eliminate the tensions still existing in other parts of the world. I should like to present my Government's position on some of those questions.

The General Assembly is now discussing in plenary meetings the item on the situation in the Middle East, which, obviously, has become more strained since the conclusion of the separatist agreement between Egypt and Israel. That agreement has generated new tensions and complications and made it more difficult to reach a comprehensive and just settlement in the region.

We reaffirm our full support for the African peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia in their struggle to gain genuine independence. We share their rejection of any attempts at alleged solutions which, in reality, are meant to extend the rule of neo-colonialism and racism. We condemn the policy of apartheid of South Africa, which is threatening the independence of African States.

In Asia, we fully support the efforts of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, in the tremendous and arduous task of reconstruction of the country, which was devastated by long barbarous wars of aggression. The many years of struggle of the glorious people of Viet Nam for their national and social liberation are an outstanding contribution to the global process of decolonization and national affirmation. We also highly appreciate the efforts of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in the process of stabilizing the situation in the region. It is really contributing to the strengthening of peace and security. We in Poland have been deeply shocked by the immensity of the misery and crimes inflicted upon the people of Kampuchea by the Pol Pot régime. We firmly believe that universal recognition of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is an indispensable premise upon which to promote the cause of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

Still in Asia, the situation existing in the Korean peninsula is also one of the sources of international tension and certainly does not enhance stabilization in the Far East. Poland has always supported the initiatives of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at a peaceful reunification of the country on democratic principles and without any interference. We are of the opinion that the indispensable conditions for lowering tension and for creating conditions favouring Korea's reunification are replacement of the armistice treaty by a peace treaty and the withdrawal of foreign troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

I should now like to turn to another aspect of the item under consideration which is of particular interest to my delegation. Nearly a year ago, on 15 December 1978, the General Assembly adopted without a dissenting vote its historic Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. The Polish People's Republic, which initiated the adoption of that Declaration, views that document as our common success in our common endeavour for peace, strengthening security, mutual understanding and friendly co-operation among nations.

In our opinion, the particular significance of that document is that it has formulated, with the active participation of representatives of Governments of the overwhelming majority of all States of the world, the inherent right of every nation and every human being to live in peace. We see it as a political document of direct relevance to various disarmament negotiations.

We are glad to note that the adoption of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace has had world-wide reverberations. I should like merely to recall that the Declaration inspired the 107th session of the Executive Council of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to adopt an appropriate resolution, which makes direct reference to the Declaration, reaffirming its principles and appealing for their implementation. Another encouraging example is that, at the Sixth General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL), held in Quito, its participants also adopted a resolution, based on the provisions of the Declaration, concerning the right of peoples of the region to live in peace.

As one of the initiators of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, Poland considers it its noble duty to develop activities for its implementation. My Minister for Foreign Affairs, Emil Wojtaszek, spoke of our intention in that regard in the course of the general debate last September, and only a few days ago he summarized our present efforts in his letter to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim. The text of his letter is before the First Committee as General Assembly document A/C.1/34/11. I shall briefly refer to but a few examples.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Shortly after the adoption of the Declaration by the General Assembly, the Sejm - the Polish Parliament - adopted its own resolution on the document. Since then numerous press interviews, radio and television statements by leading representatives of Polish political, cultural and scientific life, discussions of experts as well as discussions in pedagogic, professional and youth quarters offer convincing evidence of the commitment of the people of Poland to the promotion of ideas for the preparation for life in peace and the implementation of the principles of the Declaration.

The most important and basic event in this connexion was the decision on the implementation of the Declaration in Poland adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic on 18 October 1979. The following are some of the highlights of that decision. Education and schooling for children is one of the areas in which Poland intends to concentrate its efforts to ensure the fullest possible implementation of the Declaration. The decision also provides for an even greater emphasis of the idea of preparation for life in peace at all levels of the country's school and educational system. As regards higher education, the decision provides for an adequate reflection of the subject-matter of the Declaration both in instructional activities among students, particularly within the framework of seminar work and lectures, and in scientific research and publications, primarily in the area of social science and the humanities. Many studies have already appeared in both Polish and foreign publications on the newly codified concept of the preparation of societies for life in peace.

The decision further places special emphasis on the significant role of science and culture in disseminating the ideas of the Declaration. We are confident that both the work and the voice of Polish scholars and artists in support of the Declaration will join the voices of intellectuals from other countries in popularizing its purposes, provisions and principles. The decision emphasizes also the importance of the mass media in widely disseminating the idea of preparation for life in peace.

In our opinion, the political, civic, professional, women and youth organizations can play a particularly significant role in the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

As Poland's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Emil Wojtaszek stated in the aforementioned letter to the Secretary-General regarding my country's activities and plans for the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace:

"I sincerely believe that they will be received with interest and a positive response on the part of the Member States of the United Nations."

(A/C.1/34/11, p. 3)

Our hope is based on the conviction that the implementation of that Declaration would be an important and concrete contribution and would also have long-lasting effects on the process of the strengthening of international security.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): The strengthening of international security today represents a major preoccupation of the peoples. At the same time it is a paramount task of the United Nations of great urgency in the present international conditions, which are particularly complex and contradictory.

The profound changes which have taken place, and which continue to take place, in international life have brought out ever more strongly two diametrically opposed trends: the trend to maintain and to divide spheres of influence and domination and the trend to put an end to the imperialist policy of force, dismantling spheres of influence and to guarantee the independent action of all nations, détente and peace in the world.

Romania is convinced that there are forces which, if they act together, can prevent war, promote a policy of independence and détente and ensure international peace and security. To be sure, that desirable phenomenon cannot take place by itself. It requires concrete action on the part of every State as well as action by the United Nations, with all such action directed towards the establishment of new, democratic and equitable international relations and towards the cessation of the arms race and the development of the resources of all peoples for the benefit of their economic and social progress, and towards redoubled efforts

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

in favour of détente, co-operation and peace. In our opinion, that is the only alternative to a worsening of the international situation, and the only only course which might offer a bright prospect of peace for mankind.

The problems on which the strengthening of international security depends today are numerous. One of the goals of paramount importance, in our view, is the establishment of peace and security in Europe, the continent where the greatest density of armaments and troops, as well as the two opposing military blocs, is to be found. The problems of a military nature in Europe, military disengagement and disarmament on the continent, require special attention. Genuine security presupposes the withdrawal of troops from foreign territory back to their national frontiers, as well as the reduction of the troops and arms of each State and the reduction of military expenditures. In this connexion, we believe that it would be extremely useful to organize a special conference devoted to disarmament in Europe and to conclude a general pact on the non-use or the threat of use of force and the non-use of nuclear and conventional weapons.

At the same time, we feel that it is necessary to intensify efforts to develop extensive and unhampered co-operation between all European countries and to resist with greater firmness the negative factors which still exist in the life of the continent, the forces which block our progress towards détente. In this spirit, Romania has been working, and will continue to work, for the adequate preparation of the meeting in Madrid in 1980, so that it might fulfil the expectations of peoples and provide a strong impetus for the strengthening of co-operation and security on the continent.

Within the context of preoccupations aimed at building security on the European continent, Romania attaches great value to the development of relations of good neighbourliness and co-operation with the countries of the Balkans, and is working towards increasing confidence and co-operation in that region and the adoption of measures to make the Balkans a zone of peace, free of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

A major target for action with regard to the strengthening of international security is the elimination of all remaining conflicts in various parts of the world. Romania has always firmly supported the need to respect unanimously recognized rules of international law, the need to show moderation in the solution of various problems and the need to abstain from any action which might lead to tension and a worsening of the international situation. Romania has been actively working for the peaceful solution of all problems inherited from the long colonial domination in Africa, Asia and in other parts of the world.

The immense number of weapons and armaments - in particular nuclear weapons - that have been accumulated throughout the world brings us closer to the time when the international community will have to make a decisive choice between two possible alternatives: to continue the arms race with its adverse consequences, or to pass resolutely to the achievement of disarmament and the safeguarding of peace. The interests of each people and of human civilization itself require that everything be done in order to reject firmly the frenzied policy of armament and to promote consistently a policy of disarmament and peace.

Peace, security and co-operation are equally bound up with the final elimination of colonialism, with the elimination of under-development and with the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

The motive force of development and of the progress of each people resides in the guarantee of its independence and sovereignty, of its right to dispose freely of its own destiny, protected from all acts of interference, pressure and aggression. In the present circumstances of the political life of the world, that is a fundamental condition for the strengthening of international security. The facts demonstrate that every act of violation of the independence and national sovereignty of a people not only has very serious adverse effects upon the people itself but also damages the interests of all nations and their desire for peace, confidence and security.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Romania is convinced, in the light of its own experience with regard to friendly relations and collaboration with all States regardless of their social system, that absolute respect for international law constitutes the only basis that can make it possible to develop fruitful co-operation among States and a climate of international peace and security. We believe that the United Nations can make important contributions in the future, as it has done in the past, to the more specific definition and development of new democratic rules and principles for relations among States, as well as for their implementation in the conduct of all States.

It is in this spirit that the Romanian delegation would like to submit for the attention of this Committee the problem of development and the consolidation of the principle of good-neighbourliness between States. We are profoundly convinced that the application and development of the principle of good-neighbourliness is of paramount importance to promote understanding and co-operation between States, to prevent situations which might lead to conflict and to strengthen international security. The concepts of neighbourliness, and indeed of good-neighbourliness, are perhaps among the oldest concepts in international relations and of international law.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

They are just as relevant today and will remain so as long as there exist sovereign and independent States in the world. Historically speaking, the first external relations of a people, and subsequently of a nation and of a State, have been relations with their immediate neighbours. These relations, in fact, are to be found at the basis of the elaboration of principles and rules of conduct governing the relations between States, so that it is possible to say that relations between neighbours in the most diversified fields lie to a large extent at the root of the formation of contemporary international law.

It is a fact that, in practice, all States attach particular importance to relations with their neighbours. It suffices to refer to the statements of heads of delegations at the present session in order to realize that for the most part they have all referred in one way or another to relations with their neighbours and States in their zones. As a matter of fact, the principle of good-neighbourliness is reflected in the provisions of numerous bilateral and multilateral treaties, including documents of such importance as the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

As part of its foreign policy aimed at the broad development of relations of many-sided collaboration with all States without distinction as to their social régime, Romania attaches particular importance to its relations with its neighbour States. In referring to this constant feature of Romanian foreign policy, the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Romania and President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, reaffirmed at a recent party congress:

"We assign top priority to the strengthening of relations with our neighbour socialist countries and we are firmly decided to do everything, now and in the future, to extend our relations of good-neighbourliness, collaboration and solidarity with them".

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

This policy, pursued consistently, finds its expression in close collaboration on many planes with our neighbour States and is strongly stimulated by a frequent exchange of visits and encounters on the highest and on other levels, in the implementation of numerous acts of co-operation, including the building in common of hydroelectric and industrial projects of major economic importance for our countries, and in intensive scientific, cultural and other exchanges. This policy is intended to fashion genuine models of relations of good-neighbourliness and friendship between independent and sovereign States, making it possible for their respective peoples to apply all their efforts and resources to economic and social development.

In submitting the question of the development and strengthening of the principle of good-neighbourliness for consideration by this Committee, we have acted in the belief that this is a problem of interest to all States.

Geographical proximity generates a large range of extremely diverse relations between States. Moreover, the surge in human activities as a result of the great progress achieved by modern science and technology has given rise to new possibilities for co-operation, but also to a multitude of new problems which we must now solve.

It emerges from the study and observation of the positive practice of States and of bilateral and multilateral international documents relating to good-neighbourliness, as well as from the relevant jurisprudence, that the basis of this concept lies in strict respect for the principles of independence, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, equality of rights, non-interference in internal affairs, non-use or threat of use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Essentially, it is a question of showing respect for the freedom of each people and the independence of each State, and consequently it involves the inadmissibility of the domination of one State by another, regardless of the form that this might take, including the establishment of zones of influence and domination. These principles are a sine qua non of good-neighbourliness.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

They are reaffirmed and highlighted each time States refer to their good-neighbourly relations. This is tantamount to saying that there is a general and profound conviction that without respect for these principles it is not possible to speak of good-neighbourliness.

A lengthy practice of relations of good-neighbourliness between numerous States has made it possible to crystallize a series of rules of conduct which are specific and of modalities which assure the peaceful coexistence of States, a climate of understanding and active co-operation, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and the prevention of states of tension and conflict. Abstention from any act which could constitute an intervention in the domestic affairs of another State and the prohibition of the use of one's own territory in any way that might harm a neighbour State or any other State has acquired an ever richer content as international society has progressed. Today, these are rules that are generally recognized as the principles of good-neighbourliness. The fullest possible definition of such rules and their components could promote the development of relations between neighbours and could eliminate possibilities of tension in mutual relations.

We believe that an examination of the principle and practice of good-neighbourliness within the United Nations with the active participation of all States could contribute to the establishment of the political and legal content of that concept and the generalization of certain rules of conduct between States, thus promoting respect for and development of international law and, on that basis, the strengthening of worldwide peace and security.

Secondly we believe that the United Nations, its organs and its related specialized agencies must focus their attention on the adoption and implementation of specific measures which could provide the necessary material support for the effective application and the strengthening of the efficacy of the principle of good-neighbourliness. By way of example, we must mention a proposal along these lines put forward by Romania to create security zones between States on either side of national frontiers from which troops and arms would be withdrawn and where only units of border guards would remain.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

At the same time, the creation might be contemplated of zones of peace and good-neighbourliness in different parts of the world, an objective which Romania has been striving to promote in the Balkan region for a long time. There is a series of proposals of genuine value formulated in the same spirit by Non-Aligned States and designed to facilitate the peaceful settlement of certain controversial problems and to ensure the promotion of relations of good-neighbourliness between States members of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Interaction between neighbouring States is very diversified in nature. The sharing by countries of a land frontier poses a series of problems related, for example, to the utilization in their common interests of natural resources located in border areas, to the minor border traffic engaged in by many countries, to the granting of medical and rescue assistance in the case of natural calamities and catastrophes in the border zone, to the battle against plant and animal diseases, to legal assistance to be afforded to each other by States in the zone, and so on. Neighbours separated by water frontiers, maritime or non-maritime, also face many problems of great importance. Neighbourliness underground has specific aspects touching, for example, on the exploitation of natural deposits - particularly liquid deposits - located beneath the frontier between two or more States. Neighbourliness as it applies to air space necessarily determines relations of co-operation to solve certain problems such as - again by way of example - those related to radio and television broadcasts in the frontier zone and in the air traffic corridors, to air pollution and to measures designed to effect atmospheric changes.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We know that a number of States situated in different parts of the world have in certain circumstances resorted to setting up bilateral organs designed to promote co-operation and to resolve problems of common interest. In other cases, they have worked out other methods for solving common problems or else they have resorted to the framework provided by the United Nations in order to examine and to find, in conjunction with other States, solutions to problems that were of interest to the international community as a whole.

The experience and study of such agreements, which are specific to relations between neighbouring States, can obviously reveal the ways and means available for solving certain problems that exist or that may arise in different parts of the world, based on the experience and positive actions that have led to the solution of similar problems in other geographical areas. It will also be possible to proceed in certain cases to the elaboration and conclusion of international instruments that are regional or universal in nature in order to facilitate international co-operation in resolving certain specific problems of general interest.

In view of the unprecedented development of means of communication, science and technology, even the most remote States are becoming neighbours in practice, in the sense that problems similar to those that formerly existed only between neighbours can and, indeed, do arise. The effects of serious air pollution or of interference in atmospheric conditions - to mention but two examples - are frequently felt at a considerable distance and can affect peoples and States situated in very remote areas. Accordingly, certain standards of good-neighbourliness which in the past applied to States with a common border now apply as well to relations between States that are not geographical neighbours. This fact, too, lends a universal dimension to good-neighbourliness that must be given in-depth study with a view to identifying ways and means for strengthening co-operation among States.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The Romanian delegation holds to the conviction that in concentrating the attention of States on possibilities for increasing the effectiveness of the principle of good neighbourliness, useful ideas, proposals and initiatives may result that can lead to concrete measures and programmes of co-operation, some of which could be undertaken under the aegis of the specialized agencies. This could contribute to strengthening trust among States and to promoting rapprochement and mutual understanding among peoples and friendship and co-operation among nations.

The delegation of Romania, on the basis of consultations held with a large number of States, and in concert with the delegations of Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, the Ivory Coast, Morocco, Mauritania, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yugoslavia, has prepared draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54, concerning the development and strengthening of the principle of good neighbourliness between States, which it is my honour to bring to the Committee's attention.

The purpose of this draft resolution is to further a process of clarification and development of the principle of good neighbourliness and to strengthen its effectiveness. We envision a process that would enjoy the participation of all States, who would be consulted with respect to the political and legal content they intend to give to the concept of good neighbourliness. Similarly, the draft resolution invites the active participation of specialized agencies which, on the basis of their experience in matters concerning international co-operation in specific areas, can make important contributions to clarifying and developing standards of good neighbourliness.

We are convinced that, like other principles contained in the Charter and formulated in general terms that have been or are being clarified and developed, the principle of good neighbourliness can also be defined and developed. In presenting this proposal, it is in not our intention purely and simply to restate the provisions of the Charter, but rather to agree - basing ourselves

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

upon its provisions and on the long and rich experience of States that have had good neighbourly relations, on standards, modalities and ways of strengthening international security. Our basic concern is to synthesize the results of the experiences of all States with regard to good neighbourliness and to identify those elements that are universally valid. We are of the opinion that the process we are proposing to launch will have long-term beneficial effects, because we believe that it responds to the vital and permanent needs of States.

In the world in which we live, neighbourliness will continue to be an objective situation which man cannot alter from a geographical point of view, but which he can obviously improve politically, legally and morally. The United Nations, which has in its Charter inscribed good neighbourliness as one of its basic objectives, must play a decisive role in this connexion. We hope that the practical experience and especially the wisdom of all States, regardless of their size, their social and political system or their culture, can also make a signal contribution to the improvement of relations between neighbours and international relations as a whole and, therefore, to the cause of peace and security of all States.

Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet-Nam) (interpretation from French): Today, our Committee is discussing agenda item 46, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

My delegation takes pleasure in recalling that at the last session of the General Assembly, Viet Nam was a sponsor of resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978 pertaining to the "Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace", an historic Declaration which, the representative of Poland has just reminded us, is being implemented by many countries and international organizations.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

The delegation of Viet Nam welcomes the fact that in implementing the aforementioned Declaration, the People's Republic of Poland has undertaken many activities in many areas over the course of this year, particularly with regard to education, science and culture.

I can assure the delegation of Poland that the people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam warmly welcomes this important political initiative by the sister republic of Poland.

In addition, the delegation takes pleasure in expressing its appreciation for the appeal to the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to the parliaments of all countries of the world made by the representatives of the National Assemblies of the Warsaw Pact member countries at their meeting at Prague on 16 and 17 October with regard to the initiative of the Soviet Union to reduce unilaterally the number of its troops stationed in central Europe, and the constructive proposal made by the Warsaw Pact member States to promote trust among States and to limit the threat of war in Europe that is set forth in draft resolution A/LC.1/34/L.6, dated 2 November 1979, which has been presented to our Committee.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

Now I should like to come to the situation in our region.

Never have the developments in the Indo-Chinese peninsula over the past years brought into so much prominence the current question of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly and the importance of a systematic examination of its implementation by a world organization such as the United Nations.

For its part, the Vietnamese delegation wishes to take this opportunity to expound to our colleagues in this Committee the situation on the implementation of the Declaration in our region.

Since 1978 the Chinese rulers have, along with their activities of sabotage in the economic and political fields, feverishly intensified their military pressure on the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam from all directions; and at the end of that same year the world witnessed the first war of aggression against Viet Nam waged by the Chinese rulers through their henchmen in Phnom Penh, having as its objective the occupation of the frontier province of Tay Ninh and the advance towards Ho Chi Minh city. On Peking's orders, 19 out of 23 divisions of the Pol Pot army launched a massive attack on 23 December 1978 against the south-west border of Viet Nam.

Obviously this attack was aimed at weakening Viet Nam so as to facilitate the offensive by Chinese troops in the north. But exercising their right of legitimate self-defence, the Vietnamese had totally foiled that military plan. The first defeat sustained by Peking on the south-western front did not, however, prevent the Chinese expansionists from putting into practice their strategy of a two-pronged attack, and they carried out a few weeks later a large-scale offensive on the northern frontier of our country.

The offensive was launched on 17 February 1979 by 600,000 Chinese troops against Viet Nam along the whole 1,000-kilometre border.

The two wars of aggression waged by the Chinese ruling circles against Viet Nam from two different directions constitute the highest escalation of the criminal process of implementation of their policy against the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Viet Nam in order to weaken, invade and subjugate the latter, and they pose a very serious threat to peace and security in South-East Asia and in the world. Contrary to Peking's calculations

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

the Chinese war of aggression has suffered ignominious defeat. It was condemned by the whole world and repudiated by the Chinese people. On 5 March 1979, the Chinese ruling circles were compelled to declare the withdrawal of their troops - though they are still occupying over 10 points in our territory - and afterwards to agree to sit at the negotiating table with the Vietnamese side.

However, from that time until now they have unceasingly mustered their troops on our northern frontier with a strength of 15 infantry divisions supported by artillery, air and tank forces, and with five army corps regrouped in the second line. Along with the standing military pressure exerted on the northern frontier of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, this massive concentration of Chinese troops and daily armed provocations against the Vietnamese border regions obviously create an explosive situation, encroaching on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Viet Nam and seriously threatening the peace and security of the whole region.

Proceeding from the application of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security to the situation in Indo China as has been expounded, we can affirm that the Peking rulers have brazenly violated operative paragraph 5 of the Declaration which

"Solemnly reaffirms that every State has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any other State..." (resolution 2734 (XXV)).

This use of force against Viet Nam was preceded by a threat to "give Viet Nam a lesson", a threat uttered by Deng Xiaoping during his visit to the United States and Japan some weeks before the launching of the war and repeated excessively till these last days by the Peking rulers.

One might ask the following question: in what name and under what principle of international relations does Peking give itself the right to teach lessons to Viet Nam, which is, like China, an independent and sovereign country? Does not operative paragraph 2 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security call "upon all States to adhere strictly in their international relations to the purposes and principles of the Charter", among others, the principle of the sovereign equality of States?

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

Is it because the Peking rulers pride themselves on having a human force of 1 billion people and on possessing nuclear weapons that they arrogate to themselves the right to give a lesson to another country?

Whatever the real motive of the Peking hegemonistic authorities, these acts are but in reality the revival of the concept of old Chinese emperors who considered small countries around their "celestial Empire" as barbarous ones or vassals subjugated to them. In its millenary history, Viet Nam has been given countless similar "lessons" by the "celestial dynasties", and the Vietnamese people have never forgotten to show their kindness by returning these "lessons" right on their own Vietnamese soil.

It is not simply a question of wording of the present Chinese threat to "give a lesson" to some country. From from it. It is the millenary-old innermost Chinese feudal character which revives in flesh and blood in the mediaeval barbarity of monstrous crimes perpetrated by 600,000 troops indoctrinated by the Great Helmsman's thoughts against the population of the six northern border provinces of Viet Nam during their invasion of our territory. One can find the same traces of barbarous killings in the genocidal crimes committed against 3 million Kampuchians under the guidance of their agents imbued with the same thoughts. International witnesses were there to give confirmation.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

It is not only the inhuman aspect of these killings in this war of aggression that is repugnant to human conscience but also, and particularly, the expression of this arrogant attitude of those who apply the law of the jungle, yet themselves rely on the unequalled importance of their human potential and want to give a warning to all neighbouring countries: "Mind yourselves if you refuse to submit to me and serve my interests!"

We wish whole-heartedly that the representatives of ASEAN would take a closer look at all that has happened so as to be able to speak with full knowledge of the facts about the unstable situation of the three peoples living in the Indo-Chinese peninsula. At the root of the threat to "give a lesson" before resorting to force, one finds big-nation chauvinism and a notoriously bellicose attitude, like that of knights of the Middle Ages.

That is an irresponsible attitude vis-à-vis the war. It is the Peking leaders who advocate the theory of the "inevitability of a new world war" in an attempt to weaken their enemy in the war and thereby fulfil their ambition of being the number one super-Power of the world.

That is why we deem it right, during our Committee's debate on questions of disarmament, to draw the attention of the international community to the most serious danger to the whole of mankind posed by a hegemonistic nuclear China which insolently plays with war without being bound by any treaty commitment to guarantee the security of the non-nuclear neighbouring countries.

Paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security provides, inter alia:

"that the territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter ..." (General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 5)

Furthermore, after their defeat in March 1979, the Chinese ruling circles declared that their troops had withdrawn to the other side of the border but in fact they continue to occupy more than 10 places on Vietnamese territory, and to build military establishments there. Moreover, for many years they have seized by encroachment many portions of Vietnamese territory, in

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

shameless violation of the historical border which the two parties had agreed to observe. If one observes that in 1974 they used military force to occupy the Hoang Sa (Paracels) islands of Viet Nam, that furthermore they shamelessly claim sovereignty over some other islands belonging to Viet Nam in the Eastern Sea, that they still occupy 36,000 square kilometres of Indian territory since the 1962 border war between the two countries, how can one believe in those cynically hypocritical words: "we have not a single soldier on any foreign territory", "we don't want an inch of Vietnamese land"? The true nature of the expansionism of the Peking rulers was laid bare after the publication of the Chinese map that conformed to a statement by Chairman Mao in 1965, who considered that the territory of more than 10 countries, namely, Viet Nam, Laos, Kampuchea, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Bhutan, Nepal, Mongolia, part of the territory of India, of the Soviet Union bordering on China, certain islands of Japan, all the islands in the Eastern Sea and territorial waters which reach as far as Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines should be returned by right to China.

Paragraph 6 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security urges Member States to settle by means of negotiation all their disputes which are likely to endanger international peace and security.

The Chinese rulers have agreed to sit at the negotiating table with the Vietnamese party to discuss urgent measures to ensure peace and security in the border areas and other questions concerning the relations between the two countries. But in the course of the first round which took place in Hanoi and now in the second round in Peking, the Chinese party has always eluded the constructive, sensible and reasonable proposals of the Vietnamese side and rebuffed the Vietnamese proposal concerning urgent measures aimed at putting an end to acts of armed provocation and ensuring peace and stability in the Viet Nam-China border areas, an indispensable premise to the discussion of a settlement of other problems concerning the relations between the two countries. Furthermore, they demand that Viet Nam give up its policy of independence and sovereignty and renounce its sovereignty over the Hoang Sa (Paracels) and Truong Sa (Spratly) archipelagos as a prior condition for their consent to discuss other problems. This is the behaviour of big-Power hegemonists who come to the negotiating table,

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

not to settle problems on an equal footing with the other party and in a constructive spirit, but to force their partner to accept their position. The demand of the Chinese ruling circles that Viet Nam withdraw its troops from Kampuchea and Laos is tantamount to a demand that the Vietnamese, Lao and Kampuchean peoples give up their rights to organize their common self-defence as they agree among themselves, and surrender, with their hands tied, to the Chinese aggressors who are seeking to annex their territories so as to use them as a springboard for their expansion in South-East Asia.

Lastly, it is advisable that the international community should be vigilant regarding the fact that the Peking ruling circles, in order to achieve their expansionist and hegemonist goals, have made lies and deception a State policy and a strategic tool. In the field of propaganda, they are both the pupils and the masters of Goebbels. They attribute to others what they themselves are going to do. They shift to others the responsibility for their own actions. They turn black into white, mix up the real and the false and then set in motion their mass media and other means. They make a hue and cry about the anti-imperialist struggle but in fact lend a hand to the imperialists. They urge struggle against the so-called super-Powers but in fact enter into collusion with the United States to serve their anti-Soviet policy. They advocate struggle against hegemonism but in fact do everything to realize their expansionist and hegemonist aims in Indo-China and in South-East Asia. They sent their troops to launch an aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam but claimed that Viet Nam "carried out an aggression" against China.

They unceasingly talk of their anxiety about peace and stability in South-East Asia whereas they resort to divisive manoeuvres to pit the countries of the region one against the other, foment troubles and organize armed groups of subversion, with a view to destabilizing those countries, thus in fact jeopardizing peace and security in the region.

No other leaders in the world have, on the strategic plane, reversed their policy of alliances, turning friends into foes and vice-versa, so quickly and thoroughly as have the Chinese leaders.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

In the light of the aforementioned situation, one may wonder: is there any principle, among the most important ones of the Declaration, that the big-nation expansionist hegemonism of Peking has not violated, denied or disregarded shamelessly - and with ever-increasing hypocrisy under the cloak of defending the principles of the Charter and of the Declaration, at that?

A China blinded by the big-nation mentality and by the expansionist and hegemonist policy of its rulers, no matter in what direction it develops, jeopardizes not only the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the Indochinese peninsula, South-East Asia, South Asia, and peace and stability in that region, but also the interests of other countries, including those which, prompted by their immediate interests, are now going along with the Chinese rulers against Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea.

For that reason, in order to strengthen international security, along with the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, racism and apartheid, including zionism, it is indispensable that the international community oppose energetically the vicious and dangerous policy of big-nation hegemonism and expansionism pursued by Peking in collusion with imperialism.

The Vietnamese delegation warmly welcomes the fact that on the basis of the judicious proposal of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and with the precious co-operation of certain delegations of non-aligned countries, our Committee could adopt the draft resolution entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations".

For their part, the Vietnamese people, more than anyone else, want to live in peace and friendship to rebuild their country and co-operate with neighbouring countries to establish a zone of peace, neutrality and stability in South-East Asia.

As regards China, the Vietnamese people and the Chinese people are bound by a traditional friendship of fighting against colonialism and imperialism. We always do everything we can to respect and preserve that friendship, which must be built on the basis of mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of each country.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

In the face of the life-or-death danger to our nation, we are forced to fight against the big-nation hegemonism and expansionism of the Chinese leaders; this is precisely to preserve and consolidate our friendship with the great Chinese people and, by so doing, contribute our part to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The three peoples of Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos, by their sacrifices in the fight against Peking big-nation hegemonism during the past years, have contributed to extinguishing two hotbeds of war, saving the Kampuchean nation from the danger of extermination and helping it start with confidence the process of resurrection in the newly restored peace. The security and stability of the region is also being strengthened on the new basis of friendship and co-operation among the three peoples.

Meanwhile, it is true that the principles of the Charter, as well as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, are of value to peoples precisely because of the blood shed in their struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress.

The same applies to the real implementation and strengthening of those principles. They must necessarily pass through the process of the actual daily fight of peoples throughout the world. The struggle which we are pursuing for the same reason here within the United Nations is but a reflection, sometimes with quite major and uncertain deviations, of the actual fight of peoples. Hence, it is the solemn duty of the forces of peace, national independence and social progress within this Organization to ensure that resolutions truly reflect the real situation of peoples' struggle for international peace and security. Those resolutions of our Organization which might be misused by hegemonist forces, the warmongers, in their criminal plan, would not only affect the effectiveness of the Organization as an instrument for maintaining international peace and security, but also engender actions which threaten the security of peoples of any given region.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

Before concluding, allow me to inform this Committee that the Minister of State in charge of Foreign Affairs of my Government has just sent His Excellency Mr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, and His Excellency Mr. Salim Ahmed Salim, President of the General Assembly, a message dated 1 December 1979, to draw the attention of the States Members of this Organization to the serious situation in South-East Asia caused by the armed aggression and threat of war by the Chinese leaders against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. After expounding in detail the annexation plan of the Chinese authorities against the three Indochinese countries since 1974 to this day, aimed at turning those countries into a springboard for Chinese expansion in South-East Asia, the message stressed:

"The Vietnamese people and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam energetically denounce these dark schemes and criminal acts against Viet Nam by the Chinese authorities.

"We demand that the Chinese authorities:

"Withdraw all their armed forces from the Hoang Sa (Paracel) Islands and the areas along the border they have illegally occupied;

"Make compensation for the losses caused by their aggressor army to the Vietnamese side during their February 1979 aggressive war;

"Stop the armed provocations, war preparations and threats of war against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam;

"Conduct in good faith the talks at the Vice-Foreign Minister level aimed at solving the problems concerning the relations between the two countries through peaceful means.

"We are confident that the vast majority of distinguished representatives of peace and justice-loving governments and peoples in the world will extend their approval and support to our reasonable and sensible proposals."

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Cyprus to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The item now under discussion, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", is of particular significance and importance.

In the first place, it is the one draft resolution that is concerned with implementation. We have had over the years piles of resolutions and declarations in the General Assembly and other forums, practically all of which have remained unimplemented. Therefore this item, which concerns the implementation of so important a document as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted unanimously in 1970, is a matter of particular significance.

From the point of view of disarmament, this item is closely linked with our endeavours in this Committee to achieve a halt to the arms race and realistically promote disarmament. For, indeed, without proceeding expeditiously to measures for establishing the system of international security and legal order provided for in the Charter, there can be little hope, if any, of making meaningful progress towards halting the arms race and rendering disarmament a realizable proposition.

It is significant, and it should be pointed out, that all reference in the Charter to disarmament and the regulation of armaments shows disarmament as part and parcel of the structure of international security through the United Nations, and as flowing from it. I refer to the relevant Charter articles 11, 26 and 47. I will not take the time to quote them, but they speak in the sense that I have already stated.

Our efforts for disarmament, therefore, should be directed primarily towards halting the arms race through adoption of the necessary measures to establish the system of international security and legal order provided for in the Charter that would supply a positive alternative to the destructive competition in armaments.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In this respect the implementation of the Declaration under discussion as implying the implementation of the relevant Charter provisions is of pre-eminent importance to the work of this Committee on disarmament. But also and from a more general aspect the endeavour at restoring legal order and security under the Charter is equally necessary and therefore doubly compelling and urgent.

Particularly in the face of the growing manifestations of a rapidly declining legal order and security in present-day world developments, both internationally and internally, the manifestations of such a decline are so obvious that dwelling on them in detail would be redundant.

The need for international order and security becomes more demanding by virtue of the very facts of life in a radically changed world of closely interdependent nations as a result of the technological break-through. The system needed for legal order and security through the United Nations emerges clearly from the contents of the Charter running right through its provisions from the very start in perfect sequence. The appropriate function of the United Nations system for the maintenance of international peace and security is the primary purpose of the United Nations and the corner-stone of the whole structure of the Organization. It cannot therefore be left out without dire consequences.

The Preamble of the Charter declares the determination of the peoples of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and to this end "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security". The Charter thus dedicates and commits the United Nations and its Members, signatories of the Charter, to collective action for international security and peace through the United Nations.

The primary purpose of the United Nations is more concretely stated by Article 1 of the Charter, as follows: "to maintain international peace and security, and to this end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression". That is the sense of international security in the Charter and not the outdated concept of balance of power or, really, balance of weapons, which has been condemned and discarded by the United Nations and the signatories of the Charter. By retaining this concept, or returning to it, we would be violating the Charter in its primary and essential purposes and principles. Article 2 lays down the

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

principles on which the Organization shall act in pursuance of that purpose - that is, maintaining international peace and security - namely, the principle prohibiting the threat or use of force in international relations against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State - paragraph 4. That is immediately followed, in perfect sequence, by paragraph 5 dealing with enforcement action by the United Nations and with relevant assistance to such action by all Members of the Organization.

That is the structure of international security in the Charter. Can we leave out this structure from the United Nations and not have an empty shell? And what can we do with an empty shell in a world that in these times is in such need of the Organization?

The prohibition of the use of force is thus rendered pragmatic through the effectiveness of enforcement action accompanying the prohibition. It is not left hanging in mid-air, as it now is. This effectiveness is intended to cover also the paragraph in Article 2 regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes - paragraph 3. For, unless the prohibition of the use of force is effective, the stronger side, negotiating from a position of force and domination, will never contribute to a peaceful settlement. As a result, we have hardly had any peaceful settlements of disputes and problems remain unsolved and festering because the United Nations is unable to act effectively and peaceful settlements never succeed in solving problems. Meanwhile, new international and global problems arise and remain also unsolved.

The Charter by subsequent Articles confers authority on the Security Council on all matters of international security and peace - Article 24 - and responsibility to determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression. Those Articles also confer authority on the Council to decide what measures shall be taken to maintain or restore international peace and security, including - and I wish to emphasize this - enforcement action as provided for in Articles 41 and 42.

Consequently, the essential need of compelling and enforcing the implementation of the mandatory decisions of the Security Council and the effective means to this end are set out in a concrete and binding way in the Charter - Article 39 et seq. Therefore, the responsibility and obligation falling on the Member States and, more particularly, on the permanent members

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

of the Security Council, to conform with these cardinal provisions of the Charter for international security, legal order and peace is beyond dispute or even doubt.

However, the sad reality is that these vital provisions of the Charter, which constitute the life-blood of the Organization by reason of supervening circumstances and policies, have been dropped by the wayside to be forgotten and, to all intents and purposes, almost obliterated. Although the cold-war climate has been followed by periods of détente with hopeful signs of co-operation in many fields, no efforts have been undertaken for restoring the important validity and effectiveness of the decisions of the Security Council and the consequent authority and prestige of the United Nations.

The McLoy-Zorin joint statement of 1961 and the constructive proposals for effective progress on disarmament by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1962, including the statement by United States Secretary of State Herter on 18 February 1960 are forceful evidence of admission by the major Powers of the possibility and availability of effective international security through the United Nations to replace the outmoded and anachronistic concept of balance of power, which engenders, escalates and perpetuates the arms race.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The said proposals and joint statement were, however, soon abandoned, and the continuing failure of compliance with the Charter in the fundamental structure of the United Nations for international legal order and security is the original cause and, I would say, the original sin, which places world developments on a road that inevitably leads away from peace and towards a persistent war-like atmosphere. It results in the escalating arms race and the increasing insecurity and anarchy that we are now witnessing.

The United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, having been continuously deprived of their effectiveness as a meaningful instrument of order, security and peace, cannot perform their functions and cannot have the validity and power to carry out their duties. This condition goes to the very essence of the United Nations. The impotence forced upon the United Nations in an interdependent world of the nuclear age, when no problem can be solved outside the United Nations, sets the stage for a tragic world situation for the future if no steps are taken to arrest this course. The effective restrictions on power and on the unilateral use of force have become inevitable as a result of the danger of an immense global catastrophe from the nuclear weapon. Therefore, the only potent instrument to solve problems and save the world in times of crisis should be the United Nations. The United Nations must therefore be effectively strengthened in its ability to function if there is to be any hope for a meaningful move out of the present stalemate of anarchy into the fields of human achievement for international peace, security and survival. The world needs an effectively functioning United Nations.

Those who drafted the Charter did not intend the United Nations to be a mere debating society for airing grievances without prospects of remedial action, nor were the decisions of the Security Council intended to be robbed of their validity and to be treated, as they are, as paper resolutions without effect.

The multiplying ramifications and consequences of such basic violations of the Charter in its cardinal principles and purposes have brought us to the situation of insecurity and near anarchy which we now face. All life on this planet is now hanging from the thin thread of an unreal and precarious balance of nuclear and other weapons of global destruction which are ready to explode at a sign on a computer.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Yet we have to recognize that the over-reaching in the technological breakthrough by constantly following the wrong course to negative and destructive objectives has become the gravest threat to mankind. It would seem as though science has reached heights of achievement in changing our world that are beyond the reach of man's moral adjustment within the short space of time of one and the same generation - an adjustment which is compellingly needed for man's very survival on this planet.

The dangerous and pernicious effects of policies of division and military confrontation through the qualitative and quantitative arms race are so obvious that they require no elaboration. By the very preparation for such a war, the physical, economic, social and other resources of the world are being continuously destroyed in a manner that, more importantly, erodes the moral fibre of man, in which lies the essence of his life on this planet.

However, we, the small and smaller countries in the United Nations, the non-aligned, who are not burdened by the concepts which are necessarily attendant to the militarism of alliances, may feel it our duty to raise our voice to bring more widely to the peoples of the world - to whom the Charter is addressed in its Preamble - awareness of the immensity of the danger to human survival from the present course which the international community seems to follow almost in a lemming-like way to a predestined conclusion. And our voice at the present moment and in this forum comes in terms of an appeal to all for the unanimous adoption of a draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was adopted by unanimity by the General Assembly in 1970.

On behalf of the non-aligned group of sponsors, I have the honour and privilege to present a relevant draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.55, which, in respect of the implementation of the Declaration and of the Charter - the implementation of the Declaration implies essentially the implementation of the Charter - in operative paragraph 1

"Calls upon all States to contribute effectively to the implementation and further elaboration of the provisions embodied in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security;"

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

And in operative paragraph 2

"Urges with emphasis all the members of the Security Council, especially its permanent members, to consider and to undertake, as a matter of urgency, all the necessary measures for ensuring respect for the provisions of the Charter in the effective implementation of the decisions of the Security Council on the maintenance of international peace and security including, particularly, those envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and provided for in the Declaration in question, by strengthening the confidence of States in the United Nations and in the effectiveness of the Security Council, as the organ bearing primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security;"

I am pointing out those parts of the draft resolution which specifically refer to implementation. The draft resolution is a long one, as members will note from the text, and contains equally important parts. However, those parts are declaratory, and I shall not take the time, as I would otherwise have done, to refer to them at this moment. We are concerned with implementation - it is not declarations that are lacking - and the emphasis in the draft resolution is placed on implementation and also on the report requested from the Secretary-General in paragraph 14 on the extent of such implementation.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In this respect, I should like to draw attention to an amendment that has been made since the resolution was issued in operative paragraph 3, where the current phrase "inviolability of legally established international boundaries" (A/C.1/34/L.55, p. 3) should read "inviolability of international frontiers". This is the main change in the draft resolution, and I should like to call the attention of members of this Committee to the significance of this draft resolution. It is not one of those perfunctory draft resolutions that are adopted without anybody expecting them to be implemented. We call, by this resolution, for the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and, in this sense, for the implementation of the Charter for reasons which I have already made clear in my statement.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has learned of the untimely death last Sunday of Mr. Gheorghe Nicolae, First Secretary of the Romanian delegation. In fact, Mr. Nicolae was assigned to this very Committee. I am sure that I speak on behalf of the First Committee in extending sincere condolences to the Romanian delegation and to the people of Romania in their time of bereavement.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you most sincerely for the sympathy that you have just expressed in relation to the tragic event that has overtaken the Romanian delegation. I refer to the untimely death of one of our representatives, Mr. Gheorghe Nicolae, a First Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who helped us in his capacity as an expert in this Committee.

I assure you that I shall certainly transmit to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania, as well as to the family of our deeply missed colleague, this mark of sympathy on your part.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: The list of speakers on agenda item 46 will be closed today at 6.00 p.m.

On 11 December, all draft resolutions on disarmament items will be submitted to the plenary Assembly for action. But I should like to point out that 11 December is Human Rights Day and that I have been asked to inform representatives that the decisions will be taken in Conference Room 3 because of construction work that will be taking place in the General Assembly hall.

On 14 December, in the morning, the plenary Assembly will take action on the remaining First Committee items, 122, 126 and 46.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.