



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (concluded)

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

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 46 (concluded)

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: This afternoon the Committee will take action on the draft resolutions before it. It is my intention to begin with draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1.

I shall now call on the representative of Afghanistan who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan): Afghanistan, which is an ancient, non-aligned and peace-loving country, always gives its full support to all efforts towards peace, international co-operation and good-neighbourliness.

During the lifetime of the League of Nations as well as throughout our membership of the United Nations, my country has worked towards maintaining international peace, détente, good-neighbourliness, peaceful co-operation among nations, peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for human rights, observance of political and economic self-determination, recognition of national liberation movements, and elimination of colonialism, racial discrimination, apartheid and a policy of non-interference in the domestic affairs of people and nations by military, economic and political means.

Afghanistan was among the members of the League of Nations which signed the non-aggression pact with its neighbours including the Soviet Union and Iran, during the 1930s, and remained faithful to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declarations of all five Summit Conferences of the Non-Aligned Movement. As a matter of fact, it was the reflection of this policy which decided us to sponsor the Declaration on international co-operation, as well as draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan considers that the prime duty of this world Organization is nothing less than to try by all

(Mr. Tabibi, Afghanistan)

means to eliminate the sources of actual crisis, tension and injustice, whether in the Middle East, South-East Asia, Africa, Latin America or elsewhere.

Among these hotbeds of tension is undoubtedly the question of Palestine. We believe that the United Nations has an abiding responsibility to ensure solution of the Palestinian question on the basis of its own resolutions and decisions, such as resolutions 181 (II) and 197 (III) of the General Assembly, and resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council.

The United Nations should make every effort to ensure the elimination of tension in the rest of the world, whether in South-East Asia, Africa or elsewhere.

We also express our support for the struggle of the brave people of Zimbabwe and the South West Africa People's Organization, and we want the complete elimination of apartheid and racial discrimination. My country is indeed much concerned at the growing nuclear capability of Israel and South Africa, two of the modern racist régimes. We have been and we remain opposed to the policy of political, economic or military hegemonism in all its manifestations, and in this respect we support every effort of the United Nations for a speedy elaboration and conclusion of an international treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

Our Government also supports the creation of zones of peace everywhere in Asia, Africa, the Pacific, Europe and Latin America and, as a matter of fact, would wish to see the whole world, the air, the oceans and all continents as zones of peace and co-operation.

Since our people throughout its history has shed its blood and struggled for the preservation of its independence, it therefore supports the efforts of people everywhere for self-determination. We are strongly against colonialism. The history of the United Nations and of the Committee of 24 of which Afghanistan is a member is a clear witness to this policy, which we zealously maintain.

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has supported all efforts of the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement towards the noble and cherished goal of disarmament and we hope that the Committee on Disarmament, in the light of its new organizational changes, will play its proper role in achieving disarmament, the goal of mankind.

(Mr. Tabibi, Afghanistan)

We believe that peace and security will not be preserved if the wide gap between rich and poor, between the haves and the have not nations of the world is not closed. How can we think of peace while millions and millions are starving and dying of hunger, malnutrition or ill health? We welcome the efforts for global negotiation and a restructuring of the world economy proposed by the fifth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and by the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, and we feel that this is a step towards the elimination of poverty and the creation of an atmosphere of peace and security in the world.

We also agree with all those who have stated that strict observance of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, and respect for all the conventions and the declarations of the United Nations and of the fundamental principles of international law will eventually lead us towards the goal of peace and international security.

Since draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 and the other draft resolutions on which we are voting today, strengthen international security and are useful in maintaining peace, good-neighbourliness and world security, we consider it a worthy attempt made by this Committee, which deserves our support.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". This draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 51st meeting of the First Committee on 4 December. The sponsors are as follows: Bangladesh, Burundi, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, the Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Mauritania, Morocco, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have asked that it be adopted without a vote. If I see no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. DUBEY (India): Although draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 has just been adopted by consensus, we would be less than candid if we were not to express our doubts about the utility of the proposal. The draft resolution in effect urges Member States to adhere to the United Nations Charter. That sentiment is as unobjectionable as it is unnecessary. If it is the intention of the sponsors are to create yet another legal instrument on "good-neighbourliness" we should like to state quite categorically that we believe the United Nations Charter already provides an excellent basis for the conduct of good-neighbourly relations among States. We are not in favour of a proliferation of international instruments on the subject which tend to devalue the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

I had instructions to make a few more comments on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 but, in view of the spirit of goodwill and good-neighbourliness which has prevailed in this Committee - thanks largely to you, Mr. Chairman - and the fact that Christmas is just around the corner, I shall refrain from making them.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): My delegation joined in the consensus which emerged on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 for two very different and separate reasons. One is specific, and the other of a more general nature.

The specific reason is that we are fully in agreement with the concept of good-neighbourliness and we believe it is superfluous to explain why. We have therefore joined in the consensus. It could not be otherwise, especially since the principal moving force behind this draft is the delegation of Romania, which introduced it, the delegation of a country with which mine has always had the most friendly relations, which derive not only from the imperatives of politics but also from the deep sense of affinity between our two peoples.

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

The merits of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 have served as a springboard to give us the necessary impetus for its adoption. But, as I indicated, there is another, more important reason which prompted us to approve this text - namely, that the Romanian delegation and the sponsors of the draft resolution worded it in such a way that it might conciliate the views of all delegations. It is striking to see that this text is devoid of any element that runs fundamentally counter to the conceptions of other delegations, and contains no attempt to secure an acceptance willy-nilly of unilateral views.

Moreover, the Romanian delegation and the other sponsors of the draft resolution graciously accepted a few amendments - which, incidentally, were very reasonable - one of which was suggested by my delegation. I venture to hope that this attitude of conciliation and compromise, and the absence of any attempt to impose unilateral views on the Committee will prevail throughout the work of the thirty-fifth session. Indeed, it would ill serve the cause of disarmament to imagine the draft resolutions which not only have not garnered general consensus but also run counter to the conceptions of a large proportion of members of this Committee are likely to promote the solution of the problems we are dealing with.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to explain Turkey's support for the Romanian draft resolution, A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1, on the development and strengthening of the principle of good-neighbourliness between States, which has just been adopted by consensus.

The state of international relations in the world today attests to the fact that global efforts or universal arrangements have had only meagre results so far. Otherwise, the world would look entirely different, in view of the many efforts of that sort since the beginning of the century.

We therefore believe that initiatives such as the Romanian draft resolution reflect a realistic optimism; such a text could be the basis for something concrete.

I believe that I have no right to prolong these remarks or even to embark on a brief analysis of the content of the Romanian draft resolution, since just before I came to this meeting I received instructions from my Government to add the name of the Turkish delegation to the list of sponsors. Accordingly, on entering the Committee room, I asked to be allowed to make a statement in order to announce our sponsorship before the vote, and having been too late to do that then, I am doing it now.

The CHAIRMAN: The name of Turkey will be added to those of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): The Austrian delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1, concerning the development and strengthening of good-neighbourly relations between States. However, my delegation has certain reservations on this draft resolution, to which I should like to refer briefly.

Austria has consistently striven for the establishment and further development of good relations with all its neighbouring countries, regardless of differences in their respective social and economic systems. In our view, such good-neighbourly relations must be based on the recognition of a number of principles, including inter alia, the principle of the non-use of force or threat of force, the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the principle of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the individual.

This last principle - and, in particular, the freedom of communication of individual citizens of one country with the citizens of a neighbouring country, including the principle of free exchange and dissemination of ideas and information and the facilitation of contacts between individuals of neighbouring countries - is of special importance for the maintenance of good-neighbourly relations and the establishment of trust and confidence between nations.

Therefore, we regret that it was not possible for the sponsors of the draft to include a specific reference to this important aspect of the draft resolution.

Furthermore, my delegation has doubts whether the elaboration of new legal or quasi-legal norms of a political character beyond those that have already been embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on Friendly Relations Among States and - on the European regional level - in the Final Act of Helsinki will effectively enhance the relations between neighbouring States. In any case, the elaboration of such norms, if it should indeed be contemplated, will, in the opinion of this delegation, apart from the aforementioned considerations, also have to include specific rules for co-operation in the management of the common environment, and in particular an equitable accommodation of respective interests relating to the use of shared resources, of which a clean and safe environment is

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

a part, and to particular threats to such resources - inter alia, through ultra-hazardous activities. Therefore, we should have liked to see a more specific reference to such considerations in the draft resolution.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 because we believed it to be a very positive resolution, directed towards the needed good-neighbourliness among States. In particular, we are very much attached to operative paragraph 2, which affirms that good-neighbourliness conforms to the purposes of the United Nations and is founded upon the strict observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning friendly relations among States and, of course, upon one of the most important texts of all, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Although we supported this draft resolution and would even have joined in sponsoring it, we should have liked to see incorporated in operative paragraph 2 an appeal to the Member States themselves to conform to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, in strict observance of the principles of the Charter. The draft resolution does affirm that good-neighbourliness conforms to those purposes and principles, but Member States themselves must conform to those purposes and principles if we are going to have effective implementation of them.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". This draft resolution has 25 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 51st meeting of the First Committee on 4 December. The sponsors are Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guyana, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

The financial implications of this draft resolution are set forth in documents A/C.1/34/L.58 and Corr.1. The corrigendum responds to the point raised by the representative of Morocco.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): I should merely like to make a brief comment and offer a suggestion for the consideration of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly as resolution 2734 (XXV). As several representatives have noted, the date of its adoption was 16 December 1970, and the draft resolution now before us takes note of the tenth anniversary of this adoption.

I think that it is generally accepted that an anniversary is the yearly recurrence of the date of a past event. If that is accepted, there seems to be something wrong with the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. For my part, try as I may, I cannot up to the present count more than eight anniversaries of 16 December 1970, which is when the Declaration was adopted, though I am sure that we would all be happy to concede a ninth, since 16 December is only nine days away - I think.

I think it would be a great pity if the First Committee were to go down in the annals of the United Nations as a Committee that does not count - or cannot. We would therefore commend to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 the following amendment - that the fifth word in the second preambular paragraph be deleted and replaced by the word "ninth".

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of New Zealand; however, I should like to say that the United Nations does indeed count.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): What is probably meant here, really, is that we are at the close of the decade of the 1970s.

However, since the Declaration was adopted in 1970, the draft resolution should not say "the tenth anniversary" - although we are at the close of this decade. Therefore, while I cannot speak for the other sponsors, for myself I have no objection to saying in the draft resolution, at the appropriate place, that we are approaching the end of a decade since the adoption of the Declaration. Changing it to read "the ninth anniversary" would not really mean very much; what is meant is that nearly a decade has elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Cyprus, even though I do not think that he has helped my situation. I just wanted to know whether the sponsors are willing to accept the word "ninth", or whether they wish to retain the word "tenth".

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I am accepting "ninth", but I would have thought that it would be better to have it in the other terms. However, I am not objecting to the word "ninth", since it does not make much difference to the substance of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): Canada will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 - or perhaps it is now A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.2 - for the following reasons:

We share the concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution about the existence of many situations in the world which threaten peace and security. We agree that questions of development, disarmament, decolonization and non-use of force are linked and that in many cases the obligations of the Charter covering those matters are being ignored.

(Mr. Pearson, Canada)

On the other hand, we note the omission from the draft resolution of matters we think are also important, such as the protection of human rights and the strengthening of the United Nations as a centre not just for harmonizing the actions of nations but for actively promoting the keeping of the peace and the development of international law.

We also note that the draft resolution is selective and partial in its focus on certain problems and areas to the exclusion of others.

Finally, we do not believe that the annual adoption of omnibus draft resolutions of this kind is necessarily a helpful contribution to the strengthening of international security. We look rather for specific constructive proposals designed to facilitate the negotiation of disputes and to improve co-operation between nations.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): On behalf of the nine member States of the European Community, I should like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 on the "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

The 1970 Declaration remains an important document of the General Assembly. Its continuing importance and its current relevance derive from the fact that it offers an agreed political framework within which the objectives of strengthening international security can be pursued. The Nine remain committed to the implementation of the Declaration and have sought to contribute, and will continue to contribute, to the strengthening of security both at the international and at the regional levels. Not least within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, we have played a full part in efforts designed to encourage a relaxation of tension and the development of co-operation in Europe.

At the same time, we have felt it necessary to make clear our reservations on the requirement that this Committee continue to debate year after year the implementation of the 1970 Declaration. We seriously doubt the practical contribution which these debates can make to the achievement of the goals established in the Declaration. Furthermore, we remain concerned at the practice

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

of introducing draft resolutions at successive General Assembly sessions which either repeat or, more frequently, re-interpret the provisions of the original Declaration. By offering a selective presentation of a common document, these draft resolutions risk weakening the impact of the Declaration and distorting the general understandings on which it was based.

In addition to these reservations of principles, there are particular points of contention in the present draft resolution to which we feel obliged to refer.

We cannot accept the reference in the text to controversial decisions taken outside the United Nations framework which we do not endorse or support. Furthermore, it is just not acceptable that other bodies should seek, as in operative paragraph 12, to impose views or solutions in respect of matters which are within the competence of the States directly concerned and on which there is no agreement.

Nor can we agree that the General Assembly should seek to predetermine the agenda or conclusions of regional conferences which meet following arrangements freely agreed upon by the States directly interested. In particular, in this context we cannot accept the wording or the content of operative paragraph 10, which seems to interfere unduly with issues such as the follow-up to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which fall within the direct and exclusive responsibility and competence of the States participating in that Conference.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

We believe that it is necessary to draw the attention of the authors of the present draft resolution to the fact that CSCE meetings are conducted in accord with the rule of consensus. The preservation of the consensus principle is essential if the views of all States participating in the CSCE process are to be fully respected, and we cannot accept any attenuation of that principle.

We have difficulty in endorsing certain of the references to the Security Council in the present text, and not least the general and unspecified call, which we cannot accept, for recourse to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, as contained in operative paragraph 2.

An essential and, indeed, crucial element within the over-all balance of the 1970 Declaration was its recognition of the importance of respect for human rights within the process of strengthening international security. The absence of any reference to human rights in the present draft resolution is, in our view, a serious omission. In this context, especially the right to freedom of opinion, expression and information should have been mentioned. The Nine hold the view that greater freedom in the exchange of information between peoples in our increasingly interdependent world is an indispensable element of international peace and security.

For the same reason, we regret that in the paragraph stressing the contribution of a new world information order to the strengthening of international peace and security, no mention is made of this basic requirement.

Finally, we have noted the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 as set out in document A/C.1/34/L.58/Corr.1, and note that the report to be prepared by the Secretary-General for the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly is to be done with the help of a group of government experts at a total cost of \$165,800. We beg to doubt the need for the employment of government experts for this purpose and the cost which this involves.

For these reasons, we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

Mr. WINN (United States of America): The United States will vote "No" on this year's draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

In our explanation of vote on resolution 33/75 last year, we noted a number of points in that resolution which departed from the language of the United Nations Charter. Some of those points remain in this year's text; others have been changed, but remain unacceptable to my delegation.

In addition, the draft resolution endorses conclusions reached at the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries. The United States does not share all of those conclusions, and cannot join in a resolution which urges United Nations Members to apply them.

Finally, my Government cannot join in a vote to create an additional group of experts to work on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We should like to note that an expert group is already at work on disarmament and international security, and we understand that this group is examining a broad spectrum of ways to enhance international security. The creation of an additional group would be costly and superfluous.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1. However, our delegation has a comment to make with respect to operative paragraph 14, which requests the Secretary-General to prepare, with the help of a group of government experts, a report for the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution gives no indication of the membership of that group of experts nor of its specific tasks. However, the document prepared by the Secretariat, A/C.1/34/L.58, indicates that the group will consist of 10 experts, that it will hold two series of meetings in 1980 in New York, and that it will require travel and subsistence expenses amounting to \$71,000. In the view of the Soviet delegation, the report to be prepared by the Secretary-General mentioned in paragraph 14 of the draft can be prepared, if necessary, in consultation with representatives at the United Nations and, in particular, with the representatives of the regional groups and others, which can be determined. That is why

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

we feel that the preparation of the report could quite easily be done at a properly high level by a group made up of representatives of permanent missions to the United Nations who are already in New York. We therefore propose in connexion with operative paragraph 14 of this draft that an understanding should be reached in our Committee that the assistance referred to will be obtained at the level of the permanent missions to the United Nations, and that therefore it will not be necessary to incur the additional expenditures mentioned in document A/C.1/34/L.58, paragraph 3.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. Chairman, since this is the last intervention that the Finnish delegation will make in this Committee, I should like to thank you for the way in which you have conducted the work of the Committee.

The delegation of Finland will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1. Although this draft contains several provisions and principles which we have consistently endorsed, it also contains numerous formulations that my delegation would find difficult to accept in any context. However, the main reason for our abstention is related to provisions which touch upon the Conference of Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and matters closely connected with it. Given the well known role of the Finnish Government regarding that conference, anything that concerns the CSCE is of the greatest importance to us and therefore we must subject it to the most careful scrutiny. In this respect, we note that operative paragraphs 11 and 12 contain references to proposals which do not have the support of all the parties concerned in the respective regions. Furthermore, operative paragraph 10 does not, in our view, accurately reflect the consensus of the CSCE countries as manifested, in particular, in the Helsinki Final Act. It is up to the participating States to determine how this process should be developed. By way of intensive consultations, this determination is in fact at present under way.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

We also doubt the advisability of setting up a group of experts to assist the Secretary-General in the preparation of the report on the extent of the implementation of the Declaration. We are not convinced that this is the most appropriate manner in which to carry out the task envisaged.

My delegation recognizes the many positive elements contained in the draft resolution and concurs with its basic aim, the promotion of the implementation of the Declaration, which the General Assembly adopted unanimously nine years ago. At that time the Government of Finland took an active part in drafting the Declaration. We continue to recognize its value as one of the basic documents adopted by the General Assembly with a view to implementing in practice a number of the central principles of the Charter. We see the Declaration as an expression of the will of the Member States to work together for a peaceful and rational world order and to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security.

This Declaration was elaborated through negotiation and mutual accommodation within a considerable span of time. It was a carefully balanced document which took into account the views of Member States representing various regions and political systems. The Declaration was firmly anchored to the basic principles of the Charter. This is why it remains as valid today as it was at the time of its adoption.

Furthermore, the adoption of the Declaration has given rise to a mechanism whereby the action taken by Member States and their views on the implementation of the Declaration are reported to the General Assembly through the Secretary-General. The Government of Finland has found this practice most useful. It has annually conveyed

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

its views to the Secretary-General. We hope that this practice will continue and that, in fact, more Governments will take advantage of the opportunity to pronounce themselves on this matter, which concerns the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take vote  
draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

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

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has voted in favour of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security contained in document A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1. The resolution enunciates tasks that must be given priority in the interest of consolidating world peace.

There are special reasons to point, in particular, to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in which States are called upon to refrain from any act which may hinder the continuation of the process of relaxation of international tension, and to operative paragraph 10, in which the hope is expressed that the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to be held in Madrid in 1980, will result in a further strengthening of the security and co-operation of States in Europe in all spheres, including reduction of armaments and armed forces and halting the arms race in both the nuclear and conventional fields.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

In fact, questions relating to military détente in Europe are at present assuming special topicality and urgency. The solution of these questions determines, in various aspects, the prospects for further advancing the process of international détente.

In this context, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic wishes to draw attention to the meeting of the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which was held in Berlin on 5 and 6 December 1979. The participants in this meeting called upon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries not to station any further nuclear weapons in Europe and to give an affirmative response to the proposal to start negotiations. They reiterated in all seriousness that the adoption of a decision on the production and the stationing of new types of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and the implementation of this decision would destroy the basis for negotiation.

Based on their initiatives relating to lessening military confrontation and to adopting concrete disarmament measures, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty specified their ideas on the preparation and convening of an all-European conference on questions relating to military détente and disarmament. This conference should deal both with confidence-building measures among the States in Europe and with steps designed to reduce the concentration and levels of armed forces and armaments on the continent.

For the first stage of the conference, the socialist States propose that agreement be reached upon the following confidence-building measures: first, to give prior notification of major military manoeuvres to be held in the area determined by the Helsinki Final Act, not from 25,000 but from 20,000 troops upwards, and not 21 days but one month in advance; secondly, notification of movements of

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

land forces in the same area from 20,000 troops upwards; thirdly, notification of major air force manoeuvres in the area; fourthly, notification of major naval manoeuvres near the territorial waters of any other participant in the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The participants in the meeting referred once again to their proposals aimed at strengthening international security, namely, for the conclusion of a treaty among all States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, obligating them not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other, and for an agreement by the countries of NATO and the States of the Warsaw Treaty not to admit new members to their respective alliances.

The participants in the Berlin meeting propose to hold a preparatory working meeting in the first half of 1980, the recommendations of which could be the subject of discussions at the Madrid meeting.

The content and the working procedures of the Madrid meeting and the improvement in relations among States in various fields were further important items discussed.

The meeting of the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty furnished yet additional proof that these States, including my own country undertake all efforts in order to put an end to the arms race, to strengthen international security and to contribute towards the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1, L.56 and L.57.

Agenda item 46, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", deals with fundamental principles upon which rests the whole edifice of the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations was created with the principal aim of supporting the maintenance of peace and security in the world. This is its essential *raison d'être*, and all other activities, however important, are subsidiary to this, the main goal of our Organization. Israel has always supported resolutions of the General Assembly that were in full accord with the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter, its ideals and purposes, and will continue to do so.

If one were to enumerate all the armed conflicts one by one that have taken place since the inception of the United Nations, conflicts that have caused so much suffering to mankind, one would surely come to the conclusion that most if not all of them could have been avoided. They could have been avoided if Member States had been prepared to be guided by the provisions of Article 2 of the Charter, and especially by the injunctions contained in paragraph 3 of that article. What does Article 2 (3) say? It says:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered".

The key words in this paragraph are "peaceful means". Peaceful means in this context connote negotiations, and no negotiations are possible without contact. Even at the worst periods of the cold war, diplomatic contact was maintained between the United States and the USSR. It was this maintenance of contact that made negotiations between the two Powers possible at a later stage, negotiations that in some fields led to far-reaching agreements, both encouraged and endorsed by the United Nations.

The draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1, L.56 and L.57 submitted under agenda item 46 contain appeals to Member States that have often been made in the past. They repeat obligations already existing under the Charter. They do not contain a single new thought that would make peace more durable or would make war less likely. Here and there the language of the draft resolutions departs from the accepted terminology of diplomacy and borders

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

on the well-worn clichés of a propaganda pamphlet. When we try to take an over-all view of the debate thus far, we cannot help asking ourselves whether these draft resolutions, as well as some of those adopted in previous years, were really necessary. How much did this last debate, which was a repetition of so many previous debates, actually contribute to the cause of peace? And with so little to show for this debate we accordingly regret to note the introduction into the draft resolutions before us of certain semantic nuances where the original meaning of words has been changed to denote political conceptions that do not always fully conform with the principle of solving disputes by pacific means.

Moreover, these draft resolutions, however repetitious, are remarkable for certain glaring omissions. Nowhere are Member States urged to initiate dialogues where none had existed before; nowhere are States urged to enter into direct negotiations where wide divergences of views are known to exist. I am not referring exclusively to the Middle East. There exist also other areas of tension and armed conflicts in the world. In fact, reading some of the resolutions, one is sadly led to doubt whether their authors have fully understood the true meaning and practical application of the words "peaceful means" as it was envisaged by those who drafted the Charter of the United Nations.

In addition, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57, though procedural in character, is related to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.56 where zionism is mentioned in a malicious way. Therefore, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 is totally unacceptable to us.

Mr. ZELADA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): The Spanish delegation has voted in favour of the successive draft resolutions submitted for the consideration of this Committee and of the General Assembly since 1970, when the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted, in spite of the increasing trend every year whereby the General Assembly is urged simply to endorse stands relating to questions of the strengthening of international security that derive from entities for which we have the greatest respect but whose decisions do not represent the opinions of all countries represented in our Organization.

Furthermore, this year the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 includes, in its operative part various paragraphs relating to the forthcoming session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe that are difficult for the Spanish delegation to accept.

The Spanish Government has been holding numerous consultations in preparation for that Conference, which is to take place in Madrid next year, in order to ensure its success. Nevertheless, our delegation cannot associate itself with affirmations that are designed to distort or prejudge the content and conduct of that Conference.

Lastly, the Spanish delegation is not convinced of the appropriateness or usefulness at this stage of asking the Secretary-General, as is done in operative paragraph 14, to prepare a report with the help of a group of government experts on the extent of the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration and on actions that should be undertaken by the General Assembly in order to secure full compliance with the provisions of the Declaration.

For all these reasons the delegation of Spain felt itself bound to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): In connexion with the adoption of draft resolutions similar to the one we have just adopted, my delegation has during the past few years constantly emphasized the importance that my country attaches to the strengthening of international security, consolidation of peace, and the development of détente and its extension to all regions of the world and in particular to the Mediterranean region. We also attach a high degree of importance to the establishment of friendly relations and the promotion of diversified co-operation mutually advantageous to all countries irrespective of their socio-economic or political systems. In short, we have always supported, and we continue to support, the sincere and legitimate aspirations that underlie those resolutions and caused them to be submitted. As the same debate is repeated each year, I have ventured to repeat so far the statements I made last year and, as was the case then, I shall provide the Committee with concrete examples which have governed our attitude this year.

In operative paragraph 11 my country is called to a regional meeting and we are asked to welcome this invitation, which even contains a mandate. First of all, my delegation has not been consulted on this subject any more than have several of our partners, who are as much concerned as we are. This, it must be admitted, is a somewhat unusual procedure.

Secondly, if such a regional and restricted meeting is to be convened, the entity competent to take a decision to that effect is certainly not the First Committee.

Operative paragraph 12 deals with a very delicate and rather complex matter affecting the security of a group of countries concerned, and on which my country's position is well known since the matter has recently been debated at length at other multilateral gatherings.

In operative paragraph 14, provision is made for the establishment of a group of experts whose qualifications escape us because they will be instructed to evaluate world security conditions and to propose measures to improve them. An expert, by definition, is someone who has technical knowledge in specific fields and yet, here, a group of alleged experts is called upon to discuss a highly political subject.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

I hope that the examples I have just given will clearly explain my Government's position concerning the text we have just adopted.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish):

Costa Rica voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 because my delegation considers that implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is most important because, as the representative of Cyprus pointed out when he introduced the draft resolution, we must now have to go on to the stage of specific application and leave fine-sounding declarations behind. Today more than ever before the world is in need of international security in order to establish a climate of confidence and an order based on mutual trust.

My delegation shares the views expressed by the representatives of Finland, Ireland and Spain with respect to operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. Indeed, it seems to us that the reference to such an important event as the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which is to be held soon, should, in fact, have been more carefully worded if it was to be included at all in the draft resolution.

We should like also to associate ourselves with the remarks of the Irish delegation concerning the omission of any reference to human rights. Respect for and observance of human rights are a guarantee of peace within States and also between them, as can be seen from the present state of international relations.

With respect to item 46 of the agenda, Costa Rica has sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev. 1, which was introduced by Romania, whose delegation we wish to thank for having taken that valuable and timely initiative. We wish to congratulate the Romanian delegation for ensuring its adoption by consensus.

Mr. MOSSBERG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation has in earlier sessions of the General Assembly on many occasions been able to support resolutions regarding the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

In recent years, however, elements have been introduced which have made it necessary for Sweden to abstain in the votes on this matter. It is with regret that we note that this year's draft resolution also contains elements and formulations which made it impossible for Sweden to support it.

With regard to the fourth preambular paragraph, Sweden is concerned by the fact that among the list of violations of the United Nations Charter, no reference is made to violations of the respect for human rights. Sweden considers this a serious omission in this context.

The reference to a new world information order does not reflect all the elements we consider necessary in this respect. No mention is made of the need to maintain a free circulation and the efforts to achieve a wider and better-balanced dissemination of information.

The Swedish delegation also has reservations concerning operative paragraph 10. Sweden attaches great importance to the follow-up meeting in Madrid of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Not least important in this context is the further development of the process of détente. There are, however, other elements of great importance to be dealt with in Madrid such as human rights issues and questions relating to the wider and freer flow of information. It is vital that the inherent balance of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference is respected when reference is made to the Conference on Security and Co-operation process.

There are also other elements of this draft resolution where we would have preferred different formulations. Finally, let me repeat that it is with regret that Sweden is compelled to abstain on a draft resolution on a subject as important as the strengthening of international security.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): On behalf of the Austrian delegation, I should like to make the following explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1 as orally revised today.

Because of its geographical position in the heart of Europe, Austria has always considered its national security to be closely linked to international stability and is thus rightly interested in all measures conducive to the strengthening of international security and the promotion of peaceful co-operation between States in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

We have, therefore, from the very outset, supported the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. We have also been in a position to lend our support to a number of resolutions presented in previous years under the agenda item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" inasmuch as those resolutions reaffirm the well-balanced and comprehensive provisions contained in that Declaration.

At the same time, however, we had to register our reservations on certain formulations in those resolutions which we considered to be either imprecise or introducing new elements into the framework of the Declaration without allowing the necessary time for a sincere and thorough discussion of those new elements.

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

As far as the wording of the present draft resolution follows the wording of previous resolutions on this agenda item, these reservations of my delegation remain valid.

To those general remarks I should like to add the following specific comments on the draft resolution before us which led my delegation to abstain in the vote.

With regard to the fourth preambular paragraph, the Austrian delegation considers that the enumeration of different forms of violations of the Charter of the United Nations is incomplete, inasmuch as it does not refer to questions raised by the non-observance of human rights in various areas of the world.

Furthermore, I should like to recall that in the context of the elaboration of the mass media Declaration of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as well as in the debate concerning the United Nations public information policies and activities held during this session of the General Assembly, Austria has repeatedly referred to the proposal to establish a new world information order and has expressed its appreciation and understanding of the interest of developing countries in an increased participation and involvement in the international exchange and flow of information. In this connexion, Austria attaches great importance to the strict observance of the fundamental rights of freedom of expression and information, which have found world-wide recognition and have been embodied in numerous international declarations and conventions. Austria must reject any attempt made to limit the freedom of information by way of governmental restrictions.

We feel that this aspect has not been adequately covered in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and therefore we hold serious reservations on that paragraph.

Finally, and with regard to operative paragraph 10, let me stress that Austria attaches special importance to the follow-up meeting in Madrid of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in the context of the further development of the process of détente. That Conference, however, must not deal exclusively with questions of détente in the military field, although such questions are certainly of great significance, but must safeguard the inherent balance between all parts of the Final Act of Helsinki.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57, entitled "Non-interference in the internal affairs of States", in which, representatives will remember, the draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.56 has now been incorporated.

The draft resolution has 14 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Guyana at our 52nd meeting, on 5 December. The sponsors are Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guyana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

I call on the representative of Guyana who wishes to explain a change in the text.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57, the item whose inclusion is sought in its operative paragraph 3 is the same item whose inclusion we have just agreed to in operative paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1, and it should read in the same way, so that in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 the item should be entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". It is just a question of adding, before "Implementation", the words "Review of the ...".

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): On behalf of the nine member States of the European Community I should like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57, entitled "Non-interference in the Internal Affairs of States".

The Nine wish once again to reaffirm their commitment to the principle of non-intervention, as set out in Article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter. The principle is clearly an important one within the

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

over-all framework of Charter provisions and the obligations arising for the United Nations. However, the Nine see no alternative but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57.

In the first place, the principle is given full and clear elaboration within the friendly relations Declaration where its scope and application in relation to other principles is clearly defined. If we remove it from its existing context, we risk a selective and unbalanced presentation of the principle, which is obviously in no one's interest.

Furthermore, we have on many occasions made known our reservations on the expectation that this Committee should undertake as a matter of practice, session after session, the elaboration of new declarations on selected themes in international relations. The effect of this practice is gradually to erode the value of what has already been agreed. In this connexion, we wish to repeat once again that what is required is not the elaboration of new texts, but respect for existing undertakings and, above all, for the clear principles of the United Nations Charter.

We must also point out that it is the Sixth Committee which is responsible for questions pertaining to the definition and interpretation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter, not the First Committee. Indeed, we do not see how the First Committee could be competent in an area such as this, which could touch on the work of several Committees of the General Assembly. Accordingly, we cannot agree to the establishment of an ad hoc working group of the First Committee on this topic, nor indeed do we consider it open to this Committee to decide in effect to create, if only for one session, an ad hoc committee of the General Assembly.

We note that the draft resolution implies that negotiations have already commenced in the First Committee on this question, and in this connexion would appear to ascribe a status to the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of interference in internal affairs of States, contained in document A/C.1/34/L.56, introduced by Guyana. For our part, we are not aware of any such negotiations having taken place on this question and we have certainly not participated in any, nor could we accept that any status could be given to any document which has emerged to date in this area. Furthermore, we feel

MLG/lc

A/C.1/34/PV.55  
39-40

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

obliged to say that we regard the draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.56 as unacceptable, inasmuch as it seems to involve in a number of instances recommendations which we can only characterize as interventions of one type or another in the internal affairs of States, and because of the distorted presentation of the principle of non-intervention which it contains.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors had asked that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote, but based on the statement made by the representative of Ireland the Committee will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.57. A recorded vote has not been requested.

The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The Australian delegation abstained on the draft resolution just adopted (A/C.1/34/L.57), on non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

The Australian delegation has at previous sessions of the General Assembly voted in favour of this item. At this session, however, the draft resolution makes direct reference to a draft Declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.56. That draft contains a number of contentious sections which are unacceptable to Australia. I will not detail those sections to the Committee. It is sufficient, however, to point out that they make the document as a whole unacceptable.

In addition, Australia questions the advisability and necessity of a further declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States. There are other international instruments directly related to these subjects. If, however, a further instrument or declaration on a subject of such importance is to be negotiated, it should take place only in an atmosphere of consensus and goodwill. In this respect, the draft contained in document A/C.1/34/L.56 would need considerable improvement if such an atmosphere is to prevail at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. WINN (United States of America): The United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 because this draft resolution perpetuates an exercise with unsound premises. We do not believe that the adoption of a declaration on non-interference will accomplish the ends of the sponsors. Instead, we fear that the practical effect will be to undermine the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 takes note of document A/C.1/34/L.56, which has been offered by the sponsors as the basis for work next year. The United States has fundamental problems with major portions of the draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.56. For example, the preamble repeats the formulation equating zionism with racism. We are dismayed that this unacceptable formulation has been reintroduced in this Committee, when others have wisely chosen not to press it in the discussions on Middle East issues in other Committees of the General Assembly.

We note that in operative paragraph 1 (b) (vi) of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.56 any economic reprisal by a single State or group of States against another is described as a form of intervention in the internal affairs of States. This would appear to conflict directly with the prerogative of the United Nations to use economic measures under Chapter VII.

There is a basic contradiction between the draft's call for non-interference, on the one hand, and its call for support of "the struggle of national liberation movements", on the other. We believe that no amount of redefinition can reconcile these two concepts.

The reference in operative paragraph 1 (d) (vii) of the draft Declaration to the right and duty of States to combat the dissemination of false or distorted news that can be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of States would contradict one of the basic principles of our constitution. We have made this point before in our explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32, on international co-operation for disarmament.

(Mr. Winn, United States)

As a general matter, if this draft Declaration were to be adopted and implemented, all diplomatic missions, international financial, cultural and philanthropic organizations, as well as world-wide news agencies, would have to close their doors. By setting impossible standards for international behaviour, the draft Declaration would not further the goals of the United Nations. Indeed, we fear that it would only create conditions for additional disputes between States.

Mr. Chairman, please do not rule me out of order if I depart from draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 to say one more thing.

I expect that this will be the last time my delegation has occasion to speak in the First Committee this session, and I should like to express my delegation's appreciation for the efficiency and judicious manner in which you have guided our work in the last two months. You have set a worthy example for your successor next year, and let me say that I hope he will be able to fill your shoes.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the United States for his very kind words.

Mr. ZELADA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.57. I should like to explain our reasons for doing so.

The delegation of Spain has voted in favour of resolutions on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, a principle whose consolidation and effective implementation we regard as highly important.

Both by its favourable vote on resolution 33/74, adopted on 15 December 1978, and in our reply to the Secretary-General in document A/34/192, the Government of Spain has indicated its position of principle in favour of the elaboration of a declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

We have also expressed the view that the elaboration of that declaration should be carried out by the United Nations bodies particularly concerned with legal matters.

(Mr. Zelada, Spain)

There are two aspects to the draft resolution which was put before us for consideration with which my delegation has been unable to associate itself: first of all, by taking note of the draft Declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, contained in document A/C.1/34/L.56, a certain degree of acceptance is being conferred on a document whose complexity has rightly impelled its sponsors not to put it to the vote because they had been unable either to negotiate or discuss it.

Secondly, the decision in operative paragraph 2, as I have just pointed out, is not in keeping with the views stated earlier by the Spanish delegation.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Last year my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution that carried the same title. This year we abstained because we have considerable doubts, especially with respect to the special procedures provided for in operative paragraph 2.

Mr. MOSSBERG (Sweden): Sweden attaches great weight to the principle that States should not interfere in the internal affairs of other States in order to change or influence their political or economic life.

The threat or use of force against the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of States is inadmissible according to the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on friendly relations.

Sweden has also expressed its understanding of the concerns and fears behind the presentation of earlier draft resolutions on non-interference.

Against that background, Sweden has given its general support to those earlier draft resolutions. At the same time, we have also expressed our doubts about the necessity or the advisability of embarking on the preparation of a declaration on non-interference.

Lastly, the reply of the Swedish Government of 29 June 1979 to the Secretary-General on this matter states:

"... interference in the internal affairs of States in order to change their political systems, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity is already prohibited according to the United Nations Charter and the friendly relations Declaration. A new instrument on this subject might in fact lead to a certain confusion and cast doubt upon the interpretation and the scope of the already existing prohibitions against interference." (A/34/192, p. 12)

The Swedish delegation also wishes to underline that it cannot agree to any proposal in this context which might be used to restrict the rights of Governments to express their views on various international questions, including human rights, or restrict the work of the mass media and the free expression of opinion by the public.

Considering the above-mentioned reservations, and considering also the replies of other States to the Secretary-General, Sweden is not in a position to support a call for the elaboration of a declaration on non-interference and, consequently, had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57.

(Mr. Mossberg, Sweden)

If, however, negotiations on a draft declaration on non-interference should be initiated, in spite of reservations on the part of several countries, it is important that these negotiations be carried out in such a manner that the views of all countries are taken into consideration, as in the elaboration of the well-balanced Declaration on friendly relations. That Declaration took several years to finalize and, in order to produce an instrument on non-interference which would be regarded seriously by all countries, it might prove necessary to provide for more time than is envisaged in the present draft resolution.

Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 because we believe that it is important and that interference in the internal affairs of States has become very dangerous. There have been changes of Government by the actions of foreign Governments, whereas any change of régime should be a matter for a State itself because it is up to that State to decide what is best for it. Also, we should respect the sovereignty and territorial waters of States and their right to exploit and utilize their own natural resources to the best of their interests.

My delegation agrees with the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/34/L.56, because, in our view, it provides an acceptable and a very important basis, expresses the views of various parties and enjoys the support of the majority. We wish to thank those delegations that have prepared it.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica): Costa Rica abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57, despite the fact that we have at all times invariably supported the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, which under the Charter is inadmissible.

Since we already have documents on these important principles, we believe that what is required is not the formulation of new texts but, rather, compliance with the principles that have already been adopted and elaborated on in a number of resolutions and Declarations.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57, which has just been adopted and which recommends the adoption of a declaration on the basis of document A/C.1/34/L.56, does not comply with the decisions taken during this session to rationalize and improve our work, since an endeavour is made to repeat important documents that have already been adopted, whereas what we need is to implement them rather than once again reiterate their contents.

That is why my delegation abstained, although it supports, as always, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I simply wish to explain that our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57 in no way prejudices the position of the Mexican delegation on what should actually be the contents of the proposed declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States which may be elaborated during the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly.

That is matter on which we maintain our freedom of action unchanged and unlimited.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): On various occasions in the past, the Austrian delegation had the opportunity to reaffirm our strong support for the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs of States. Our endorsement of this principle, which we should like to reiterate today, has always been motivated by our recognition of the legitimate aspirations of those countries that only recently have achieved their independence further to secure and guarantee this vital element of their sovereignty. Furthermore, the principle of non-intervention is of special importance for a small country, and particularly for a country like Austria committed by its free will to a policy of permanent neutrality and thus not belonging to any military alliance.

The Austrian delegation, however, is not convinced that the elaboration of a new declaration would be the most appropriate way further to enhance and ensure observance of that principle.

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

This reservation stems from our considered view that a number of already existing international instruments, and in particular the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, provide for a sufficient and well-balanced definition of the principle in question as well as of the obligations of States which derive from that principle.

Furthermore, the aforementioned Declaration clearly states that all the principles which are defined in it "... are interrelated and each principle should be construed in the context of the other principles".

The Austrian delegation therefore questions the necessity and, indeed, the desirability of any further elaboration or codification of one of these principles in isolation of other principles which are of equal importance. In this connexion we should also like to underline the vital need for ensuring an appropriate balance between measures to enhance the application of the principle of non-intervention and our common responsibility to guarantee the strict observance of human rights on both the national and the international levels.

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

Furthermore the Austrian delegation could not agree to any proposal which could be interpreted as restricting the work of the mass media or limiting in any way the exercise of the fundamental rights of freedom of expression and information. To our regret, these important considerations have not been reflected in the draft resolution before us.

It is for these reasons that the Austrian delegation, in spite of its general support for the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs of States, had to abstain in the vote on the present draft resolution.

My delegation has also taken note of the "Draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in internal affairs of States" which has been presented to this Committee. I should like to state that a first preliminary examination of this draft declaration confirms our reservations on this matter. In particular, we regret that the wording of the draft declaration in certain aspects appears to be incompatible with the considerations I have referred to above. On the other hand, my delegation appreciates the flexible attitude of the delegation of Guyana and the other sponsors in not pressing for a vote on the draft declaration at this session of the General Assembly. We hope that further consultations and negotiations in the future would lead to a broadly acceptable course of action on how further to enhance the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right to reply.

Mr. FULLER (United Kingdom): During the course of the debate on this item, the Soviet Union, speaking sometimes through the mouths of certain other delegations, has continued its current propaganda campaign against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). But there is no need to answer the various allegations that have been made since, given that delegations in this Committee include many experts on security matters, it is most unlikely that they will have been taken very seriously. I shall, however, reply on a separate point.

There have been various implications in the statements of the Soviet Union and its friends that my Government is in some way currently trying to impose on the people of Rhodesia a Government of our own choosing. They have made similar statements in other Committees, but those remarks here have continued even after the announcement that agreement has been reached on a cease-fire by all the parties at the Lancaster House Conference following the earlier agreements on an independence constitution and interim arrangements.

I categorically reject any such implication. My Government is wholly committed to ensuring that a free and fair election will take place in Rhodesia. The fact that the Soviet Union and its friends still continue this campaign when the final agreement by all parties at Lancaster House is imminent, suggests that they are in some way displeased by the immediate prospect of a settlement, that is to say, their remarks suggest that they are not interested in seeing an end to the war in and around Rhodesia, an end to the bloodshed and the misery that have for so long plagued that unhappy country.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

The CHAIRMAN: With the conclusion of the consideration of agenda item 46, the substantive deliberations of the First Committee of the General Assembly at the thirty-fourth session have been completed with considerable accomplishment.

(The Chairman)

It is my belief that with the full co-operation and hard work of members, the First Committee has been able to complete the very important tasks assigned to it in a very satisfactory and co-operative manner. The issues we have discussed - disarmament, settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States, the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations and the strengthening of international security - are crucial problems of our time which influence the state of international relations and are of utmost importance to every nation.

The Committee considered 18 disarmament items in 39 meetings and adopted 38 draft resolutions and one draft decision, and recommended them to the General Assembly for approval. The analysis of the related proceedings showed a very high degree of conscientiousness and spirit of co-operation, which have been demonstrated by all representatives during the consideration of and action upon draft resolutions. Of the 38 resolutions adopted by this Committee, 18 have been adopted without a vote, and 16 without a negative vote. These very positive achievements are related to the most vital and urgent problems in the field of disarmament, such as halting the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, the prohibition of chemical weapons, an early conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, the security guarantees of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as well as the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction, the prohibition and restriction of certain excessively injurious conventional weapons, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, the reduction of military budgets and the relationship between disarmament and development, deploring the further proliferation of nuclear weapons, confidence-building measures and international co-operation for disarmament, and so forth. This sequence of issues by way of illustration only confirms the general feeling that the First Committee has approached with seriousness the task assigned to it and has not spared any effort to succeed in seeking acceptable solutions, taking into account the existing circumstances.

In general, one can say that the views expressed in the general debate on the items underline the common concern of the Members of the world Organization and reflect their apprehension over the unrelenting arms race,

(The Chairman)

with stress, in particular, on the urgent need to stop armament and to deploy the resources thus saved for economic development. It is the wish of the entire world community that these resources could and should be channelled to projects and programmes that ensure the welfare of mankind,

The Committee considered agenda items 122, 126 and 46 in 14 meetings, and adopted three draft resolutions. There was good and valuable participation in the debates and a wide contribution to the formulation of draft resolutions. The deliberating process has been long but also productive. In my view, and I hope that the majority share my opinion, those issues complement each other within the context of the main objectives of the United Nations, that is, the maintenance of international peace and security.

Hegemonism in international relations was singled out as a phenomenon with a potential to endanger global as well as regional peace. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States has been usefully emphasized within the specific context of the unsatisfactory situation of our present world.

By the resolution the Committee is recommending on the pacific settlement of disputes, we may have started a process which can lead to an increase in the effectiveness of the Charter provisions and machinery in the vital area of preventing and settling conflicts by political means.

(The Chairman)

The results of the consideration of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security have indicated how essential it is to persevere in the efforts which have been made, and are being made, to reduce tensions and the underlying causes of conflict. This conviction, I am sure, underlies the request in the draft resolution on the subject for the Secretary-General to assess the progress of the implementation of the Declaration and give practical recommendations for actions to be undertaken in future to guarantee its further progress.

While there were differences in the Committee with regard to specific aspects of the draft resolutions, these, I believe, were far less important than the broad consensus, in which we are joined, on the necessity of strengthening this international security on which all of our futures may depend.

Permit me to express my thanks to each and every one of the members of this Committee, who made it possible for me and my colleagues in the Bureau to discharge the responsibilities given to us.

My gratitude and that of my colleagues in the Bureau go first to all members of the First Committee for their courtesy and unfailing assistance, and the co-operation that we have received in the course of the Committee's session which has been a daily source of strength. Without mentioning names, I should like to say that I have benefited immensely from the efforts of those members who have felt a particular responsibility for bringing to this Committee initiatives, proposals and draft resolutions. I was particularly heartened by the substantial contribution made by developing countries to the debate and in draft resolutions regarding policies and guidelines for the continued strengthening and maintenance of peace and security. It is my hope that that kind of participation will be more pronounced in coming years.

(The Chairman.)

The awareness in the Committee that it is in the interest of all that we should endeavour to reach a consensus on as many issues as possible augurs well for the future. It is my hope that the spirit of give-and-take which makes a consensus possible, will continue to pervade the Committee.

I address my sincere expression of gratitude and appreciation to the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, Mr. Yuri Kochubey of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Mr. Awad Burwin of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who were always ready to substitute for me and extend their invaluable co-operation and advice to me, and to the Rapporteur, Mr. Ernst Sucharipa of Austria, whose succinct reports testify to his abilities and co-operation.

To the Secretariat, I wish to extend my deep appreciation. I thank the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Mikhail Sytenko, for his kind co-operation. The Secretary of the First Committee, Ambassador P.K. Banerjee, has given me valuable assistance and mature advice. His vast diplomatic experience and wisdom have been a constant source of comfort and strength to the Chair. It will be very sad for the members of the First Committee to learn that Ambassador Banerjee will be completing his present contract this year. Ambassador Banerjee has been associated with the work of the First Committee for almost a decade, both as Ambassador of India and as Secretary of the First Committee. In fact, we could call him Mr. First Committee. I should like to extend to him, on behalf of the Committee and on my own behalf especially, our whole-hearted thanks and gratitude for all that he has done to assist the activities and achievements of the First Committee. I dare say that Ambassador Banerjee's departure from this post would be a loss to the entire international community. We offer to him our best wishes for the future.

(The Chairman)

I should also like to express, on behalf of the members of the Committee and on my own behalf, our gratitude to the Assistant-Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament, Mr. Jan Martension, to the Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Rikhi Jaipal, and to the Directors of the Centre for Disarmament and to all members of the Secretariat, whatever their jobs, who have facilitated the work of the Committee.

Let me close by plagiarizing a story told to me by a friend of mine in these words:

"It seems that one day a somewhat harassed clergyman was preparing his sermon for the following Sunday and had been left in charge of a rather active six-year-old son. Finding that his responsibility somewhat impaired the fluency of his theological thought, he cut up a picture of the world into small, irregular pieces and gave them to his son to put together, hoping thereby to keep him quiet for at least half an hour. The son reappeared in five minutes with the world neatly stuck together. The clergyman's dismay at being interrupted once again so soon was outweighed by his admiration for the achievement of his six-year-old son.

"How did you do it?" he asked.

"His son said, 'It was quite easy. You see, on the back of the picture of the world was a picture of a man. I knew that if I put the man together right, I would have got the world right.'"

I am sure you members have the picture.

Finally, I wish to extend to all my sincere greetings for the Yuletide season and best wishes for much personal success in their future endeavours.

It is with mixed feelings that I declare that the last meeting of the First Committee during the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.