



UN/SA COLLECTION
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 50TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 50 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES

Statements were made by:

Mr. Ovinnikov (USSR)
Mr. Waliur Rahman (Bangladesh)
Mr. Sujka (Poland)
Mr. Lai Yali (China)
Mr. Rodrigo (Sri Lanka)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)
Mr. Rose (German Democratic Republic)

PROGRAMME OF WORK

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/35/PV.50
3 December 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 50 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/35/505 and Add.1-3; A/35/542, 654, 661; A/C.1/35/L.48; A/C.1/35/14 and 15);
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the first speaker for this morning, I would propose for the Committee's consideration that the list of speakers on this item be closed at 12.30 p.m. today. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is so agreed.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: So far there are no speakers for this afternoon. On the other hand, quite a number of representatives are listed to speak at either the morning meeting or the afternoon meeting tomorrow. The result might be an unusually large number of speakers for both meetings, making it impossible for the Committee to conclude its work tomorrow evening as planned.

As representatives are aware, there is a general understanding that the first organizational session of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be held on 4 and 5 December. To make that possible it is essential that the First Committee conclude its work by the evening of tomorrow, 3 December.

Accordingly, I would request those representatives inscribed to speak on Wednesday to indicate their willingness to speak this afternoon instead, if they are in a position to do so, in the hope that we may be able to arrange a meeting for this afternoon and hear as many delegations as possible today.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The strengthening of international security, the elimination of warfare from the life of mankind, has been the immutable goal of the foreign policy of the Soviet State throughout its history. "Peace", as has been stressed by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Brezhnev, "is a transcendental value for mankind. The banner of peace and co-operation amongst people was raised by Lenin. It is a standard to which we will be true."

The Soviet Union is convinced that by the concerted efforts of peace-loving forces it is possible to halt the unfavourable development of international events. We must defend and strengthen international détente; we must extend it to all parts of the world. The Soviet Union continues to be ready to make its important contribution to this noble work in the interest of strengthening international peace and security.

Ten years ago the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, approved almost unanimously an important international document - the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. For all these years the Declaration has served as a broad programme of action aimed at developing and putting into practice international détente, preventing the danger of a new war, the achievement of concrete measures in the field of disarmament, and the eradication from international life of the policy of hegemonism, colonialism, racism and apartheid.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The annual consideration at General Assembly sessions of progress in the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration has made it possible to focus the attention of all States on the performance of the major, principal task of the United Nations - the ensuring of universal peace and the development of mutually advantageous international co-operation between States with different social systems.

Within the framework of the discussion of the Declaration the United Nations adopted a Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, and also other important decisions. On the proposal of the non-aligned countries, in the course of the discussion of the question of the strengthening of international security, work on the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States became a reality. This Declaration would be a logical extension and development of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1965, on the initiative of the Soviet Union. The content of the new Declaration must, of course, be in keeping with the requirements of the United Nations Charter and take into account the relevant decisions of the Security Council, General Assembly and other United Nations organs.

Thanks to the efforts of socialist, non-aligned and other peace-loving States, in the 1970s it was possible to make progress in certain important areas in the strengthening of security, the limitation and cessation of the arms race. Détente was a major trend in the development of international relations. Talks on various aspects of limiting and halting the arms race assumed an intensive character during the 1970s and led to the achievement of certain results.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was prohibited; the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons came into effect; States renounced the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction in near-earth orbit and on celestial bodies, on the seabed and ocean floor; bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons were prohibited and eliminated; a ban was placed on the military or other hostile use of means of influencing the natural environment; also, agreements and treaties were concluded placing limits on strategic armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States. For the first time in international relations, confidence-building measures began to be put into effect: information on military exercises, the inviting of military observers - measures which were designed to eliminate mistrust and suspicion with regard to the military activities of States. More favourable conditions were created for the peaceful settlement of controversial issues and international conflicts.

However, more recently, aggressive forces have produced a countervailing policy to those positive processes, dictated by a reluctance to reckon with the realities of the world today, with the strengthening and consolidation of the positions of socialism, the success of the national liberation movements and the growth of freedom-loving democratic forces as a whole. Imperialism and its henchmen have been attempting to change the objective course of world developments and to disrupt the approximate equality in the military-strategic sphere. They have adopted a course of undermining détente, of whipping up international tension, of intensifying the arms race, and of adventurist actions in various parts of the world, and of militant anti-Sovietism.

The switch of the United States and its allies from a policy of détente towards a policy of anti-détente was very clearly marked as far back as two and a half years ago, in the spring of 1978. That milestone in time and the responsibility of United States ruling circles for that switch must be clearly and unambiguously recognized, because we still have with us those people whose practice it is to falsify history, and the facts give us the following picture of how this all began.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

February 1978 marked the last Soviet-American talks on questions pertaining to limiting military presence in the Indian Ocean. After that the United States administration unilaterally renounced the idea of resuming those talks and adopted the course of an arms race in the Indian Ocean. And it can hardly be mere coincidence that immediately thereafter, in the spring of 1978, we began to hear talk in the United States about the need for creating a rapid deployment force designed for military intervention in the internal affairs of Middle Eastern countries and, above all, countries of the Persian Gulf.

Let us go a little further: in May 1978, at the NATO meeting in Washington, a long-term programme of increasing the armaments of that military bloc for many years ahead was adopted. The Soviet Union, even at that time, drew attention to the danger of that decision and to the fact that it undermined the possibility of putting into effect the Final Document of the United Nations special session on disarmament, adopted at that time in New York. Unfortunately, those apprehensions of ours have been vindicated.

That same month - May 1978, when Brzezinsky left on a special mission to Peking, became a watershed from which time forth the United States began to adopt the course of involving China in the actual military strategy of the NATO bloc.

We should add to this that after that milestone - that turning point in the spring of 1978 - the policy of the United States continued to follow the same course: all bridges leading to disarmament and arms limitation began to collapse and, like pontoon bridges designed for forcing the borders of other countries, ever newer programmes in the arms race began to emerge.

December 1978 was the last month when the United States was still conducting Soviet-American talks on the question of the arms trade. After June 1979 the United States did not resume even the talks on anti-satellite systems.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

At the end of 1979 the United States adopted a long-term arms race programme. Simultaneously the United States and its NATO allies adopted a decision for the emplacement in Western Europe of new American medium-range nuclear missile systems. Accordingly, the decision of Washington and NATO to bank on the arms race, on military power - a decision taken in the spring of 1978 - continued to be put into effect, and is to this very day being put into effect, stubbornly and with an assiduity worthy of a more noble cause.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Those are the facts of history. That was when and that is how the foundations were laid for the switch in the foreign policy of the United States to militarism, which American propagandists today, in their attempts to rewrite history, are trying to date one and a half years later, to bring it near to the end of 1979 and to link it to the events in Afghanistan. In actual fact the United States, long before that time, one and a half years before that, began to yield to the temptations of militarism. How dangerous that disease is to the fate of peace we can see from its further development.

Recently, or to be more accurate, on 25 July this year, the United States proclaimed in Presidential Directive 59 the so-called new nuclear strategy, which brought the world to the brink of a nuclear war. Our Committee, quite justifiably, pointed out the growth of the risk of a nuclear catastrophe linked, in particular, "with the adoption of the new doctrine of limited or partial use of nuclear weapons, giving rise to the illusion of the admissibility and acceptability of a nuclear conflict".

On the whole, however, we must state publicly and openly to the sabre rattlers: there is no serious international problem which can be solved unilaterally from a position of strength. The path to the solution of all the major problems facing mankind, primarily the problems of peace and security, is the path of negotiation founded on respect for the legitimate rights of other States.

In spite of the deteriorating situation in the world, the Soviet Union is convinced that there are objective possibilities for preventing the slide towards a new cold war.

In present day circumstances, there is no sensible alternative to the policy of international détente. Détente is a readiness to resolve differences and disputes not by force and not by threats or sabre rattling, but by peaceful means. Détente is a kind of trust and a capacity to recognize each other's legitimate interests. To adopt the course of détente means to adopt the course of eliminating the threat of a world war and to proceed towards disarmament, towards the consolidation of international security and to ensure the most favourable peaceful conditions for the successful solution of the social and economic problems which face mankind.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

In the circumstances, in the view of the Soviet delegation it would be important to make use, among other things, of the role of the United Nations so as to prevent a weakening of détente and to make additional efforts to protect and consolidate it.

A reliable material guarantee for a lasting peace would be provided for mankind by the cessation of the arms race and by disarmament. We believe that there are no international problems that could not be resolved by negotiations, taking due account of each others interests. The Soviet Union is ready to come to agreement on the reduction or the prohibition of any weapons, primarily nuclear weapons, and to prevent the manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union is fully determined to work for the successful conclusion of all present negotiations, and the resumption of all those that have been broken off, on the limitation of armaments and on disarmament. We believe that the General Assembly would be doing something very useful if it supported the idea that it is necessary to have the concerted efforts of States in order to curb the arms race.

The Soviet Union has always believed that the formulation and implementation of arms limitation and disarmament measures should be indissolubly linked with the strengthening of political and international legal guarantees of the security of States and the preservation of peace. Such measures would lead to ridding the world of an atmosphere of suspicion in inter-State relations and to a general improvement of the international climate, as well as to promoting efforts to halt the arms race. The key to that lies in making the renunciation of the use of force a law of international life.

The Soviet Union believes that war, and hence the use of force in any form or manifestation, cannot and should not be a means of resolving disputes between States.

We welcome the decision to extend the mandate of the Special Committee on increasing the effectiveness of the principle of the non-use of force. Together with other peace-loving States, we shall work for the early conclusion and signing of a world treaty on the non-use of force.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

A genuine and lasting settlement of conflicts in the world can be brought about only around the negotiating table. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union supports the continuation and deepening of political dialogue among States belonging to different social systems. We are ready to make our own constructive contribution to ensuring the success of the Madrid meeting of representatives of States parties to the European conference, which could open the way to a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

The process of international détente must be extended to all parts of the world. The Soviet Union believes that it is important to work for a settlement of existing regional conflicts and, at the same time, to show concern for the adoption of measures to avert and prevent the outbreak of any more such conflicts.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The Soviet Union supports the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and is in favour of the achievement of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East with the participation of all interested parties including the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. An end must as soon as possible be put to the conflict between Iran and Iraq, which is exhausting both countries and simply playing into the hands of outside forces.

The Soviet Union supports the just struggle of African countries and peoples for the early elimination of the remnants of colonialism and racism in Africa. We resolutely oppose the designs of the racist Pretoria régime aimed at perpetuating its domination in South Africa and Namibia. The very existence of that régime represents a threat to peace and security on the African continent and in the world at large. We offer our whole-hearted and comprehensive support to the efforts of African countries to thwart the plans of South Africa to acquire nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union whole-heartedly supports the proposals of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan of 14 May 1980 with regard to a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. The Soviet side is extending support to the efforts of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea to turn South-East Asia into a zone of peace and stability, which would be in keeping with the interests of all the States of the area.

Imbued with the aspiration to consolidate international peace and security, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty produced the initiative to hold a meeting at the highest level of Heads of State from all parts of the world. The focus of attention for participants in that meeting would be a task of vital concern to European peoples and indeed to all mankind: that of eliminating sources of international tension and of preventing war.

Our whole historical experience since the time of the anti-Hitler coalition until now has demonstrated that it is precisely a meeting of that kind at the highest level that is the best and most reliable way of achieving mutual understanding and lasting peace.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

In the year of the tenth anniversary of the adoption by the United Nations of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Soviet Union wishes once again to state its readiness and determination to work with all peace-loving States for the full implementation of that document. The unswerving nature of the active peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union in international affairs was confirmed once again by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Brezhnev, when he stated:

"In the future too we will spare no effort to preserve détente and everything good that resulted from the 1970s to achieve a turn-about towards disarmament and to support the right of peoples to free and independent development and cultivation and consolidation of peace."

Mr. WALIUR RAHMAN (Bangladesh): On behalf of the delegations of Bahamas, Ecuador, Egypt, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia and my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution on the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security contained in document A/C.1/35/L.48.

Since the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted by virtual consensus by the General Assembly 10 years ago, certain positive developments have taken place which need to be commended by the international community. However, it has not been possible so far to ensure full compliance by all States with all the provisions of the Declaration.

The worsening international situation, as evidenced in the recent past, has proved conclusively that the lack of consensus and political will has been the main stumbling-block in the way of full implementation of the provisions of the Declaration. Continued dependence on the unsavoury concept of realpolitik and the imposition of power politics on the territorial integrity and political independence of States, convoluted attempts to resolve international disputes by force, and economic and financial pressures are but some of the stark realities which enjoin us all to make sustained

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

efforts towards full implementation of the Declaration.

The adoption of the Declaration was considered a landmark in the history of the United Nations. That important document provides guidelines and a broad programme for the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument for the easing of international tensions and the creation of conditions for the attainment of a just and lasting peace.

At each of its last nine regular sessions the General Assembly has adopted resolutions solemnly reaffirming all the principles and purposes contained in the Declaration. The Assembly has called upon all States to adhere fully to the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the Declaration, as well as those of the Declaration on the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States as the basis of relations among all States irrespective of their size, level of development, and political, economic and social systems.

In those resolutions the General Assembly has noted with deep concern that many of the principles and provisions of the Declaration have been ignored or violated, particularly with regard to the principles of national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-intervention and non-interference, recourse to the threat or use of force resulting in breaches of the peace, and threats to international peace and security.

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

Attention was also drawn to the non-compliance by States with their obligation to solve disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and disregard of the role of the United Nations and lessening of confidence in the effectiveness of the Security Council in ensuring international peace and security.

The Assembly also stressed its grave concern with the continuing existence of crises and focal points of tension in various regions and the continuing existence of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid, which remain the basic obstacles to the strengthening of international peace and security.

The General Assembly and the Security Council have in the recent past been seized in several instances of a great number of disputes and conflicts brought about by the failure to comply with the obligations assumed under the Charter. Such conflicts have proved profoundly detrimental not only to the parties involved but to the international community as a whole. The time has come therefore for all Members of the United Nations to redouble their efforts and to seek urgently equitable solutions of the conflicts, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, and bring about a lasting peace in the world. Determined efforts should be made further to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, particularly by enhancing its peace-keeping and peace-making capabilities, including the improvement of the machinery for the pacific settlement of disputes.

The Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament contained certain fundamental principles for disarmament negotiations, strict adherence to which would ensure that disarmament measures would be compatible with the improvement and increasing of security through disarmament. The success of disarmament efforts presupposes a balanced and strict observance of mutual obligations. Further adequate measures for verification, satisfactory to all parties, should be provided for so as to gain the confidence of all parties in the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

There is a close relationship between disarmament, development and the strengthening of international security. Concerted international co-operation in the economic field on the basis of an agreed strategy to reduce and eliminate the gap between the developed and the developing countries is a vital precondition for the strengthening of international peace and security. It is essential that developed and surplus-fund countries demonstrate the political will necessary to understand better the plight of the developing countries and that they join their efforts to avoid an economic cataclysm, with unforeseen consequences for international peace and security.

While the urgency of the need for the restructuring of economic relations and the establishment of the New International Economic Order has been accepted, little real progress has been made in advancing the dialogue between the developed and the developing countries towards that end. Despite the adoption of two resolutions on an emergency action programme for the least developed countries and other developing countries, the General Assembly at its eleventh special session was regrettably unable to adopt an agenda for the initiation of global negotiations on international economic co-operation and development.

The draft resolution as contained in document A/C.1/35/L.48 is self-explanatory. It provides the framework for the implementation of the Declaration on International Security. The deliberations just concluded on disarmament have convinced us more than ever before that no real progress towards international peace and security can be achieved without the full implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Therefore, the various provisions of the proposed draft resolution are aimed only at promoting the full implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which, as I pointed out, was adopted by the General Assembly virtually by consensus.

Since the Declaration enjoys the support of all Members of the United Nations, I trust that the draft resolution will be acceptable to all. On behalf of its sponsors, I urge all delegations to join in a display of the same unanimity that prevailed 10 years ago in the formulation and the

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

adoption of the Declaration in this very Committee. That would be a constructive manifestation of the genuine desire of the international community as a whole to maintain and promote international peace and security for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): The current session of the General Assembly marks the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That fact alone adds a new dimension to the consideration of the item now before us.

The Declaration, recognized as it is as a milestone in the work of the United Nations, has always been viewed as a programme of concrete action. It rests upon three most important principles of the community of nations: first, the non-use or threat of the use of force in international relations; secondly, the peaceful settlement of disputes among States; and thirdly, the development of broadly conceived international co-operation. Adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the Declaration greatly facilitated the undertaking of a number of important practical steps, with a view to strengthening international peace and security.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

It is not by chance that the adoption of the Declaration coincided with the advent of the positive processes of regional and global détente, at the beginning of the 1970s. It is likewise a matter of record now that the world has witnessed genuine and, indeed, fruitful efforts towards greater understanding and co-operation, in the spirit of the provisions contained in the Declaration. We have witnessed numerous productive meetings of Heads of State or Government, pronounced progress in the SALT process, the historic Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and momentous bilateral treaties on the basis of normalization of relations between some European States and the Federal Republic of Germany. At the same time, we have achieved further progress in the decolonization process and in mapping out rules of international economic relations. These have been only some of the undisputed fruits of the momentum generated by the spirit of co-operation for the strengthening of international security.

It cannot be safely stated that, had it not been for the attempts of forces opposed to détente and had it not been for the adverse climate of international relations they have been trying to create, the world of the latter half of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s would have been an entirely different one. There would have been less tension and a firmer, more advanced global infrastructure for peace.

Today, looking back on the past decade, it seems proper to us to reflect not only on what was achieved during that period but also on what is still to be done to ensure the continuous and unhampered implementation of the provisions of the Declaration. Numerous delegations have on a number of other occasions referred extensively to those questions. It is now clearer than ever that the matter of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has lost neither its immediacy nor its urgency.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

We note with satisfaction that despite the complicated and precarious situations now obtaining in many parts of the world, during the past decade the idea of the peaceful coexistence of States with different socio-political systems has made important headway and the processes of détente and the tendency towards equal and mutually advantageous co-operation have become a real factor in shaping international relations.

There is a growing understanding and belief that no international problem at present can be resolved from the position of power politics or by the use or threat of force. Even taking into account the dangers inherent in the current international situation, there is no problem so complicated that we could not tackle it by way of a dialogue and seek a solution, if only the parties concerned show adequate understanding and the political will truly to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and the well-being of nations.

In the continuing international dialogue, Poland has always done its best to maintain a constructive position in taking up matters that are important, urgent and ready for solution. We have always approached such matters with an open mind and the readiness to consider all constructive proposals and arguments. Together with our allies, we continue to make our contribution to the building of strong foundations of peace, security and co-operation in Europe.

We do not act from any tactical motive or out of political convenience. We firmly believe that a peaceful Europe and friendly relations in the world at large correspond to the most vital interests of our people today and tomorrow. In other words, we conceive of Poland's security and further development in close and inseparable connexion with the preservation and consolidation of peace and security throughout the world, including Europe.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

The past four decades have confirmed beyond any doubt that my country's independent existence and sovereign development are indissolubly linked with socialism. A socialist Poland can and will further contribute in a most constructive manner to the European dialogue and to the cause of strengthening international peace and security. It is in this spirit that, together with our allies, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, we spare no effort to counteract all the unfavourable trends in the international situation. We have always been aware that the policy of détente has no reasonable or acceptable alternative. The only possible way to consolidate peace, international security and co-operation is through constructive dialogue, détente, a halt to the arms race and the achievement of effective disarmament through respect for the independence of peoples and a general improvement of relations between States. This consistent and durable policy was once again strongly reaffirmed last May and October in the documents of the Political Consultative Committee and the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, respectively.

To the extent possible and in accordance with the interests of the security and peace of the whole continent, Poland is ready to undertake further specific steps to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe and thus contribute to improving the climate of mutual trust and co-operation for the benefit of all nations. This includes a reciprocal obligation among the parties concerned to freeze the number of our respective armed forces. The same motives guided the socialist States in submitting, several days ago, new compromise proposals at the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Indeed, we attach great importance to the Vienna talks, as they may contribute decisively to the progress of military détente in Europe, based on the principles of reciprocity and the undiminished security of either side.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Poland attaches particular importance to the current meeting in Madrid. We sincerely hope that a constructive atmosphere will prevail at the meeting.

In particular, we see the need for deciding in Madrid on convening a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe. The conference should in no way be a substitute for any existing negotiating forums. It would strengthen the process of political détente and co-operation by real measures in the field of mutual security.

As members of this Committee are aware, Poland has offered to host the conference in Warsaw. We hope the meeting in Madrid will adopt a decision along these lines concerning the time and venue of the conference.

I now wish to turn to another aspect of the item under consideration which is of particular interest to my delegation. Two years ago, in translating the lofty provisions of the Declaration of 1970 into the language of political action, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.

We note with satisfaction that the Declaration has met with a positive response in international forums. Creative expansion of its purposes and principles has already been embarked upon by a number of Governments and international organizations.

We think it especially worth mentioning that this year alone it has given rise to a very important resolution adopted by the twenty-first session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), held in Belgrade, devoted entirely to the contribution of that Organization to the preparation of societies for life in peace. Earlier, the World Conference on the United Nations Decade for Women, held in Copenhagen, adopted a resolution on the role of women in the preparation of societies for life in peace, a task that has also been incorporated into the Programme of Action for the second half of the Decade.

As an initiator of the Declaration, Poland has undertaken a number of steps for its implementation. In that connexion, the Government of Poland will be submitting to the Secretary-General a comprehensive summary and an

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

assessment of the progress thus far made in the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace which, we venture to hope, will contribute to the over-all report next year.

The continuing arms race and the absence of reliable guarantees of international security have a hampering effect on peace and prosperity in the world of today. I do not intend to dwell on this problem, since my delegation has already expressed its views thereon in our general debate on disarmament. In this context, however, we would like again to express our full support for the important proposals of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contained in its memorandum on "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees," A/35/482, Annex. These proposals constitute most timely and realistic steps.

The nuclear arms race remains particularly dangerous. Hence, we cannot but view the decision of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to station new types of nuclear missile systems in Europe as a serious infringement of the process of détente on a world-wide scale. We place hopes in the commencement of Soviet-American negotiations on medium-range nuclear missile systems in Europe and on United States forward-based nuclear systems, which started last October in Geneva.

We share the view that the limitation of nuclear armaments remains the most important problem of today's world and constitutes the basic condition for strengthening peace.

Recent developments confirm that there is urgent need to undertake serious efforts to eliminate tensions haunting different parts of the world.

Among the imperatives of our time, the question of a comprehensive and lasting settlement of the conflict in the Middle East also remains pending. Such a settlement, in the preparation of which all interested parties should participate, together with the Arab people of Palestine, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, would remove one of the causes of international tensions whose effects by far transcend the boundaries of the Middle East. Such a settlement would require withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the territories occupied since 1967, restoration of the rights of the

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, together with the creation of their own independent State, as well as guarantees of the sovereignty and security of all States in the region.

We reaffirm our support for the people of Namibia in its struggle for genuine independence and resolutely condemn the policy of apartheid of South Africa.

We support the constructive proposals of the three Indo-Chinese States to create a zone of peace in South-East Asia.

Poland supports the just demands of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3390 B (XXX). As in the past, we lend our full support to the peaceful reunification of Korea on democratic principles, without foreign intervention, and for a replacement of the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement, as a measure to ease tension and maintain and consolidate peace in Korea, in Asia and all over the world.

In conditions of détente a constructive dialogue on problems is certainly possible. When tensions flare up, its importance is all the greater. Keeping all channels open at a time of crisis is the first step towards reducing those tensions.

In the present situation, when international relations are more complicated, the need for dialogue is growing. We shall spare no effort to make that truth a practical reality in relations among States.

Mr. LAI Yqli (China)(interpretation from Chinese): It is the fervent hope of the people of the world that the United Nations will fulfil its lofty aims and purposes of safeguarding world peace, opposing wars of aggression and strengthening the independence and security of countries. States Members of this Organization are duty bound to abide strictly by the principles and purposes of the Charter; no one has any reason and any right to violate or trample on those principles and purposes.

It has been ten long years since our Committee was first seized of the item "Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security." In face of the turbulent international situation, the people of various countries are hoping that the gradual and earnest implementation of the Declaration will be of real benefit to the cause of world peace and the independence and security of countries. However, people cannot but regret and be disappointed at the development of the actual situation. The resolutions adopted every year on the implementation of the Declaration and on non-interference in the internal affairs of States are explicit in their provisions. For example, it has been repeatedly stressed in those resolutions that countries in their international relations must respect the Charter principles of national independence, territorial integrity, equal sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of States; respect the right of other countries to choose by themselves their political system and economic, social and cultural development free from any outside interference and oppose aggression and foreign occupation. However, these basic norms of international relations, far from being scrupulously adhered to, have been repeatedly and grossly violated and trampled upon.

There is no security in the world at present. Israel is still occupying Palestinian and other Arab territories by force. South Africa is maintaining its illegal rule in Namibia. The most recent and serious case of gross violation of and trampling upon the norms of international relations is the Soviet Union's armed invasion and military occupation of Afghanistan, a non-aligned and Islamic State. It will be recalled that the item "Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" was first introduced by the Soviet Union shortly after it had launched an armed invasion against one of its allies. Throughout the

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

past ten years, under the guise of "strengthening international security," the Soviet Union has been engaged in activities which undermine international security. Its armed forces have provoked incidents along the borders of other countries; its espionage apparatus has infiltrated and subverted other countries; its militarist and bellicose agents have unscrupulously jeopardized the independence and security of other countries. At the end of 1979, it dropped all its pretence and once again launched an armed invasion with its own troops. Ten years ago, the consideration of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security began in the wake of the Soviet invasion of one of its allies. Today, ten years later, the Soviet Union is engaged in a massive invasion of non-aligned Afghanistan. The history of the last ten years is a history of continuous escalation in the aggression and expansion of this super-Power. Such open disregard for the earnest desire of the people of the world to safeguard international security must not be allowed to continue. The resolution of the emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority on 14 January 1980, calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan, is a clear reflection of the urgent desire of the people throughout the world. The resolution adopted by the present session of the United Nations General Assembly on 20 November by an overwhelming majority of 111 votes in favour is again a reflection of such an urgent desire. To insist on pitting oneself against the will of the people of the world would only make oneself even more passive and isolated.

The hegemonist behaviour of the Vietnamese authorities in Indo-China is another serious case of undermining international security. Emboldened by the support of the Soviet Union, the Vietnamese authorities have stubbornly refused to withdraw their aggressor troops from Kampuchea as called for in the resolution of the thirty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly. While continuing to escalate their war of aggression against Kampuchea, they have massed their forces along the Thai-Kampuchean border and made repeated armed provocations and threats of war against Thailand. The present session of the

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

General Assembly has also passed a resolution, once again calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea and for the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Kampuchean people. Let us see what the Vietnamese authorities will do next. Since the beginning of July this year, the Vietnamese authorities have created one incident after another along the Chinese border, sending armed personnel into Chinese territory on harass and sabotage missions, kidnapping Chinese fishermen and shelling Chinese villages in the border region, inflicting heavy loss of life and property on the local inhabitants. By pursuing the policy of aggression and regional hegemonism, the Vietnamese authorities alone are responsible for the serious situation in the Sino-Vietnamese relations and for the failure in the talks between the two countries at the level of Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs. However, the Vietnamese authorities have been spreading all kinds of rumours in an attempt to shift the blame onto China. As the Chinese saying goes, "The real culprit is always the first to accuse others". No matter how hard the Vietnamese authorities try to whitewash themselves by trumping up countercharges against others, the fact that more than 200,000 Vietnamese aggressor troops are still lording it over the people in Kampuchea is something which no amount of lies can cover up. The policy of aggression and expansion pursued by the Vietnamese authorities is a serious danger to peace, security and stability in Indo-China and the entire region of South-East Asia as well as a grave threat to international security. In order to strengthen international security, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam must be sternly enjoined to withdraw their aggressor troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea respectively in full compliance with the provisions of numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on the subject.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

Developments on the Korean peninsula have also aroused the concern of the peoples of the world. The intensified fascist dictatorship practised by the South Korean military junta has created new obstacles for the dialogue between North and South Korea and the peaceful reunification of the country, and has an adverse effect on the peace and security of the region of North-East Asia. In order to safeguard peace and security in East Asia and the Pacific, the resolution adopted five years ago by the United Nations General Assembly should be resolutely carried out by disbanding the "United Nations Command" and withdrawing all United States military forces from South Korea. The question of Korea should be reasonably settled once and for all through negotiations among the parties concerned on the basis of the three fundamental principles proposed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and in accordance with the recent proposal on the establishment of a confederal State put forward by President Kim Il Sung.

The Chinese delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48 and hopes that it will be faithfully carried out.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): First, I should like to thank Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas for his lucid and comprehensive introduction of document A/35/505 which contains the report of the Group of Experts on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

To my delegation, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is one of the few documents which, rooted firmly as it is in the United Nations Charter, links virtually all the issues and complex questions which the United Nations is called upon to consider. In a sense, it covers practically the entire spectrum of the United Nations agenda and, most important, it seeks to discern the interconnexion between those various items.

International security has its political, economic, social and even psychological ramifications. For example, the Declaration sees a close nexus between international security, on the one hand, and disarmament on the other; and between international security, on the one hand, and

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

economic development on the other. In a sense, then, it affirms the indivisibility of international peace and security.

In the United Nations we have little alternative for practical consideration but to see each issue in some isolation, as a different agenda item, tending thus in a sense to fragment the whole question of international security. All unresolved questions, all points of tension, all inequalities - political, economic and social - are all proper subjects of the Declaration. For this reason my delegation, together with delegations of non-aligned countries, has consistently supported the principles enunciated in the Declaration.

Despite its all-embracing nature and the wide range of issues which it covers, when the Declaration was adopted 10 years ago it was adopted without a dissenting vote. It was therefore with some sense of regret that the Group of Experts carried out its mandate without the participation of representatives of some groups. I am aware that resolutions on the Declaration adopted subsequent to 1970 have sometimes been controversial; but an opportunity was afforded to all groups to participate in the review of a key United Nations document which not only had been adopted virtually unanimously but comprehensively covered issues affecting international security.

Ambassador Hepburn has already given a detailed analysis of the positive developments of the last decade which have helped to strengthen international security. He has also covered other developments and factors which still hamper the strengthening of international security.

The report contained in document A/35/505 undertakes such a review of the implementation of the Declaration and makes proposals which, in the Group's view, could strengthen conditions of peace, security and co-operation in the world.

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.48 - which was so ably introduced a little while ago by the representative of Bangladesh - bases itself largely on the report of the Group of Experts.

I shall now comment briefly on one or two aspects of the report and the draft resolution which have been the subject of some discussion.

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

Contrary to some comment that has been heard, neither the report nor the draft resolution seeks to pillory the Security Council or to accuse it of being ineffective. In fact, implicit in the report, as well as in the draft resolution, is the hard inescapable premise that the Security Council is indeed the primary United Nations institution for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is precisely for that reason that the report has devoted so much attention to the role of the Security Council.

The Council is accorded grave responsibilities under the Charter. It has been called to action in a number of world crises and has been instrumental in the prevention and solution of conflicts. Considering the present international situation - which affords no cause for jubilation, to say the least - the argument for a strong, responsible Security Council is even more cogent than before. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the international community should carefully consider how the authority and enforcement capacity of the Security Council could be further enhanced to cope more decisively and more firmly with the issues before us.

The confidence of Member States in the Security Council must be strengthened. It is only on occasions when the international community as a whole does not have that degree of confidence in the Council to live up to its high responsibility that recourse is made to other methods of decisive international action.

The report does not in any way dispute the primary responsibility of the Security Council in matters concerning international security. It would really like to see the Council fulfil its primary responsibility under the Charter, and it is only in that context that proposals are suggested by the Group of Experts in section II of its report.

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

In their separate and individual capacities, too, the permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility for strengthening international peace and security. This is especially so in considering developments in the Indian Ocean area. We are now at a decisive and crucial stage in our progress towards the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, an area which has seen a steep foreign military escalation in the recent past. The participation of all permanent members of the Security Council in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is welcome as the Committee prepares for the Conference on the Indian Ocean called for in resolution 34/80 B.

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

Whatever the different perceptions, everyone agrees that developments in the area seriously jeopardize not only regional peace and security but international security as well. We see the deterioration in conditions of peace and security in the area as the strongest and most cogent rationale for the holding of the conference as scheduled. It is hoped that all Permanent Members of the Security Council will co-operate in a positive manner to ensure the success of the conference. The conference surely cannot establish a peace zone in the Indian Ocean overnight, but could nevertheless take crucial steps forward towards the establishment of conditions of peace and security in an area which of late has been deteriorating into an area of instability, tension and big-Power confrontation.

I have deliberately confined myself in my brief remarks to just one or two aspects of the report before us, because these aspects have been the subject of considerable discussion in the meetings of the Group of Experts. I do not thereby minimize the importance of other components essential for the strengthening of international security, such as the restructuring of international economic relations, the completion of the process of decolonization, the eradication of racism and apartheid, the establishment of a system of universal collective security without military alliances or mutually antagonistic blocs, increased international co-operation and mutual trust among nations, freedom from foreign domination and foreign interference in the internal affairs of States, and so on.

The list is long, but the Declaration seeks to bring all these to a single focus in accordance with the United Nations Charter, emphasizing the indivisibility of international security.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The maintenance of international security is the primary function of the Security Council and is the most important part of the Charter of the United Nations, which deals with it 32 times.

Now, one would have to make clear what is meant by the words "international security", because there seems to be some confusion over their meaning. There is a general and all-encompassing meaning of "international security" which implies justice and freedom in the world and all that results from it. But there is another, specific meaning of "international security" which refers to the system of international security provided for in the Charter, and which is explicitly stated therein. That system relies upon the decisions of the Security Council in cases of aggression or other breaches of the peace and the implementation of those decisions - and, if they are not implemented, the taking of enforcement action. That is the basis of the maintenance of peace in accordance with the Charter.

That, which forms the heart of the Charter, has, since soon after the establishment of the United Nations, been truncated and almost wiped out by the elimination of Chapter VII. Therefore, we have no enforcement action to give validity and effect to the Security Council's decisions, which, by remaining unimplemented, lose their validity and effect.

There has been for many years the situation due to the cold war. When the cold war started melting and there was a degree of détente we had the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, in 1970. That was the first trend towards effectively moving in the direction of international security. Then, gradually, we had a new trend, resulting from the adverse developments in the world, where the pronouncements of the Secretary-General in his reports to the General Assembly emphasized the need to activate the function of the Security Council in the implementation of its decisions.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

This is very significant, because in the past the Secretary-General had not felt it necessary to deal with this matter before, but it has emphatically been dealt with in a number of recent reports of the Secretary-General, which shows the trends in the world that have become necessary because of the situation developing in the world - and particularly the latest developments, which are very ominous. Therefore, we have to turn to the effective implementation of international security and, to that end, to the effective implementation of the Declaration.

In a recent report the Secretary-General had the following to say about the Security Council:

"It is essential that its capacity for this central function should not be lost sight of. The Council is, or was intended to be, the keystone of the structure of international order prescribed in the Charter. The way in which the Council is used, or not used, and the respect or lack of it, for its decisions is therefore a matter of the highest importance for the effectiveness and credibility of the United Nations as an essential instrument of peace." (A/32/L, p. 2)

I must refer to this because there seems to be a move afoot to try to dilute the effectiveness of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This trend should be discouraged, and I do not think there is anything more important than referring to what the Secretary-General has said on these matters in three of his recent reports.

The Secretary-General went on to say in the report from which I have already quoted:

"I know that there are practical political reasons for these shortcomings and that Governments reserve the right to use or to ignore the Security Council if they so desire. I only wish to repeat here that such attitudes are full of risk, for they may bring us to a time when the Council is desperately needed and will be found to be too weak to fulfil its responsibilities. We should not forget the disastrous experience of the League of Nations. That is why I believe that the strengthening of the position and authority of the Security Council and respect for its decisions should be a major and continuing preoccupation of all Governments." (Ibid., pp. 2 and 3)

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

That is one part of the current trend, because it does not appear in reports of the Secretary-General of previous years. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that in a subsequent report the Secretary-General pointed out that small countries do not have recourse to the Security Council in case of any conflict between them because they feel that any decision of the Security Council is of no validity. We see the situation now of a war going on without either of the belligerents going to the Security Council, and this is the result of the ineffectiveness of the decisions of the Security Council. Even unanimous decisions of the Security Council remain without effect.

Another trend towards international security is marked by the resolutions of the General Assembly calling for a study on the relationship between disarmament and international security.

We hear complaints about the existence of the veto. But if, even without the veto, unanimous resolutions are not implemented and not enforced, then what is the complaint about the veto? It will make no difference, if the situation continues as it is, and I say this to emphasize the need for complying with the Declaration as it is - not for complying with a Declaration that is being diluted.

I should like to refer to the Declaration to show that in its first part it solemnly reaffirms purposes and principles in a general way, but then comes concretely to what is required for the implementation of the strengthening of international security. That starts from paragraph 8 of the Declaration.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

This is the part that needs to be implemented, not the vague terms of the Declaration about other matters not directly concerned with the system of international security through the Charter. Paragraph 8 reads:

"The General Assembly, ...

"8. Recognizes the need for effective, dynamic and flexible measures, in accordance with the Charter, to prevent and remove threats to the peace, suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and in particular for measures to build, maintain and restore international peace and security;"

It then goes to the very heart of the matter:

"9. Recommends that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter in order fully to develop its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter;"

That is the gist of the Declaration. It then:

"11. Recommends that all States contribute to the efforts to ensure peace and security for all nations and to establish, in accordance with the Charter, an effective system of universal collective security without military alliances;"

That means that international security should rest on a United Nations force in accordance with Article 43. That is most important because, unless we have international security through the United Nations and through collective security, it would be impossible to stop the arms race. The arms race is the result of reliance on weapons. By relying solely on weapons, it would be unnatural to expect nations to desist from a competition in armaments. The only way to expect nations to desist from engaging in a competition in weapons is to provide international security.

The Declaration states further:

"13. Calls upon the Security Council, including the permanent members, to intensify efforts to discharge, in conformity with the Charter, its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security;"

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The draft resolution before us, which is so direct and addresses itself to the Security Council and its permanent members, is supported also by a recent consensus resolution adopted by this Committee in document A/C.1/35/L.41/Rev.1. The latter deals with the same subject and its operative paragraph 3:

"Recommends that the main organs of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, give early consideration of the requirements for halting the arms race ... and developing the modalities for the effective application of the system of international security provided for in the Charter;"

Operative paragraph 4:

"Requests the permanent members of the Security Council to facilitate the work of the Council in carrying out its essential responsibility under the Charter."

I find that the draft resolution which is proposed on the basis of the report is a very mild form of applying the Declaration and therefore should be accepted by consensus. I cannot conceive of any objection to a draft resolution which is so delicate and yet effective in dealing with this matter. It should not meet with any difficulties. Therefore, I would support the draft resolution and emphasize the need for its acceptance by consensus.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): Ten years ago, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted. That document is a landmark in the Organization's history and occupies a worthy place among those basic instruments which express the firm will of the peoples to end the cold war and to embark upon the road of détente. Thus, the United Nations has helped advance the process of furthering relations among States on the basis of peaceful coexistence.

The Declaration was the first to stipulate the manifold tasks resulting from the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter in our time and to cover those tasks in their inter-relationship. Progress needs to be achieved with regard to all those tasks in order to strengthen international security at large.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

The Declaration has been an important long-term guideline for the activities of both the States and the international Organization and has influenced many United Nations decisions in a positive manner. Today, this function is as topical as it was 10 years ago. Now, as before, it is most important that the United Nations Charter be recognized as the firm basis for a system of collective international security.

Since the adoption of the Declaration, every United Nations General Assembly session has dealt with the state of its implementation. The outcome has now been summarized in a report of the United Nations Secretary-General in document A/35/505. My delegation wishes to express its thanks particularly to the Chairman of the Group of Experts, Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas, for the excellent work he has done. The report states, inter alia, that some tasks set out in the Declaration were fulfilled and that, in respect of others, progress has been achieved or that measures have been undertaken to implement those tasks. But we also agree with those parts of the report indicating that there is still much left to be done for the purpose of translating the Declaration into lasting international practice.

The German Democratic Republic is of the view that the major concern of the Declaration must, now as before, be the focus of United Nations activities, namely, to establish for all peoples a peaceful environment which would enable them to develop their abilities for their own benefit and for social progress.

The present international situation, unfortunately, does not allow a contemplative retrospect, which sometimes takes place on the occasion of anniversaries. All through the 1970s, we did not refrain from pointing out the dangers that jeopardize détente. Now, those imperialist and hegemonistic forces that seek to seek recourse in the cold war have gained more influence. They think they can reach their selfish goals by the reincarnation of their policy of strength. They plan to replace the patient search for a peaceful and fair reconciliation of interests by the policy of military blackmail,

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

which is well-known from earlier days. One cannot but speak of a dangerous trend towards militarizing international relations on the part of those circles. That is also proved by the constant expansion of the United States Navy and of the navies of other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries in various regions of the world, by ever greater military manoeuvres, by the establishment of new military bases and by the declaration of entire regions to be what they call "regions of vital interest" to them. Much could be added to those facts.

(Mr. Rose, German
Democratic Republic)

Let me point only to the officially announced dangerous doctrines in which nuclear war is contemplated. The aim of such activities is quite clear - namely, to make States accept another's will. There are intentions to recreate conditions under which the big corporations will be free to exploit at random the resources of other peoples to their own advantage.

New conflicts are thereby pre-programmed, and the elimination of existing ones is rendered more difficult. The danger of military adventures increases generally - including the danger of a third world war, which would plunge the world into a nuclear catastrophe. We realize this danger but we reject the thesis of the inevitability of a new world war, which is now as before advocated in one form or another by politicians of China, who try to pit the world of capitalism and hegemonism against the socialist world and thereby intentionally further increase that danger. They have introduced a new doctrine in international affairs - namely, the teaching of lessons to others - and they have acted accordingly, as is well known.

The champions of an adventurous policy obviously do not realize that the world of 1980 is no longer the world of 1950. One can with absolute confidence predict that such a policy will meet with fierce resistance from the peoples. Particularly now, peace requires strong actions in its defence, and the German Democratic Republic will take part in those actions. As before, we are of the opinion that for the peoples there is no acceptable alternative to the course of détente and peaceful coexistence.

Reactionary Euro-centric ideologies find no place in a socialist conception of the world. We have to recognize, however, that the actual situation imposes a specific responsibility for world peace on the States of our continent. The positive appreciation of the Helsinki Final Act in General Assembly resolutions is well founded, and the non-European States are following events in Madrid.

Like the other socialist countries, the German Democratic Republic advocates that constructive measures for the further implementation of the entire Final Act, particularly in the field of military détente, be achieved at

(Mr. Rose, German
Democratic Republic)

that meeting. In this connexion I should like to quote from the communiqué on the State visit that the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, paid to Austria between 10 and 13 November 1980. It states, inter alia:

"The two sides expressed the view that the Madrid meeting should give a considerable impetus to further steps for deepening détente and for disarmament. They stressed the importance that an all-European conference on military détente and disarmament could have, and advocated that within the framework of balanced decisions taken at the Madrid meeting in all spheres of the Final Act also a decision on the convocation of that conference should be passed."

However, some NATO States are endeavouring to divert attention from the priority questions through demagogic propaganda, and they try to interfere in the internal affairs of other States. They dress up in judges' robes that do not fit them.

The distorted and one-sided reports and comments in Western publications were backed up by the fact that the text of the Final Act was not at all, or only very selectively, disseminated in Western countries. So it is necessary even to recall its name: the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Much remains to be done in order to consolidate the results achieved and to develop them further. This is true of the political and economic fields, and particularly of the military sphere. One need only think of the Vienna talks, which, despite numerous constructive proposals made by the participating socialist States, have not yet produced tangible results. One may also bear in mind the intentions to station highly sophisticated nuclear-weapons systems near our western border. And what about the principles proclaimed in Helsinki, when a State declares the citizens of another State to be its own?

We hope that in Madrid a substantial exchange of views will take place and lead to forward-oriented decisions.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security calls for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts in compliance with the United Nations Charter. Much to our regret, we have to state not only

(Mr. Rose, German
Democratic Republic)

that all the existing seats of tension continue to smoulder but also that new ones have emerged.

No stable peace can be achieved in the Middle East because Israel, backed up by its imperialist friends, is not willing to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, which includes the creation of a State of their own.

Just like the conflict in the Middle East, the conflict between Iraq and Iran is used by imperialist forces to transform the entire region into a huge military camp in order to preserve allegedly vital interests.

Rapid deployment forces are drilled for war against the peoples of the Middle East and the Near East. In order to prevent worse things happening, all efforts must be directed towards achieving a negotiated peaceful solution as early as possible.

The political independence of Zimbabwe constitutes an important victory of the cause of justice and security in southern Africa. But Namibia is still dominated by the racist régime, which at the same time keeps the people of South Africa under the colonial tyranny of apartheid.

The German Democratic Republic resolutely supports the proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the solution of the Korean question, including the withdrawal of United States forces from South Korea. In this connexion many people strongly protest the recent events in South Korea.

Pursuing a policy directed at strengthening international security, the German Democratic Republic attaches particular importance to arms limitation and disarmament. It has good reasons for doing so, reasons I should like to summarize as follows.

First, NATO's super-armament, which is programmed well into the 1990s, and which is sometimes called rearmament, means nothing else but the steady enlargement of weapons arsenals and the permanent perfecting of weapons systems. At the same time it is designed to help enforce political diktat. The drive for military preponderance is meant to create a potential for political blackmail.

(Mr. Rose, German
Democratic Republic)

The intensification of psychological warfare set off by an alleged human rights campaign is now being continued by using the situation around Afghanistan as a pretext for ever growing military expenditures.

Secondly, it is imperative that States commit themselves to mutual respect for generally recognized norms of international law and conclude agreements to that effect, which would be commendable steps. But the stability of such commitments and agreements will be fully ensured only when physical means of warfare are first reduced and finally completely eliminated.

Thirdly, the intensified arms race already entails extremely negative consequences for both the economic and social development of individual countries and international economic relations as a whole. If continued, those consequences will become even worse and will hit even harder at the developing countries in particular. Therefore practical measures leading to arms limitation and disarmament are urgently required.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

The overwhelming majority of States have called most emphatically for concrete steps to be taken towards arms limitation and disarmament and for pertinent negotiations to be entered into. That is reflected in many resolutions and decisions adopted at this year's session of the General Assembly.

In order to increase the effectiveness of the activities undertaken by the United Nations with a view to strengthening international security in accordance with the United Nations Charter and with the provisions embodied in the aforementioned Declaration, the German Democratic Republic deems that what is necessary is as follows. First, to undertake all possible efforts with a view to putting an end to the arms race and to achieving effective measures of disarmament. Those intentions should underlie the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is of great practical significance that negotiations be conducted at various levels so that better results will be reached. The priorities are well known. We should also like to draw attention once again to those measures which are aimed directly against the threat of war, and which the Committee adopted, inter alia, by the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/35/L.36.

Secondly, to make progress with a view to strengthening the basis for peaceful coexistence and détente in political and legal terms. Part of that process is the early drafting of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, as well as the elaboration of a declaration on non-interference. Such a declaration could play an important role, provided that it is firmly based on the United Nations Charter. The same goes for a declaration on the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Thirdly, to increase the United Nations contribution towards solving international conflicts on the basis of the United Nations Charter, and to preclude the emergence of new conflicts. In this connexion, my delegation would like to recall a proposal made by the Warsaw Treaty member States in May this year. They proposed considering the limitation and reduction of military presence and military activity in their respective regions, be it in the Atlantic or the Indian Ocean, or in the Pacific Ocean, the Mediterranean or the Persian Gulf.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

Fourthly, to take practical action with a view to making the struggle for equitable economic relations yet more effective. That should exclude any attempt to take possession of the natural resources of other peoples by force or neo-colonialist methods.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic hopes that those fundamental requirements for the purpose of strengthening international security will also be reflected in the draft resolution concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the decision taken at the beginning of this meeting, the list of speakers on agenda item 50 was closed at 12.30 p.m. We have still 20 speakers, but none are listed for this afternoon so that I have had reluctantly to confirm the cancellation of the meeting arranged for then. Tomorrow we shall have 8 speakers for the morning and 12 for the afternoon, and when the statements are concluded the Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48.

The afternoon meeting will be an extended meeting in the sense that it will not conclude by 6 o'clock, but will continue until we have concluded the general debate and taken action on the draft resolution, and also dealt with certain other related matters. In other words it is my intention to continue the meeting from 3 o'clock until the Committee concludes its work for the thirty-fifth session. It is to be hoped that the Preparatory Committee for the second special session devoted to disarmament will then be able to start its organizational session here on 4 December.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.