

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



FIRST COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Wednesday, 3 December 1980
at 3 p.m.
New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 52ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 50 (concluded)

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. Sheldov (Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Rakotoniaina (Madagascar)
Mr. Gonzalez (Cuba)
Mr. Kostenko (Ukrainian SSR)
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)
Mr. Sy (Senegal)
Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam)
Mr. Grinberg (Bulgaria)
Mr. Makonnen (Ethiopia)
Mr. Chebeleu (Romania)
Mr. Fein (Netherlands)
Mr. Moini (Iran)

A draft resolution was introduced by:

Mr. Thomas (Guyana) - A/C.1/35/L.62

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 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.52
5 December 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 50 (concluded)

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/L.4 and 15);
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES (A/C.1/35/L.62)

Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has always attached great importance to the consideration at sessions of the United Nations General Assembly of the item on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The position of the Byelorussian SSR on this topical problem has been stated in detail in our reply to the letter from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which is to be found in document A/35/505/Add.2.

In participating in this discussion our delegation would like to focus on a number of related issues. The firm and consistent policy of strengthening peace and international security forms the unshakeable basis of the foreign policy of socialism. In the struggle to exclude war from the life of mankind and to affirm the principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries having different social systems as a norm of international relations, the founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, whose 110th birthday is being celebrated this year by all progressive mankind, considered one of the most important tasks of the foreign policy of the country of the Soviets to be the strengthening of peace. He said, "The preservation of peace is dearest to us all". Later, he emphasized that

"Having buckled down to our own peaceful construction, we are now making every effort to ensure that peace continues uninterrupted."
The Soviet State has unwaveringly acted in accordance with that Leninist behest.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Ten years ago, in 1970, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which has become one of the most important documents of today's world. It provides a broad programme for action and initiatives by States aimed at developing and giving further material content to the relaxation of international tension, the prevention of the danger of another war, the attainment of concrete measures in the area of disarmament, and the eradication from international relations of the policies of hegemonism, colonialism, racism, apartheid, exploitation and diktat.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The annual consideration at sessions of the General Assembly of the results of the implementation of the provisions of that Declaration enables us to focus the attention of all States on the implementation of the main purpose of the United Nations, namely the ensuring of general peace and international security. In the course of that process, the following have been adopted: the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, the resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, the resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations and a number of other important decisions.

In the struggle for peace, security and détente, both within and outside the United Nations, the socialist States have always been consistent and have taken a fundamental position of principle. They have taken a constructive approach, have demonstrated goodwill, have been bold in putting forward initiatives, have been realistic in negotiations and have been quite willing to take account of the legitimate rights and interests of other people. Thanks to the determined and purposeful struggle of the Soviet Union and other countries in the socialist community, with the support of all peace-loving forces, the struggle to realize the purposes embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security resulted in a noticeable improvement in the international political atmosphere during the 1970s. The policy of détente gained strength and peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems became more stable and began to be supplemented by concrete measures.

One event of historic significance was the holding of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the signing of its Final Act. It proved possible to move forward in various areas relating to the limitation of the arms race, including the area of strategic nuclear weapons. There has been a clear relaxation of the cold war; more favourable preconditions have been established for the resolution of topical international problems; and a considerable amount of experience has been accumulated in settling situations of conflict between States. A new and positive aspect of this aspect of international relations is represented by the confidence-building measures and their implementation.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

As a result of the anti-imperialist, national liberation struggles of peoples, new and strong blows have been dealt to the system of colonialist and neo-colonialist domination, racism and apartheid.

On the whole, the basic changes that have occurred in the world balance between the forces of progress and those of reaction, of peace and war, national liberation and colonial oppression, have established the conditions necessary for joint efforts on the part of all peace-loving States and peoples and for ensuring important steps forward in resolving the problems of strengthening peace and international security throughout the sphere of international relations.

An extremely valuable contribution was made by the socialist community, which was the first to put into practice the principle of excluding war from the life of human society. As a result of that contribution, it proved possible to break the tragic vicious circle in which peace is only a short breathing space between world wars. Indeed, that is the most impressive success in the struggle for peace since the great victory over fascism 35 years ago.

Imperialist reaction, disturbed by the fact that the world is developing along lines quite removed from those it would like, is now making efforts to halt or at least to slow down developments. To that end and in order to maintain their own positions, the forces of imperialism have started trying to undermine détente, to whip up international tension, and to resort to the flexing of their military muscles and to acts of aggression. That is where one can find the real, not the assumed, reasons for the present further complication of the international situation; that is where the winds of the new cold war arise; and that is where one finds the real threats to international peace and security.

The leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) military bloc, and above all the United States of America, are taking active steps to disrupt the strategic balance between West and East, to their own advantage and to the detriment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other socialist countries, and to the detriment of détente and international security.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Their intention is to return the world to a time when politics were carried out from a position of strength and when the dangerous doctrine of brinksmanship held sway.

In May 1978 the NATO countries took a decision automatically to increase their military expenditures on an annual basis, and to continue to do so for many years to come. In December last year, they took a decision to develop and deploy in Western Europe new American medium-range nuclear missiles.

At the same time the United States proclaimed a new multibillion dollar programme to speed up the development of its weapons. According to recent reports in the American press, there is now a rather feverish desire to increase the military budget of the United States, which, in an attempt to sooth the military-industrial complex and the Pentagon has already spiralled upwards to an unprecedentedly high level of \$161 billion and that is apparently not the upper limit.

In the light of the growing aggressiveness of that policy, one must also consider facts such as the establishment by the United States of the rapid deployment forces for armed intervention in all parts of the world, as well as the statement made by Washington to those parts of the world where oil can be sniffed, to the effect that those areas are essential to the vital interests of the United States of America. There is also the expansion of old and the establishment of new military bases on the territories of other countries, of which there are already over 3,000, and the presence of the American army outside the frontiers of the United States. Because of the actions of the United States, negotiations have been halted or suspended on a number of important aspects of limiting the arms race. The United States recently proclaimed a new nuclear strategy, which was quite correctly assessed by international public opinion as a kind of nuclear blackmail, a sort of cynical, adventuristic toying with the fate of mankind.

In their military-political calculations the aggressive militaristic circles are focusing increasingly on playing the "Chinese card" and using for their own interests Peking's policy, which is imbued with big-Power aspirations. That partnership between imperialism and Peking

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

hegemonism is a dangerous phenomenon in world politics - dangerous to all of mankind, including the peoples of the United States and China. A new, disturbing reminder of the militaristic ambitions of Peking was China's recent powerful nuclear test in the atomsphere. The poisonous radioactivity from that test extended over a large part of our planet.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The reactionary forces are attempting to camouflage all this by setting up a propaganda campaign. This is really a psychological war, and its pivot is, as in the past, anti-Sovietism and the already exhausted myth of the so-called Soviet military threat.

What we have to deal with here is the usual falsifications of the imperialist circles and their faithful assistants, who are trying to cover up what they are doing. And what they are doing in fact is building up their military preparations.

As for their statement that the Soviet Union is, supposedly, building up its military potential, that is a deliberate attempt to mislead the peoples. Let us take Europe as an example. As has frequently been stated - and stated also during this session of the General Assembly - for several years now there has not been an increase in the number of Soviet troops in Central Europe. Moreover, in agreement with its allies in the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union has in fact unilaterally withdrawn from the territory of the German Democratic Republic 20,000 troops, 1,000 tanks and other military equipment, and for several years running has been reducing its expenditures on defence, which for 1981 amount to 5.7 per cent of its national budget.

In other words, the Soviet Union is doing nothing that goes beyond the framework of its defence needs - defence for itself and for its allies and friends. It firmly abides by the principle of equal security. If one wishes to talk about so-called military superiority, the idea of attaining this is quite alien to the socialist countries, just as the policy of competition and confrontation and the aspiration to divide the world into spheres of influence and to dominate also is alien to us.

This approach was confirmed once again in mid-May this year by a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Pact. The Declaration adopted at the meeting emphasized that the members of the Warsaw Pact had never striven and would never strive to attain military superiority. They constantly advocate that military equality should be ensured at increasingly lower levels and that there should be a reduction and elimination of military situations in which people are pitted against one another

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

strive to attain military superiority. They constantly advocate that military equality should be ensured at increasingly lower levels and that there should be a reduction and elimination of military situations in which people are pitted against one another in Europe. They have not, they have not had and they will not have any strategic doctrine other than that of self-defence, and they will never create the potential for a first nuclear strike. They will not strive to establish spheres of influence or to establish military or any other kind of control over any other regions or international means of transport or communication.

Like all States of the Socialist community, the Byelorussian SSR firmly opposes the policy of imperialism, hegemonism and reaction. In its place, we constantly aspire to consolidate détente and to make it the dominant factor in international life, to establish firm guarantees for the security of States, to achieve détente in the military area, halt the arms race and to reduce armed forces and the arms and arsenals of States.

Realistically a solution to these problems can be found only through continuing and intensifying the political dialogue between States belonging to different social systems, through serious and businesslike negotiations whose basis would be the principles of equality and refraining from actions detrimental to the security of the other side.

We are deeply convinced that the broad context of measures to strengthen international security includes as one of the most important the strengthening of the political and legal foundations for peace, in particular the conclusion of a global treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. In this connexion, we would note with satisfaction that some days ago the Sixth Committee adopted by an overwhelming majority, for recommendation to the General Assembly, a draft resolution under the terms of which the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations will continue its work, with a view to drafting as soon as possible a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security contains an appeal to all States to make urgent and concerted efforts

"... for the cessation and reversal of the nuclear and conventional arms race at an early date, the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control ...". (resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 20)

This appeal is particularly relevant at this time since, as has already been emphasized at this session of the General Assembly, mankind is now faced with a choice: either the peoples and States will do all they can to preserve peace, or else they will be thrust into the gulf of a destructive and devastating nuclear world war.

The Soviet Union and other countries of the Socialist community, because they want to put an end to the arms race, have in recent years put forward a dozen or so specific proposals on limiting the arms race and on other disarmament questions. As is known, at this session of the General Assembly the Soviet Union put forward a new and important initiative concerning a number of urgent measures for reducing the danger of war. It also submitted a memorandum entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees" containing various proposals for enhancing the effectiveness of work being done on specific aspects of the struggle to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament.

We view with satisfaction, as a substantial contribution to strengthening international security, the draft resolutions adopted during the last few days by our Committee calling for a halt to the expansion of military alliances and for their dissolution, for a freezing of the numbers of troops and levels of conventional weapons and for the beginning of negotiations, with all nuclear States participating on the question of nuclear disarmament and on the drafting of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. There were also the draft resolutions seeking the prohibition of new types and

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

systems of weapons of mass destruction and the speeding of progress in the field of the banning of chemical and radiological weapons, and a series of measures on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. We welcome the call for the renewal and development of negotiations on various aspects of the disarmament problem, including a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests.

I should also like to emphasize the importance of the document adopted on 30 October of this year by this session of the General Assembly on the initiative of the Soviet Union, namely the resolution on the "Historical responsibility of States for the preservation of nature for present and future generations", the focus of which was the deadly consequences of the arms race for man's environment.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

My delegation sincerely hopes that the resolutions adopted will not remain simply pious wishes but rather will become effective and practical measures that will be applied.

As a country which in the last war suffered from Hitler's aggression and in the struggle against fascism lost every fourth inhabitants and more than half of its national wealth, the Byelorussian SSR is vitally concerned to ensure that peace and security in Europe are maintained. Of paramount importance to the fate of peace in Europe and throughout the world is the Final Act adopted at Helsinki just over five years ago. As members know, representatives of States that participated in that European conference are now meeting in Madrid. The socialist countries take a very serious approach to the Madrid Conference. The participants in the meetings of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of States Parties to the Warsaw Pact that met in late October this year reaffirmed in their communiqué:

"the intention of their States to make their contribution to the achievement at the Madrid meeting of agreements within the frameworks of all the sections of the Final Act.",

and noted that

"The achievement, at the Madrid meeting, of real progress in the direction of strengthening détente, consolidating security and developing co-operation on the European continent is of special importance of the continuation of the process begun by the all-European conference." (A/35/558, Annex, p. 4)

However, I think we have to say quite openly that certain circles in the Western countries are trying to turn the Madrid Conference into a place for engaging in slanderous anti-Soviet propaganda and cheap demagoguery. We hope that those attempts will be halted and that in their place a business-like approach will prevail.

Reaching agreement on holding the all-European conference on military détente and disarmament is of particular significance. In order further to strengthen international security it is necessary to work to regulate existing conflicts by political methods, by peaceful means. Unfortunately, as a result of crude intervention by the forces of imperialism and hegemonism in the internal affairs of other States, new conflicts are in fact being added to the old existing ones. There is a particularly tense situation in the Middle

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

East. Militaristic imperialist circles are carrying out an expansionist policy with the aim of crushing the national liberation struggle of the peoples of that region and are trying to steal the national resources, particularly the oil resources, of the States in the region. That policy, which is a by-product of the shameful Camp David deal, is a flagrant flouting of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Israel continues to occupy the Arab lands which it seized in 1967. Also, there is the escalation by the United States of its military preparedness in the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea, and there are attempts made to restore imperialist influence in Afghanistan, Iran and other places, which constitute a threat to peace and security. They disrupt stability and create conditions in which new military conflicts could occur.

The Byelorussian SSR, like other countries in the socialist community, believes that the Middle East and the Persian Gulf area are a sphere of vital interests of the States and the peoples there and that nobody is entitled to intervene in their affairs or to do anything with their national wealth against their will.

The hegemonistic policy of Peking, encouraged by the United States, has created a state of tension in South-East Asia. We support the efforts of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea to make South-East Asia a zone of peace, stability and co-operation, which would be in the interests of all States in the region.

The Byelorussian SSR also supports the just struggle of the Korean people for the peaceful and democratic unification of Korea, without outside intervention, and we are in favour of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea.

Another pending problem is the final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid, as well as the problem of the restructuring of international economic relations and placing them on a just and democratic basis.

Anyone here or in any other body in the United Nations would be working in vain if he were simply trying artificially to whip up a lot of noise about events in Afghanistan and Kampuchea in the desire to distract people from the actual vital issues facing mankind today: the problems of curbing the arms race,

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

finding a settlement in the Middle East, eliminating racism and apartheid, achieving independence for Namibia and developing the struggle against neo-colonialism and for the elimination of discrimination and exploitation in world economic relations. It is time to put an end to attempts to whip up enmity and hostility and to escalate hatred among peoples. In the coming years not only will it be necessary to do all we can to use the experience we have acquired in the last decade, but we must also continue to develop the struggle for peace, freedom, national independence and social progress.

There is no people in the world that would deliberately wish to link its fate to the policy of the arms race and preparations for war. All peoples are united by a common aspiration for peace, development, détente and disarmament. As stated recently by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev:

"Peace is the first and the inalienable right of every person and every people. Peace is that invaluable property of mankind and it is the noble purpose of all peoples of goodwill to fight for it and to strengthen it."

The Byelorussian SSR delegation is deeply convinced that it is the duty of the United Nations during this year, the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, to make its valuable contribution to that end.

Mr. RAKOTONIAINA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security deserves our attention for more than one reason. First, this year is the tenth anniversary of the Declaration, which was adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 2734 (XXV) in 1970. Secondly, that historic document, which refers emphatically and explicitly to the fundamental principles of the Charter, has been recognized as an important instrument that has had a positive influence on the conduct

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

of States, and therefore on the status of international relations, because it has provided guidelines for efforts undertaken during the 1970s to promote stability in the world.

Since the adoption of the Declaration numerous initiatives have emerged in the United Nations aimed at returning to the Organization the role which it normally should play under the provisions of the Charter and at creating conditions that would lead eventually to the establishment of a global peace.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

As part of our review of the implementation of the Declaration, we might mention three areas in which concerted action was taken before the adoption of the Declaration but which were subsequently furthered by it.

First, the persistence of colonialism has always been regarded as a major obstacle to the establishment of peace, because constant friction between the oppressor and the oppressed inevitably leads to confrontation and violence, which in turn cannot fail to have an impact on international security. Consequently, recognition of the rights and aspirations of the subjugated peoples of the world has become an overriding necessity and requires support for the principles of the Charter, as they are set forth in the Declaration.

Secondly, the constant worsening of international relations and the inability to produce genuine disarmament has confronted States with the choice between coexistence and mutual destruction. In search of a modus vivendi in their relations the process of détente has emerged.

Thirdly, the interdependence of international security and economic development implies that an end must be put to the great disparity between the haves and the have nots in the world. The justified anger caused by the exploitation of the poor countries calls for restructuring of international economic relations.

Decolonization, the New International Economic Order and disarmament are the main areas of international life which we have considered in assessing the extent to which the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has been implemented.

Clearly, one does not need to be too prescient to be aware that there's many a slip 'twixt cup and lip. The decade coming to an end regrettably has seen many acts which are incompatible with the spirit and letter of the Charter.

The death knell of colonialism has of course sounded, and the process of decolonization is coming to an end, but attempts at colonial reconquest and other forms of domination have emerged under the cover of neo-colonialism, spheres of influence and hegemonism. Haunted by a nostalgia for the past, certain

(Mr. Rakotoniana, Madagascar)

circles have not hesitated to avail themselves of any opportunity to intervene, more or less overtly, in the internal affairs of other States. Prompted by short-term interests, States have had no compunction about brandishing the threat of force on specious pretexts, trampling underfoot the principles of the Charter and causing serious crises in international life. Acts of subversion and destabilization have been perpetrated against governments whose political or economic choices have not suited these same circles.

The establishment of a new international economic order requires co-operation among all States. This co-operation presupposes taking into account the interests of all sides and must be conceived of as being free of any notion of subordination or subjugation.

However, it does not seem that the dialogue begun on the restructuring of economic relations has been pursued in terms of world stability.

The international situation has deteriorated recently and détente, which has already been acknowledged as limited in scope and content, has experienced certain setbacks. Negotiations on the limitation of armaments have dragged on, and the balance of power, instead of curbing the arms race, has only aggravated it to such an extent that we are now wondering whether disarmament is not part of some mystifying process and a utopian dream.

Today's international realities are hardly a cause for optimism. No effort should be spared to reduce international tension by eliminating focal points of tension wherever they may appear in the world.

In southern Africa, the eradication of apartheid and self-determination and independence for Namibia must become a reality without further delay.

In the Middle East, stability cannot be envisaged by denying the Palestinian people their inalienable rights.

In the Far East, the reunification of the Korean nation would help to improve the political climate and eliminate the threat of armed conflict. Here the declaration of the Workers' Party of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 10 October 1980, suggesting the setting up of a confederated republic, should be seriously considered by all parties, for it contains valid, realistic proposals, aimed at peacefully reunifying Korea.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

The idea of promoting a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean must be pursued relentlessly if that area is not to become the theatre of military escalation.

The persistence of crises and focal points of tension in the world, and the emergence of new conflicts among States are especially disturbing, because the Security Council no longer seems able to be effective in preventing and stopping conflicts. States must discharge their responsibilities and refrain from seeking shelter behind considerations of strategy and economics, the validity of which is not convincing.

States have committed themselves under the Charter to resolve their conflicts by peaceful means. The importance of that principle is borne out by the fact that it has been endorsed in two United Nations Declarations, the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States in Accordance with the Charter, and the Declaration the implementation of which we are now considering.

However, we regret that some States seem to lose sight of these principles by refusing to resort to the peaceful ways and means mentioned in these two afore-mentioned Declarations, scorning the principles and convictions in these Declarations, whereby the prolongation of a dispute or a situation might affect friendly relations among States and jeopardize international security.

The strengthening of international security is a complex, long-term task. We must encourage individual or collective initiatives aimed at lessening international tension and strengthening security among States on sound political and legal bases which will stand the test of time and the vicissitudes of international relations. In the meantime, it is imperative that States abide strictly by the principles of the Charter and the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

(Mr. Rakotoniana, Madagascar)

In conclusion, we should like to stress once again that whatever we do in support of the cause of peace and international security will be futile unless everyone contributes to it. The present international situation is such that it requires a display of firm political will directed towards peace and towards the elimination of tensions in strict conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Mr. GONZALEZ (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): The Government of Cuba attaches primary importance to the item on international security. The positions of my Government are known to all delegations. In document A/35/505/Add.1, entitled "Review of the Implementation on the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security," there is a summary of Cuba's positions on the item before us. In addition, in our delegation's principal statement in the First Committee we expressed our views and opinions on matters related to the subjects under the agenda item of disarmament.

Once again, we have repeated the unshakeable commitment of our Government and people to the cause of peace and international security.

Everyone is familiar with the efforts that our Government has made and is continuing to make to bring about an honourable political settlement, based on respect for the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, in the conflict in South-East Asia and in that between Iraq and Iran. Our delegation has, on a number of occasions during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, stated its view at considerable length on these matters.

Today the world is investing approximately a million dollars a minute on weapons, a figure that exceeds \$500 billion a year, and according to studies produced by various organizations concerned with this matter, there now exists in the world's nuclear arsenals three tons of high-powered explosives for every inhabitant of the earth, man, woman and child.

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

Never before in the history of mankind has it been more likely that our species will be annihilated, and indeed that all living things on earth will be wiped out. That is why the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons, to bring about general and complete disarmament under effective control and to strengthen international security is of concern to all peoples and Governments and why it is acquiring ever-greater importance for all human beings.

The international community is aware of the serious threat to its future, and its anxiety has grown in recent days as we have witnessed the deterioration in the process of international détente with the appearance and development of new trouble spots, any one of which could seriously jeopardize international security and even lead to a holocaust.

The fight for international détente, for the peaceful solution of differences between States by peaceful means and for respect for the rights of peoples to self-determination and independence grows more urgent with each day. Respect for the territorial integrity of States, non-interference in internal affairs and non-use of force in international relations, are indispensable conditions for preventing new conflicts and for resolving those which already exist.

My delegation today would like to stress the growing importance to international peace and security of respect for the right of peoples to determine their own futures and to choose the social, political and economic régime best suited to their interests. The violation of that principle has been and continues to be one of the primary sources of conflict. Imperialist forces are still resisting, often with unprecedented ferocity, the recognition of the rights of peoples to control their own natural resources and the wealth they create. If we go to the root of the main conflicts in today's world, we always find a "philosophy of plunder".

For many years the Cuban people personally experienced imperialist aggression, and there is no need for us to give details at this time. In spite of that, we survived, we consolidated our independence and sovereignty and we rescued the dignity of a people who had lived for more than four centuries, first

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

under colonial and then under neo-colonial domination. And yet we are still being subjected to a criminal economic blockade that makes it impossible for us even to acquire medicine, a blockade set up by the most powerful imperialist Power of all time. And still that Power, against the will of our people and our Government, is occupying a part of our national territory, the Guantanamo Naval Base, and it is still violating our air space and making periodical espionage flights. A few months ago, as is well known, certain manoeuvres of rapid-deployment forces were carried out in the Caribbean, including the landing of troops on our national territory. These are attempts at blackmail and intimidation carried out against the peoples of Central America and the Caribbean and aimed at thwarting the right of the peoples of that region to choose the social, economic and political régime best suited to their own interests. The arms escalation in this region by the United States, its complicity with the repressions of the fascist military régime in El Salvador and the pressures it exercises upon other Latin American Governments, as in the case of Ecuador, are manifestations of the predominance of the imperialists who wish to perpetuate the régime of neo-colonial domination that they have established in our region, but which is inexorably doomed to disappear.

We draw attention to this situation, which is a dangerously explosive one, and we point the finger of blame at the imperialists who are responsible for the gradual deterioration of the situation in our region. No solution can be found for this situation that is not based on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, on full respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity and on respect for the right of peoples to choose the social, economic and political régime best suited to their interests.

The right of the people of Namibia to independence is beyond all question. The mandate of South Africa as administering Power lapsed long ago. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has been recognized by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. Our Organization has adopted many resolutions condemning the illegal occupation of Namibia

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

by the Republic of South Africa and the illegal plundering of Namibia's natural resources by South Africa and many multinational corporations. There is a unanimous appeal by the international community for the immediate granting of independence to Namibia and an end to the hateful régime of apartheid in South Africa, for both those situations exist in open defiance of the international community. We all know that they are possible only because of the support -- from diplomatic support to nuclear collaboration -- given South Africa by the imperialist Powers who derive large profits from the inhuman exploitation of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa and pitilessly plunder their natural wealth.

If there is a desire to bring about a neo-colonialist settlement to the problem of Namibia, that conflict cannot be resolved. If there is a desire to maintain the inhuman régime of apartheid until a settlement can be found that will guarantee the profits of the multinational corporations, then the conflict will never be resolved. No voice in the international community will be raised to call upon the peoples of Namibia and South Africa to renounce their sacred right to human dignity, to self-determination and independence and their right to struggle for their achievements with all the means at their disposal.

The responsibility for what is happening and for what might happen rests and will rest completely with the racist Government of South Africa and the Western Powers that support and sustain it. They are responsible for the nuclear capability South Africa has acquired with the clear aim of exercising pressure and blackmail on the independent African States and of intimidating the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, creating a serious danger to Africa in particular and to the world as a whole, although the African States have proclaimed their desire that Africa be a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In the Middle East, an attempt has been made to create the illusion that it is possible to work out a settlement to the conflict by means of a so-called peace treaty, one that deliberately excludes the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. No lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East can be achieved until the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to have their own State in Palestine, as well as the representative role of their organization, the PLO, are recognized.

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

Israel is today one of the principal countries producing and exporting arms. Its ability to do so is the result of the support of and collaboration with the imperialist Powers. Enriched uranium has even been "diverted" to accelerate Israel's nuclear capacity, as is very well known. The fact that some have capitulated in exchange for a plate of lentils is merely grist to the mill of the imperialists and the Israeli Zionists; but the Arab peoples, in particular the Palestinians, will never falter in their legitimate efforts no matter how great the present and future obstacles may be or appear to be.

My delegation is convinced that a settlement of the conflict in the Middle East will never be found unless the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are taken into account.

The situation in South-East Asia remains explosive. Collusion among the colonialist Powers, which wish to protect their neo-colonialist interests, and the hegemonists in Peking have considerably complicated things in the area. No people has had to bear such sacrifices or show such heroism in defence of their independence and freedom, since the Second World War, as has the people of Viet Nam. An unshakeable friendship has been forged in the process among the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea. With the support of and inspired by the Chinese leaders, the Pol Pot régime not only slaughtered 3 million Kampucheans but also unleashed a border conflict with Viet Nam which served as a pretext for aggressive military action on a wider scale by the Peking leaders. Pol Pot's evil régime was destroyed by the Kampuchean patriots, who heroically fought against the genocidal régime and enjoyed the fraternal support of Viet Nam.

The imperialists are now trying to set themselves up as the great champions of the human rights of the peoples of Indo-China, those self-same imperialists who not so very long ago stopped at nothing to exterminate them, using the largest number of explosives and chemical weapons ever used against any people in the history of the world. They invented the Vietnamese "peril", just as they are inventing the "communist peril" in the Caribbean, invoking an alleged need to defend the Cape route to justify their support of the apartheid régime, and claiming strategic interests in the Middle East and in the Gulf area to

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

justify their support of Israel and the build-up of their military presence in the Indian Ocean. Owing to their monopoly on the dissemination of information and the complicity of the ruling clique in Peking and other reactionary forces, we have been faced with the unusual situation in which the representatives of a non-existent Government - which when in power was more blood-thirsty than even the Hitlerite fascists - now occupy the seat in our Organization which rightly belongs to the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

We draw attention to this situation because it only encourages the aggressive plans of the imperialists and hegemonists in Peking against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and therefore only serves to maintain a dangerous focal point of tension in South-East Asia. My delegation is convinced that the truth will emerge sooner or later.

Thirty-one years ago the Korean peninsula was divided between the North and the South. Twenty-three years ago the Korean Armistice was signed. In its resolution 3390 (XXX) of 18 November 1975, the General Assembly spoke out in favour of the dissolution of the "United Nations Command" and of the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea; it appealed to the signatories of the Armistice Agreement to replace it with a peace agreement because it considered that a lasting peace could not be achieved under the terms of the armistice.

Many acts of aggression continue to be perpetrated daily against the People's Democratic Republic of Korea so as to maintain a state of conflict.

The "United Nations Command" has not yet been dissolved, and under its flag United States troops are impeding and obstructing the full exercise of the most sacred rights of the Korean people, using the territory of that country as one of their most important bases for the development of their imperialist plans in Asia.

We denounce the attempts of imperialism to unleash further military aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Mankind must denounce those mad designs in order to stay the hand of the aggressors, while there is still time.

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

While this situation continues and until conditions are created for the peaceful reunification of the Korean people, on bases that are freely determined without external pressure, this dangerous source of tension will continue.

It is for those reasons that my delegation considers it necessary to stress the importance for the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international security of the right to self-determination of peoples, the right to independence and to dispose of their resources, and the right to unrestricted observance of the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the affairs of States.

My delegation considers that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has played an important role in the creation of conditions for maintaining peace and international security and for promoting co-operation among States, on the basis of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the majority of the Member States have supported the provisions and principles of the Declaration and have actively contributed to its implementation, there continue to be flagrant violations of the Declaration, particularly with reference to non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, and resort to the use or threat of use of force in international relations, which have produced conflicts that threaten international peace and security. The persistence of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, including zionism and apartheid, constitutes a major obstacle to the achievement of the kind of security that we all need and want.

The opposition of my Government to any attempt to accentuate or exacerbate confrontation among the major Powers is very well known. That is why today we oppose and denounce with renewed vigour the criminal attempts of the imperialist Powers to represent the legitimate struggle of peoples for their independence and against neo-colonialist and racist régimes as a threat to international peace and security. They would have us believe - showing complete scorn for our intelligence - that these conflicts derive from external sources and not from unjust relations of domination and exploitation created by them for their own benefit.

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

These considerations inevitably lead us to comment, albeit briefly, on the problems and obstacles confronting most of mankind as they move towards development - a fundamental basis for stability in today's world.

To the structural distortions caused by centuries of colonial domination and decades of neo-colonialist and imperialist exploitation, there should be added today for the majority of the underdeveloped countries new phenomena which are epitomized by trade on unequal terms, a growing lack of capital, soaring indebtedness, monetary uncertainty and the actions of the multinational corporations, to mention but a few, resulting inevitably in an unprecedented widening of the gap between the developed and other countries, the growth of internal and external dependence, the prospects of growing poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and malnutrition. In short, the chances for real development are becoming ever fewer.

It is necessary to stress the role of the imperialist Powers in this situation. In addition to the traditional policy of exploitation, based on the view that our countries are and should be suppliers of raw materials and cheap labour, an attempt is now being made to transfer to the underdeveloped countries the effects of an economic crisis caused by the self-same imperialist Powers, a crisis which is a feature of the economic and social systems that they would like to impose on the world.

(Mr. Gonzalez, Cuba)

The imperialist Powers stubbornly refuse to engage in a genuine process of international negotiation leading to a collective and comprehensive settlement of the acute economic problems afflicting the world - in particular, the under-developed countries. The imperialist countries are actually systematically shirking their responsibility to make a decisive contribution to the development of the "third world" countries, without realizing that in the long run their own survival is indissolubly linked with ours.

The creation of a new international economic order is one of the imperative necessities of our time. It is impossible to conceive of the strengthening of international security as long as most of mankind is deprived of its right to development.

The aggressive actions of the imperialist Powers against the economies and the development opportunities of the under-developed countries are also serious threats to the maintenance of international peace and security. My delegation considers that the strengthening of international security is a task which must be borne equally by all countries. The prevention and elimination of hotbeds of conflict can only be achieved on the basis of unrestricted respect for the principles of the Charter.

Let there be respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and independence; let intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States cease; let all forms of support for apartheid and for régimes based on racist doctrines come to an end; let us work together for the establishment of a new international economic order which is more just and equitable. We shall thus be making an effective contribution to the achievement of lasting peace and the strengthening of international security.

Mr. KOSTENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The United Nations General Assembly's adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security marked the beginning of the 1970s, a period that will enter the history of international relations as a time of major positive changes. The principles proclaimed therein undoubtedly served as important guidelines for the activities of States in the international arena. The annual consideration of an item on implementation of that Declaration has enabled us to see to what extent and in what areas of the strengthening of international security these guidelines are being used.

During the debate, and in the resolutions adopted, there has been a considerable enriching of the content of that important document. The United Nations has considerable experience in joint efforts to solve major problems facing mankind. The very fact that there has been no world war for 35 years is an asset in itself, and indeed a certain amount of the credit goes to the United Nations. However, experience also shows that the United Nations' potential is fully used only when there is a firm majority of countries within the Organization that stand by the principles and positions of the Charter and endeavour to strengthen the foundations of peace. That was the majority that made possible the adoption of the resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; that was their strength.

The Ukrainian delegation believes that our current discussion should also be devoted to consideration of the main features of the contemporary international situation so as to ensure that we strengthen the foundations of security in the world.

Full and unwavering implementation of the basic provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is an urgent task today, as well. In addition, the international situation requires that we redouble our efforts to preserve peace and ensure security.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In the 1980s the world is entering a period of increasing militarism, together with growing aggressiveness on the part of imperialist circles. This is disturbing. Even in the mid-1970s we began to detect dangerous trends in United States foreign policy that cancelled out the fruits of peaceful co-operation achieved in conditions of détente by many peoples and States, and resulted in the virtual return of the world to the days of the cold war. But recently these trends have begun to determine all of Washington's foreign policy actions. This can be seen, for example, from the NATO decision on the United States proposal for a major long-term increase in military expenditures; the proposed deployment in Western Europe of new nuclear missile weapons; the establishment of rapid deployment forces; Washington's virtual sabotaging of the disarmament negotiations; the decision to freeze the SALT II Treaty; and also the anti-Soviet campaigns that have been whipped up, as well as other hostile acts such as discriminatory measures in commercial, scientific, technical, cultural and sports relations.

The hegemonists of Peking are acting at one with the militarists of the West: they have declared that efforts to strengthen international security are fruitless, considering, as they do, that a world-wide thermonuclear conflict is inevitable.

In considering this question of implementation of the Declaration, we cannot fail to say that its basic principles have received their fullest embodiment in Europe. The five-year period that has elapsed since the historic Conference at Helsinki has been one of an enormous amount of very difficult work done to implement the provisions of the agreements reached there. The peoples of Europe have become increasingly aware of and have greatly appreciated the fruits of détente. That is why those who are not friends of peace have a considerably more difficult time in Europe. It is why the overwhelming majority of Governments and peoples in Europe advocate a continuation and development of the political dialogue between countries with different social systems.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

True, much remains to be done by way of strengthening and reinforcing peace and security in Europe. In particular, it is important to ensure the success of the current Madrid meeting of the participants in the Helsinki talks and also to ensure the convening of the conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

The Soviet Union, anxious to curb the arms race in Europe, has proposed negotiations to limit medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe simultaneously and in organic relationship with questions of American forward-based nuclear weapons in the region. On 1 August of this year 20,000 Soviet troops were withdrawn from the German Democratic Republic ahead of schedule. In the negotiations on mutual reductions of armed forces and arms in Central Europe the Socialist countries have put forward new and constructive proposals. That is an actual contribution made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to the further improvement of the situation in Europe.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

For more than 30 years Europe has lived without a war, but the same cannot be said of other continents and parts of the world. The situation in the Middle East remains explosive. The separate negotiations leading to the notorious Camp David agreements have only taken us further away from a settlement of the conflict, and in the meantime Israel is expanding its network of settlements in the occupied Arab lands and has proclaimed Jerusalem its eternal capital. At its emergency special session the United Nations General Assembly quite correctly emphasized that the key to a comprehensive settlement was the granting to the Arab people of Palestine of their right to self-determination, including the establishment of their own State. Another integral part of a settlement would be the withdrawal of Israel's troops from all the Arab territories it occupied in 1967, including East Jerusalem, and ensuring the sovereignty and security of all the States of the region. All interested parties must participate in that settlement, including the Arab people of Palestine, through their representative the Palestine Liberation Organization. Other issues that have arisen between States of that region recently must also be settled by peaceful means at the negotiating table.

At this session concern has several times been expressed in connexion with the continuing tension in South-East Asia. The Chinese-American deal is dangerous to the peoples of that region of the world. The big-Power expansionists and the hegemonists of China are an extremely dangerous enemy not only to the three peoples of Indo-China; they are also a dangerous enemy to peace, national independence and social progress as a whole in South-East Asia. Attempts to drive a wedge between the States of South-East Asia and to train and slip through frontiers into the countries of Indo-China all sorts of reactionary riff-raff and to establish logistical bases in the territory of Thailand alongside the frontier with Kampuchea, where the dregs of counter-revolutionary gangs have found a haven are but some of the methods used by Peking and Washington as they pursue their parallel interests in that region of the world.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR welcomes the long-term constructive programme for the normalization of the situation in that region put forward recently by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, a programme aimed at the peaceful settlement of disputes. The initiative is fully in keeping with the interests of peace and security, and it deserves full support.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the resolutions on this item have frequently emphasized the importance of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. The United States and Chinese violations of that principle led to the creation of a complicated situation around Afghanistan. In accordance with the United Nations Charter, at the request of the Afghan Government, Afghanistan was offered assistance by the Soviet Union to repel threats from the outside. However, the threats persist. It is natural for us to raise the issue of a political settlement of the situation, the basis of which is well known: the proposal made by the Government of Afghanistan on 14 May of this year, the essence of which is a full and guaranteed halt to armed aggression and, in general, all forms of hostile activities directed from outside against the legal Government and people of Afghanistan.

The Ukrainian delegation has already had an opportunity to state its position on disarmament issues. At this point we shall therefore simply emphasize the importance, particularly in current conditions, of implementing disarmament measures, halting the arms race and strengthening international security. We fully support the position of those countries that have emphasized the need speedily to eliminate inequity, discrimination and diktat from economic relations between States. Our sympathies lie with those peoples waging struggles for the final elimination of the remnants of the heinous system of colonialism.

Despite the difficult situation in the world today, we are convinced that objective opportunities do exist, and so do social and political forces that can help to prevent us from backsliding into a new cold war. Forces exist that can ensure the normal peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems and prevent the threat of a world thermonuclear conflict. That means that the basic principles proclaimed 10 years ago in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security have not become irrelevant. They need to be implemented. The Ukrainian SSR intends to work precisely in that direction.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): A number of important documents have been adopted by the United Nations General Assembly during the past 10 years relating to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The Declaration is based on the purposes and principles

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

of our Organization - that is, the maintenance of international peace and the development of good-neighbourly relations and co-operation among countries with different social systems.

In our opinion the consideration at this session of the General Assembly of the progress made in implementing the Declaration, is an extremely important aspect of our work in the light of the current complications in the international situation. It is well known that as a result of the consistently peace-loving policy and actions of the Soviet Union, the initiator of that Declaration, and the efforts of the countries of the socialist community and other progressive forces, détente has in recent years become the dominant feature of international life. The peaceful dialogue between East and West and the Helsinki spirit have brought and continue to bring noticeable progress in this area. In the 1970s the political will and determination of States made possible many bilateral and multilateral agreements aimed at curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament.

Important successes have been achieved in the just struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America as they defend their political and economic independence and their national and social liberation and freedom against the neo-colonialist and expansionist aspirations of the forces of imperialism and reaction.

The support of the world community for peace, disarmament and détente is gaining ground, as can convincingly be seen from the results of the World Parliament of Peace held in Sofia. In expressing the sincere aspiration of the Mongolian people to peace, we can say that on 21 November of this year an appeal was made to the peoples and Governments of the world, to parliamentarians, State and public figures who cherish truth and peace to strengthen the struggle to improve the atmosphere of trust and co-operation among States and to adopt effective measures to reduce the military threat, to curb the arms race and to move on to practical disarmament measures.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The United Nations has made and is still making a positive contribution on the whole to resolving these burning issues of our times. Over the past 10 years a number of important political documents have been adopted, for example, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament, and many others.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that those measures are the result of constructive efforts and initiatives by the socialist countries, which have consistently advocated and continue to advocate the strengthening of international peace and security.

The general improvement in the international political atmosphere and the positive changes in world developments have given rise to a negative reaction among certain circles in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and their allies, which have made efforts to oppose the peaceful approach of the countries in the socialist community and other peace-loving States and peoples in the world which are striving to strengthen and deepen détente and general peace and security.

It is the policy of imperialism and hegemonism that has taken this approach to the arms race, whipping up international tension, trying to achieve unilateral military superiority and rapidly developing their military capacity in various parts of the world. They are also trying to negotiate from positions of strength and using the notorious doctrine -- Directive 59 -- relating to a so-called 'limited nuclear war'.

Despite the current deterioration in the international situation, we can still say that the policy of détente is supported by growing forces throughout the world and that the preconditions really exist for ensuring that this tendency continues.

Consideration at this session of the General Assembly of a whole series of issues relating to the curbing and halting of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament bears witness once again to the very strong inter-relationship between questions of disarmament and the problem of strengthening international security.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

What is particularly relevant in the present circumstances is the undertaking of negotiations on various aspects of disarmament. It is in that context that we regard the constructive initiatives of the Soviet Union embodied in its proposal for the consideration of the item on certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war and its memorandum entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees", which have been reflected in a number of resolutions submitted to this Committee by the delegations of the socialist countries and a number of non-aligned countries.

Without going into great detail, I should like to emphasize the urgent need for measures to be taken to limit and eliminate nuclear weapons and to prevent the stationing of nuclear weapons in territories where they do not now exist, to conclude a world convention on strengthening the security of non-nuclear States, to prohibit the development of new weapons and systems of mass destruction, to convene a world disarmament conference and other steps as well.

In that connexion, I should like to refer to the rather irresponsible approach taken by certain Western countries, under the pretext of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43, which was supported by some representatives from developing countries. We must say quite frankly that the situation arising from the adoption of the draft resolution will not really help to strengthen the 1925 Geneva Protocol but is more likely to set an undesirable precedent in the consideration of this kind of international agreement, and thus could have a negative effect.

The maintenance of peace and security in Europe is of particular significance in the present circumstances, when certain circles in NATO are taking steps to achieve one-sided military superiority.

That is why the Mongolian delegation adheres to the view that a businesslike approach to the Madrid Conference, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, and the convening of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe would help us to resolve the complex problems of that continent. In that context, we welcomed the beginning of negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

on the question of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe in close relationship with American forward-based weapons.

I should like to emphasize once again that the well-known document of the anniversary meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of States members of the Warsaw Pact in May 1980 contains new and important initiatives which testify to the willingness of the socialist countries to continue and deepen the process of international détente.

The Mongolian People's Republic, as an Asian State, is much concerned over the development of events in that large continent, where the situation is becoming increasingly difficult as a result of an intensification of co-ordinated actions by the forces of imperialism, hegemonism and militarism.

In the communiqué on the results of the visit of the Foreign Minister of Mongolia, Mr. Dugersuren, to the Soviet Union in late November this year, it was noted that the Mongolian People's Republic and the Soviet Union consistently advocate firmly based peace and security in Asia on the basis of the joint efforts of States of the continent and a just political settlement of situations of conflict in various regions. The parties expressed their conviction that relations among all Asian States can and must be based on sovereign equality, non-intervention in internal affairs of others and the non-use of force, respect for the territorial integrity of States and other generally recognized norms and principles of international life.

The Mongolian People's Republic stands firmly on the side of the peoples of Indo-China in their struggle against the continuing aggression of the Chinese hegemonists and fully supports the efforts of the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and the People's Republic of Kampuchea to transform South-East Asia into a region of peace, stability and co-operation. We consistently advocate a political settlement of the situation that has developed around Afghanistan. The only proper approach to normalizing the situation is, in our view, the immediate halt to the renewed war being waged against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan by the forces of international imperialism and reaction and their henchmen. The Mongolian delegation cannot but regard as a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations the actions of the imperialist and hegemonist circles which have as their aim dragging the United Nations and other international organizations into the orbit of their aggressive policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other States under various spurious pretexts. This is the only way in which we can view the resolutions imposed on the General Assembly under the so-called question of the situation in Kampuchea and in Afghanistan.

The Mongolian delegation is deeply concerned over the dangerous developments in the Middle East, particularly in the region of the Persian Gulf. The position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the proper way to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question has frequently been presented in statements by our representatives, and, in particular, in statements made during the emergency special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the question of Palestine.

The Mongolian People's Republic expresses its solidarity and its support, as it always has, for the efforts of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to reduce tension in the Korean Peninsula and

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

peacefully and democratically to unite the country. We would once again reaffirm the need for the implementation as soon as possible of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea.

The year 1980 is a significant one for all progressive and peace-loving forces, particularly the peoples who are struggling against colonialism, racism and apartheid. In a few days the General Assembly will mark the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which made an important contribution to the cause of the peoples who are struggling for their national and social liberation.

The Mongolian People's Republic strongly advocates the full implementation of the provisions of that historic Declaration and the establishment of such conditions as would enable the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic will in future continue to follow its peace-loving policy of strengthening the struggle of peoples against any intensification of the threat of war, of preserving and strengthening détente, consolidating the basis of international peace and security and creating the conditions for mutually beneficial co-operation among States.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Ten years ago the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That Declaration, which was a major event in international life, aroused many hopes. Even today, many peace-loving countries view it as a guide to the conduct of their foreign policy. In this connexion, it should be stressed that considerable success has been achieved in implementing the Declaration. One

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

need only mention the accession to independence of many territories and colonies during the past decade. The countries formerly under Portuguese domination have regained their freedom, and Zimbabwe finally achieved independence under a democratic and representative Government.

Similarly, the convening of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe could be considered as one of the positive factors promoting the implementation of the Declaration.

The fact remains, however, that a number of conflicts have not been solved, rivalries between military alliances continue to gain momentum, the use of force in international relations is becoming increasingly frequent and, finally, intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other States is tending to become ever more widespread.

These negative factors have made international peace and security far from certain for peoples and States, and it is therefore necessary to redouble our efforts if we want a world in which all can live free from the constant fear of aggression.

In the opinion of my delegation, one of the greatest threats to international peace and security is the increasingly frequent resort to the use of force in international relations. That threat, based on the policy of domination and hegemonism on the part of certain States, is maintained by the arms race engaged in by rival military blocs and the failure to comply with the principles of the Charter. The creation of military alliances which are continually engaged in military preparations has led to both the nuclear and the conventional arms race, which it has so far been impossible to curb.

This arms race has always cast a dark shadow over international relations because it shows that there is a great gap between the commitment of the protagonists to relinquish force and their military preparations. Furthermore, it conveys the impression that the non-use

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

of force depends solely on the existing military balance. In areas in which there is a strategic balance, there scarcely seems to be any check on the use of force. Force has been used on almost all continents to preserve, restore and re-establish the strategic balance.

The priority thus accorded to military considerations has led to the creation of military bases, the deployment of forces in the Indian Ocean and the establishment, as we all know, of rapid deployment forces ostensibly aimed at restoring the strategic balance.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

Such an approach, of course, runs counter to the right of peoples to self-determination and to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources. In addition, it constitutes an obstacle to the exercise by peoples of their right to choose their economic and political system. Armed intervention or the threat of it hardly facilitates the speedy settlement of disputes. Instead, it creates new international tension which has a negative effect on international peace and security. The major Powers, in particular the permanent members of the Security Council, have a duty to protect international peace and security and they must set an example first and foremost for others to follow. They must make the renouncing of the use of force more credible by proceeding to genuine disarmament and abandoning the arms race. They must show moderation and refrain from seeking to defend by the use of force what they selfishly consider to be their own interests, to the detriment of the right of peoples to self-determination and to the detriment of the principle of the sovereign equality of States. They must also refrain the military invasion and occupation of neighbouring countries simply because the peoples of those countries wish to change their economic or social systems.

Of course, not everything in the attitude of the major Powers with respect to the non-use of force has been negative. One of them has shown a good deal of restraint in one of the crises in the Middle East. Others have helped to bring about a solution to the problem of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. The fact remains, however, that the main feature of the present international situation is tension among the super-Powers and that tension threatens international peace and security.

The use of force is tending to become widespread today. The war frenzy is tending to extend to regions of the world so far spared from it. Some countries of the third world have built arsenals which far exceed their legitimate security needs. Unfortunately, the accumulated weapons are not used to support the liberation struggles against foreign occupation or apartheid. They tend to be used to destabilize neighbouring States, to intervene in the affairs of many States and to create a climate of tension among peoples that have every reason to be united. Such a policy, obviously, does not contribute to the

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

development of relations of co-operation and good-neighbourliness. Instead, it is a real obstacle to solidarity among peoples.

One of the primary causes of recourse to the use of force in international relations is the persistence of the apartheid régime. That régime, not content with depriving the majority of the South African people by force of their fundamental human rights, is engaging in numerous acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. The international community has an obligation to respond vigorously by imposing on South Africa the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

If we are seeing an ever more frequent recourse to force nowadays it is because the machinery for preventing and suppressing the illegal use of it is not functioning as it should. The Security Council, because of the improper use of the right of veto, has frequently been unable to influence the course of events in certain armed conflicts. Hence if we want to strengthen the system of collective security provided for in the Charter, it is essential for the countries that have the veto power to show some restraint in using it. Moreover, it must be possible for the Security Council to be seized of the matter every time a conflict threatens international peace and security. It is disheartening to see war raging in certain parts of the world while the Security Council remains inactive.

Peace-keeping operations are also a means that should be developed to stop certain armed conflicts. My country, which has always supported peace-keeping operations and has participated in many, feels that additional efforts by all are needed.

In conclusion, my delegation expresses the hope that the recommendations contained in document A/35/505 will be taken into consideration by all States and that they will do their utmost to implement them.

Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): During this tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 1970 on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is greatly gratified by the relevance and vitality of that document, which marked an important victory of the forces of peace and progress, and which, in the terms of

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

the report of the Group of governmental experts annexed to the report of the Secretary-General, "was considered a landmark in the history of the United Nations" (A/35/505, annex, para. 1) and "continues to provide an important platform for the conduct of international actions aimed at strengthening and consolidating peace in the world as well as promoting co-operation on terms of equality among all countries, on the basis of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter" (ibid., para. 5).

On this occasion, we should like to express our appreciation of the efforts of the Group of governmental experts in having reviewed the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration and suggested measures to be adopted to ensure full respect for them.

If we look back over the international situation of the past 10 years, it is not difficult to note that there has been an obvious improvement over the two preceding decades with respect to the improvement of the international climate and the strengthening of peace and security in the world. As the Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam said in the General Assembly on 25 September last:

"However, the chances of preventing war and preserving peace are greater now ... and better than they were in the 1950s and 1960s. The days when imperialism, relying on its supremacy in material resources and arms, made use of war as a means of dominating peoples are past, especially after the defeat of the American aggression against Viet Nam. More than ever before, our peoples have a real opportunity to prevent world war, to preserve international peace and security and to bring about peaceful coexistence among countries with different social régimes." (A/35/PV.11, p. 26)

During the 1970s, positive developments of primary importance took place in the international arena which had the effect of consolidating peace and security in the world.

One of the most important events was the historic victory of the peoples of the Indo-Chinese peninsula which put an end to the terrible war of aggression of the leader of world-wide imperialism, forcing it to reshape its global strategy. That event helped to consolidate peace and security not only in South-East Asia but also in various other regions of the world by removing the danger of aggression and military intervention by imperialism against the national liberation movement.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

Dictatorial and fascist régimes supported by imperialism and international reaction have been toppled. The struggle for national independence has won fresh victories. During the 1970s more than 20 newly-independent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, joined the community of nations.

The campaign against the arms race and in favour of general and complete disarmament has recorded tangible successes, although many obstacles remain. Efforts to create a new international economic order and to restructure international economic relations on a just and equitable basis have taken a stride forward, albeit a modest one, in the developing countries' struggle against domination and exploitation by imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist circles.

In short, the 1970s marked a new period of development for the forces of progress, peace and national independence, which are endeavouring to maintain and consolidate international peace and security. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 1970 has made a positive contribution to that end by solemnly reaffirming the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and by urging all States to comply with them strictly in their international relations. The efforts made by the United Nations during the past 10 years to implement the Declaration have gone hand-in-hand with, and have to some extent reflected, the successes recorded by the peoples in their struggle. Thus, as a result of the joint action of the forces of peace, progress, national independence and socialism, and their victorious struggle, and as a result of the efforts of the United Nations to implement the Declaration, the principles of peaceful coexistence and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means have for the first time in history been placed on a sound footing in contemporary society, and have become universal principles governing present-day international relations.

During the past decade, faced with the forward march of peoples and stubbornly clinging to their selfish interests, imperialist circles are frantically trying to reverse the course of history in the hope of perpetuating their domination and exploitation of peoples and of recovering their lost positions.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

We are at present witnessing another outbreak of the arms race, a deterioration of international détente and an increase in acts of aggression, intervention and subversion in various parts of the world which, together with the deployment of America's new nuclear strategy, are seriously threatening international peace and security.

A new feature of the complex international situation in the late 1970s was the policy of betrayal by a major Asian Power, in increasingly close collusion with world imperialism, in an attempt to realize its world hegemonist dream of becoming the leading world Power by the end of the century. Whereas the overwhelming majority of countries enthusiastically support the principles of the 1970 Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and actively contribute to the implementation of its provisions, that collusion between imperialism and Chinese hegemonism constitutes an obvious threat and impediment to the realization of that Declaration. Mankind must remain all the more vigilant since the most evil forces of our time working in close collusion, also claim to be acting in the interests of safeguarding international peace and security.

Pursuing everywhere their activities of aggression and intervention, of division and subversion, but meeting with the firm opposition of the forces of peace, national independence and social progress, imperialism and Peking's hegemonism have constantly claimed to be victims of aggression. They attribute to those they have attacked the very crimes that they themselves have committed. They have sought in every way to misrepresent the facts and to cast aspersions on the countries and peoples who have made the greatest sacrifices in seeking to end the wars of aggression imposed upon them, thus contributing decisively and effectively to the maintenance of peace and security in the world. In particular, the leading circles in Peking who implement their dangerous slogan of "stirring up trouble in the world so that peace will reign in their country", are particularly brazen in their campaign of slander and calumny. The advocates of this reckless policy have caused much suffering and poverty among their own people as they vie with one another for power. The aggressors who claim the right to "teach lessons" to other sovereign States, cannot deceive anyone having an open mind as their

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

actions have contradicted their words and their policies. Both abroad and at home their policy has been to turn friends into enemies and vice versa as long as it serves their hegemonistic ambitions to do so. All this is so obvious that it cannot be denied or justified.

This collusion between Chinese hegemonism and imperialism, aimed at undermining international peace and security, has proved particularly serious in South-East Asia.

It will be recalled that, following the aggression and intervention of colonialism and imperialism, peace and security were constantly disturbed in that area during the 30 year period following the Second World War. In particular, America's abominable war of aggression against the three countries of Indo-China sucked into its vortex some countries of the Far East and South-East Asia which provided the aggressors with military bases and even troop contingents. The end of that protracted war led to the emergence of the three countries of Indo-China as strong elements of peace, stability and security for all of South-East Asia. At the same time, it allowed a promising start to be made on normalization, reconciliation, peace and détente in relations between the countries of the area.

Thus was truly exposed the face of Chinese hegemonism, which boasts of the fact that it is the "NATO of Asia" and tries to impose its policy of pressure and diktat, intervention and aggression, division and subversion on the countries of Indo-China and on the other countries of South-East Asia which it considers as being within its natural zone of influence. American imperialism, forced to withdraw its military forces from the area, found in that great-nation hegemonism a convenient partner in trying to salvage what was left of its shrinking interests, hence their complicity designed to undermine peace, stability, détente and security in the area. Particularly dangerous are the attempts by the authorities in Peking to pit the member countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) against the countries of Indo-China and to incite hatred, suspicion and confrontation, to fish in troubled waters and to impose their hegemonism on them all.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

This explains why, as we move into the 1980s, the ever-closer collusion between world imperialism and the hegemonism of that great Asian nation is a grave danger to international peace and security and a serious obstacle to full implementation of the General Assembly's Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This applies as much to the situation in South-East Asia as it does to the world situation as a whole.

In the circumstances, the essential action to be taken to ensure full implementation in South-East Asia of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is above all to thwart the policy of aggression, intervention, threats of war, division and subversion by the leading circles in Peking, in collusion with imperialism, against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the area.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

The struggle of peoples and Governments to maintain international peace and security is part and parcel of the struggle being waged against this dangerous collusion which is attempting to divert the course of history.

Viet Nam practises a foreign policy of peace, friendship and broad international co-operation, a policy firmly founded in the socialist nature of its régime and on the purposes and principles of the movement of the non-aligned countries. That policy is wholly in keeping with the deeper peaceful aspirations of the Vietnamese people, who have only recently emerged from thirty years of consecutive warfare imposed upon them by colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism in turn. Now more than ever, the Vietnamese people want to live in peace and understanding with all the peoples of the world, and first and foremost those of South-East Asia, in order to be able to devote all their strength to the reconstruction of their war-devastated country. But that desire for peace and détente in no way alters our determination to defend, together with our brothers in Laos and Kampuchea, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each of our countries.

In close solidarity with the peoples of Laos and Kampuchea as we build the three countries of Indo-China into solid entities effectively contributing to the maintenance of peace and security in South-East Asia, Viet Nam extends a friendly hand to the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), with a view to pursuing the dialogue, which is the only route to détente and to the gradual settlement through peaceful means of all the problems that still divide us. Faithful to the Vientiane Declaration of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea of 18 July 1980, Viet Nam, together with Laos and Kampuchea, is sparing no effort to work with the ASEAN countries for the creation of a zone of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia. In so doing, we are well aware that we are making a concrete contribution to the better implementation of the General Assembly's Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, whose tenth anniversary we are now celebrating.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

Measures designed to ensure in the 1980s full respect for the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security touch upon different areas and involve different procedures. They can therefore be extremely diverse, as is brought out by the report of the Group of Governmental Experts annexed to the Secretary-General's report.

In our opinion, however, the main thing is to attempt to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the principles and provisions of the Declaration, and first and foremost to ensure unity among all anti-imperialist and anti-hegemonist forces in the common struggle for peace, justice and social progress.

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is determined to work with all its strength to contribute to a better implementation of the Declaration along with all socialist countries and, all peace-loving and justice-loving countries, and all the progressive forces throughout the world.

We must remain ever alert to the perfidious manoeuvres of the international imperialists and reactionaries that seriously threaten international peace and security by pursuing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, sabotaging détente, rekindling the cold war in relations among States and undermining the just cause of the liberation of peoples. Confident in the forces of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism, and encouraged by the irreversible trend of the historical development of the peoples, we commit ourselves with hope and confidence to that long, hard, but inevitably victorious struggle for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security.

Before concluding, I should like to add a few words for the benefit of the representative of China with regard to his statement to the Committee yesterday.

One is entitled to wonder, in listening to him, whether the representative of Peking is not seeking to take advantage of his right to speak to satisfy his penchant for low slander and shameful falsehood against Viet Nam and the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

As far as we are concerned, in their statements in the General Assembly and in the various Committees the representatives of China are always attempting to avoid replying to our accusations with regard to Peking's expansionist and hegemonist policy in South-East Asia. On the problem of Kampuchea, we have nothing to add to the statements we made earlier during this session. The present situation in that fraternal country, which has returned to normal quite quickly, is the most tangible proof that its heroic people have exercised their right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty. Any obstinate attempt by China to use the so-called question of Kampuchea to divert world public opinion from its hegemonist aims in South-East Asia will be doomed to failure. Rather I would invite the representative of Peking to give precise answers to the following important questions.

First, did China or did it not send tens of thousands of advisers and technicians to Kampuchea from 1975 to 1978 to guide and assist its Pol Pot agents in their policy of genocide against their own people and aggression against neighbouring countries? With what aim in view do the Peking authorities stubbornly pursue their policy of multifaceted assistance to the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique of renegades and genocide who are spurned by the Kampuchean people and condemned by all of mankind?

Secondly, is China struggling for peace and security in southern Asia and South-East Asia when it fields an army of 600,000 men to attack Viet Nam, when it continues to occupy tens of thousands of square kilometres of a neighbouring country to the south-west, when it takes control of the Vietnamese islands of Hoang Sa, when it is occupying dozens of areas in the Vietnamese border regions and, above all, when it is concentrating dozens of fully armed divisions on the China-Viet Nam frontier while threatening to teach us "a second lesson"?

With regard to the Viet Nam-China negotiations, the representative of China pushed things to the point of cynicism when he dared to throw the responsibility for the breakdown in talks on Viet Nam, whereas it was the Peking authorities that systematically rejected all our proposals aimed at putting

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

an end to confrontation and restoring peace on the Vietnamese-Chinese border, thus opening the way to a normalization of relations between the two countries. It is the Peking authorities that, on two occasions, have rejected Viet Nam's proposal to enter into the third round of Vietnamese-Chinese negotiations that they had pledged to hold during the second half of 1980.

Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria): The worsening of the international situation of late is in striking contrast to the constructive development of international relations in the 1970s. This turn for the worse has caused deep anxiety throughout the world, for it engenders serious hazards for international peace and security. These circumstances have enhanced even further the importance of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted ten years ago by the General Assembly at the initiative of the Soviet Union, as an instrument embodying the fundamental principles to guide States in their efforts at achieving lasting peace and security.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria has, on more than one occasion, stated its position on the real causes of the present state of international affairs. The facts unequivocally indicate that responsibility for the aggravation of international tensions and the increased danger of war rests squarely with the reactionary forces of imperialism, militarism and hegemonism which are trying to impose upon the world a course of confrontation and a return to the cold war.

In our view, the root cause of the present state of international affairs is, above all, the unprecedented escalation of the military preparations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the ambitions of the military circles of imperialism to upset the established approximate balance of military forces between the East and the West, and to achieve a position of strength vis-à-vis the socialist countries. To this end, during the last few years a number of steps have been taken such as the long-term programme for the rearmament of NATO, the decision to station new United States medium-range nuclear missiles in some West European countries, and the most recently announced "new nuclear strategy" which makes nuclear war conceivable and possible.

The socialist countries firmly believe that in the nuclear age there is no rational alternative to détente and peaceful coexistence among States with different social systems. Proceeding from this premise they pursue a policy aimed at decreasing tensions, curbing the arms race and promoting mutual trust and constructive co-operation among States. The will of these States to follow this line was amply demonstrated in the Declaration and Statement adopted last May at the session of the Political and Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty, in the communiqué of the meeting of Foreign Ministers in October of this year, as well as in other official documents which contain a programme of constructive measures in the interest of strengthening international peace and security. These measures are also reflected in the memorandum submitted at the present session by the Soviet Union entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees", which has our full support.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

In the present circumstances, the reversal of the arms race and the adoption of practical disarmament measures are of the utmost importance, because they undoubtedly have the greatest potential for strengthening international security.

The General Assembly at the present session has reiterated its abiding interest in the continuation of the process of further limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear arms. This and many other disarmament problems are ripe for solution. Provided there is the political will and a readiness on the part of all concerned to abide by the principle of undiminished security for all participating States, the ongoing negotiations in this field can produce prompt and tangible results.

Of particular importance among the factors conducive to the consolidation of international security is the strengthening of the political and legal guarantees for the security of States through the codification of the principle of non-use of force in international relations.

As a European country Bulgaria has an important stake in the further promotion of security and co-operation in Europe where détente should become an irreversible process. For this reason, my country attaches particular importance to the current Conference in Madrid and is doing everything it can to contribute to its successful outcome. It is our hope that the participating States will take the necessary steps to convene a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

One can hardly think of strengthening international peace and security without the elimination of the various focal points of tension and conflict in many areas of the world. Serious concern is caused by the fact that recently a new and even more dangerous military conflict was added to the previous ones. In conformity with the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, we attach great importance to the adoption of effective measures for the lasting settlement of all those conflicts through peaceful political means.

A fair and durable solution of the Middle East problem can be attained only on the basis of the well-known United Nations resolutions and with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

Our position with regard to the settlement of the Cyprus question continues to be based on the principles laid down in the relevant United Nations resolutions.

As far as Asia is concerned, we fully support the efforts of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea aimed at turning South-East Asia into a zone of peace and stability. The Bulgarian people and Government endorse the proposals of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for a political settlement of the problems created around that country. We also support the policy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which is aimed at the free and independent reunification of the Korean people, without outside interference.

The strengthening of international security requires the speedy and total elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid. We are confident that very soon Namibia will take its rightful place among the other free and independent States of Africa.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security underlines the link which exists between international security, disarmament and economic development. Therefore, the struggle for the reconstruction of international economic relations on a democratic and equitable basis is of prime importance and enjoys the full support of my country.

In accordance with its consistent peaceful policy, Bulgaria has adhered unswervingly to the purposes and principles set forth in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. They are also the principles that are of particular relevance to Bulgaria's policies towards its neighbours. As was noted in a recent joint communiqué of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the development of relations among the Balkan countries on the basis of good-neighbourliness and co-operation corresponds to the lasting interests of all States in the region and is conducive to the strengthening of peace and security in Europe and the world.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

Now, as we commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, we should like to emphasize the important role which it has played and continues to play as an instrument reflecting the strivings of all nations for lasting peace, security and co-operation. We are confident that the principles laid down in the Declaration will continue to serve as guidelines in the struggle of all peace-loving forces in the world for the preservation and consolidation of everything positive that has thus far been achieved in international relations.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Ten years ago, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Ever since its adoption the Declaration has served as an important programme of action and a code of conduct calling on all States to comply scrupulously with the objectives and principles enunciated in it.

Each subsequent session of the General Assembly has reviewed the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration and adopted several resolutions by which all the principles and provisions contained in that Declaration were reaffirmed. Furthermore, all Member States were repeatedly called upon to adhere fully to, and implement consistently, the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the provisions 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.

This year, the discussion on the subject by the First Committee has an added advantage in that there is before it the report of the Group of Governmental Experts. We wish to pay a tribute and express our gratitude to the Chairman of the Group of Experts, Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas, for his able and eloquent introduction of the report, contained in document A/35/505.

We are satisfied to note that, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 34/100, the report has two parts one dealing with an assessment of the extent of the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration, and the second with actions which should be undertaken by the Assembly in order to secure full compliance with the provisions of the Declaration.

The delegation of Ethiopia is indeed gratified to note that its own assessment of the implementation of the Declaration over the years is confirmed by that given in document A/35/505.

From the very beginning, the report emphasizes that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is a solemn reaffirmation of the universal validity of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter as the basis of relations among States, again, irrespective of their size, geographical location, level of development or political, economic

(Mr. Makonnen, Ethiopia)

or social systems, and that the breach of these principles cannot be justified in any circumstances whatsoever. The call for full compliance with the provisions of the Declaration is no more than a call upon all Member States scrupulously to observe at all times the responsibilities and obligations they have assumed under the United Nations Charter.

The continuous review and assessment of the extent of the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration also provides the added advantage of focussing the attention of all States on the fulfillment of the primary responsibility of the United Nations, namely, ensuring the maintenance of international peace and security. It therefore becomes relevant to point out that, of all the principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations, Article 2 constitutes the very raison d'être of the Organization. The provisions of that Article represent the hard core of the Charter and the principles to be preserved and safeguarded at all times and in every eventuality.

Among these provisions, the most fundamental principle is the one contained in paragraph 4 of Article 2, that all Member States shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. This is the principle upon which, to a large extent, all other principles depend. The strict observance by all States of this simple but basic principle of renunciation of the threat or use of force would have the wide-ranging effect of removing fear and anxiety from the tense international situation, of restoring faith and mutual confidence, and of paving the way for disarmament and, consequently, for progress and development. The strict observance of this principle by all States would make naked force not only useless but also purposeless. On the other hand, failure by any State to observe this principle would automatically lead to the invocation of other provisions of the Charter, primarily Article 51, which reaffirms the inherent right of States to individual or collective self-defence.

(Mr. Makonnen, Ethiopia)

Ethiopia's recent experience, as well as its firm commitment to the protection and promotion of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations are only too well-known to all members of this Committee and I need not, therefore, recount them now. Furthermore, our experience and position on these and other provisions of the Declaration have been articulated by the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia, Mr. Feleke Gedle-Giorgis, during the general debate at this session as well as at previous sessions of the General Assembly. Needless to say, members of this Committee are also aware of the documents under the item which is now being considered, elucidating my country's experience and unswerving commitment to respect the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter on the basis of the sovereign equality of all States and reciprocity.

Finally, we should like to refer to paragraph 44 of the report of the Group of Governmental Experts, which calls for wider co-operation between the United Nations and regional organizations in the efforts to promote the consolidation of international security. In our region, the Organization of African Unity has played, and continues to play, a useful and important role in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Africa, as well as of those on the denuclearization of Africa and the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The Organization of African Unity also plays an important role in the resolution of various problems in the continent. These are well-documented records of the General Assembly, the most recent of which was the report given by Mr. Siaka Stevens, President of Sierra Leone and current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, and we should only like to urge representatives of all Member States to read them carefully.

Mr. CHEBELEU (Romania) (interpretation from French): The international circumstances prevailing at this General Assembly session as we celebrate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security are such as to highlight still further the exceptional importance of that document, as well as the urgent need for its systematic implementation in good faith by all States.

The international situation is indeed becoming ever more complex and contradictory, characterized as it is by serious mounting tension and an unprecedented acceleration of the arms race, which, of course, does not serve the interests of any people.

This extremely damaging trend in international affairs stems entirely from the intensification of the policy of domination and interference in the internal affairs of other States, consolidation of spheres of influence, the deepening economic crisis, particularly in energy and oil, the sharp exacerbation of contradictions between States and groups of States, and the perpetuation of old conflicts and the emergence of new ones.

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

A particularly serious situation has developed in Europe, where the two military blocs face one another and where the most armed forces are accumulated along with the most sophisticated weapons, including nuclear weapons. Recently still more dangerous programmes have been implemented concerning the development and deployment of new types of nuclear missiles. This increases the level of insecurity and the danger of a nuclear war. It also threatens the very survival of all the nations of Europe.

Romania is working hard to ensure that the meeting now under way in Madrid ends with real steps towards peace and security in Europe and that that meeting makes a real contribution to the easing of international tension and resumption of the policy of détente, co-operation and respect for the independence of all peoples.

Like other States, Romania is deeply concerned over the continuation and aggravation of states of conflict and tension, the appearance of focal points of war and armed confrontations in various parts of the world, all of which endanger international peace and security. We would take this opportunity to reaffirm Romania's consistent position that all States should intensify their efforts and direct them towards the most expeditious settlement of disputes between States solely through political methods and negotiations, completely eschewing armed confrontation and recourse to force.

In that spirit Romania is working consistently and actively to ensure an over-all political settlement of the situation in the Middle East that would lead to the establishment of a just and lasting peace based on Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied after the 1967 war, including Arab Jerusalem, on a solution of the problem of the Palestinian people in keeping with their right to self-determination, to the establishment of their own State, and on guaranteed independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty for all the States of the region.

Romania is also working for a just settlement of the situation in Korea, and in that connexion we have taken steps, within the framework of the United Nations as well, where we were among the sponsors of the resolution adopted five years ago on the conditions for speeding up the reunification of Korea. We firmly

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

support the just, constructive policy and the initiatives and proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at ensuring the attainment of the perfectly legitimate aspirations of the entire Korean nation: the independent, peaceful and democratic reunification of the country without any external interference.

Under the present international circumstances it is not only natural but necessary that Member States consider, within the United Nations and elsewhere, measures that could be taken to help dispel the clouds looming over the entire world. Our goal must be to attain true international security and an international political climate in which every State and every people can feel safe from any act of aggression, safe from force or the threat of force, safe from interference in its internal affairs, in a climate in which it can in peace and calm settle down to tackle the problems of its economic and social development, which are such urgent matters for the overwhelming majority of States. As was recently emphasized by the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu,

"There is only one alternative to the policy of force and war, and it is co-operation, détente, abandonment of force and threats of force, and the settlement of all disputes exclusively through political negotiations. We must be perfectly well aware that a nuclear war would destroy everything that has been achieved over the ages, in Europe and throughout the world."

In our view, that goal of strengthening international security requires determined efforts to ensure the rule of law in relations between States. Experience has shown and continues most eloquently to show that the essential premise for peace and détente and the development of normal relations among States is firm promotion of the principles of equal rights, respect for national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, reciprocity of benefits, and non-use of force and the threat of force in international relations. We are, indeed, witnessing the vigorous affirmation of the desire of peoples to eliminate the imperialist and colonialist policy of oppression and diktat, and to replace it with new democratic relations.

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

The United Nations, which has made valuable contributions to the establishment and development of the fundamental principles of relations between States, can and must in the future play a role of paramount importance in this respect. There has been no lack of initiatives here, and the General Assembly has taken a number of new steps in this connexion. I am thinking primarily of the process of strengthening the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes and the development of modalities to ensure full implementation of that principle in relations between States. Incidentally, it was this very Committee that last year started this process following an initiative by Romania. The process has continued this year in the Sixth Committee, and it has enjoyed the support and active participation of an impressive number of States. We trust that that process will be completed as soon as possible with the adoption by the General Assembly of a declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes. That would be a first step towards a future general treaty stipulating firm obligations for States in this area. There would also be other measures to strengthen the role and the contribution of the United Nations in preventing and settling disputes between States.

I am thinking also of the concern expressed by the Sixth Committee in the matter of increasing the effectiveness of the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force in international relations. We should like to see those efforts intensified, and we should like to see all States participate in them constructively, determined to arrive at measures that will help eliminate this scourge, which can affect any State at any moment, with extremely serious consequences for peace and security throughout the world.

We feel that given the conditions of growing interdependence, which is a feature of relations between States, it is necessary to take action now to exclude force or the threat of force from international relations and to resolve by peaceful means alone any disputes or controversial issues wherever they may arise in the world. The military approach and armed confrontations can only do serious harm and bring terrible suffering to all peoples and thus seriously jeopardize peace and détente. We must always begin by showing respect for the independence and sovereignty of all peoples and for their right freely to determine their own fate without outside interference under any pretext and in any form.

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

In that connexion, we attach great importance to the initiative taken by Yugoslavia in the spirit of its active policy of peace and co-operation, and by other non-aligned countries, to have our Committee consider the affirmation and strengthening of another fundamental principle in international relations, namely non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. We feel that it is natural and necessary to take up that principle within the context of concerns relating to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The proposal of the non-aligned countries relating to the drafting of a General Assembly declaration on the principle of non-intervention and non-interference responds to an imperative requirement directly linked to the need to ensure relations of normality, friendship and co-operation among States, to promote détente and trust in international affairs and to consolidate peace and security in the world.

It is a fact that in recent years, along with the increase of actions that disregard the principles of equal rights and respect for independence, we have also seen an intensification in the acts of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other States, which have had a serious impact on the policy of détente and peace, trust among States and the independent development of peoples. That proves that the provisions of the Charter and of other documents adopted under the auspices of the United Nations are not in themselves sufficient to ensure the affirmation of and universal respect for the principle of non-interference and non-intervention and that determined efforts are still indispensable. If it proves necessary to reaffirm and develop the content of that principle in a Declaration it is precisely because ways of thinking and political concepts persist which inspire the political actions of certain countries and disregard the need to respect that principle rigorously.

Those political concepts and ways of thinking find expression in a broad range of ideas with which they operate in order to try to make intervention or interference in the internal affairs of other people appear legitimate. We are quite well aware of the attempts, which are made even in United Nations debates, to justify intervention under the pretext of

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

carrying out so-called special missions or defending so-called special security interests, as though it were only some States that had such interests and as though all States were not equal in their right to security. The imperialist concept of "spheres of influence" is closely linked philosophically with those doctrines. According to that concept, the world is divided into zones, and by virtue of that division certain States have the right to interfere or intervene as they deem fit at least in the zone which they claim as theirs.

We consider that it is high time for all States to recognize that those concepts and ways of thinking are completely incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter and with the norms of contemporary international law, and that the General Assembly must take a forceful position against the practices that those concepts and ways of thinking lead to in international affairs. Those practices create serious dangers for peace and security throughout the world and affect the independent development of dozens of peoples who, perfectly legitimately, wish to forge their own destiny as they see fit without being subjected to the harassment of the foreign interference and intervention which is in fact nothing but an undeclared and disguised struggle waged against those peoples by more or less subtle means.

In the light of those considerations, the Romanian delegation has decided to make its full contribution to the drafting of the declaration on non-intervention and non-interference in internal affairs, the adoption of which has been proposed by the non-aligned countries.

We feel that to affirm and to reaffirm the primacy of the norms of law and to strengthen those norms and, in general, the principles that should govern relations between States, would be to help overcome the policy of force, to diminish the role which arbitrary action and acting as one sees fit still occupy in international relations. Thus we should also be helping to do away with that damaging concept whereby international affairs are reduced to a simple confrontation of strategic forces and positions, which leaves little room for legality and morality.

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

It was in that spirit that Romania last year submitted to our Committee for consideration the question of the development and consolidation of the principle of good-neighbourliness. We did so in the firm conviction that the application and development of that principle is of paramount importance in encouraging good understanding and co-operation among States, to preclude situations of conflict and tension. In adopting by consensus the resolution proposed by Romania and by other countries last year, the General Assembly laid the foundations for a process of clarifying and developing that principle with the participation of all States. We trust that, at its next session, the General Assembly will give a strong impetus to the definition and the development of the principle of good-neighbourliness, as well as to the strengthening of its effectiveness. That would have the best possible effect on general peace and security because in the final analysis good-neighbourliness is a vital and ongoing need for all States.

Attempts to strengthen international security must give primacy to the adoption of energetic and resolute measures to halt the arms race and to move on to a policy of true disarmament, without which trust, peace and security are inconceivable.

As the Romanian delegation stressed at length during the debate on disarmament questions which has just concluded in our Committee, the vital interests of all peoples require that we proceed without delay to freeze military budgets and then constantly to reduce them. That reduction should also be reflected in the substantial diminishing of military personnel and armaments.

We also consider that it is time to take action so as to create the conditions necessary for the simultaneous dissolution of the military blocs, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and of the Warsaw Pact.

In the world today people want to cultivate relations of co-operation and of trust. That shows still more clearly the anachronistic nature of the military pacts set up at the time of the cold war, which have long since ceased to be necessary, always assuming that they ever were necessary. The withdrawal of troops stationed in the territories of other countries and the dismantling of foreign military bases also would be very important for the cause of détente, for the strengthening of trust between States and for international security.

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

The advent of an era of peace, security and co-operation would also require the rapid and final elimination of the remnants of colonialism, in all its forms and manifestations, as well as the elimination of under-development and the establishment of the New International Economic Order. The persistence of under-development, the widening gap between States, the continuing division of the world into rich countries and poor countries, are certainly not favourable conditions for international political and economic stability or for the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

(Mr. Chebeleu, Romania)

We fully share the concern expressed in the report of the Secretary-General, prepared with the help of a group of governmental experts, which was introduced so eloquently by the Chairman of the Group, Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas, in connexion with the disregard or the violation of certain basic stipulations in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Although the balance sheet of the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration over the ten years that have elapsed since its adoption is not a particularly positive one, this in no way detracts from its viability or its importance. On the contrary, the provisions of the Declaration are more relevant today than ever, and their implementation would be an extremely important contribution to building new relations between States based on true equality and co-operation.

Accordingly, the Romanian delegation feels that the General Assembly should bring to the attention of all Member States the fundamental provisions of the Declaration and that this debate and the resolution we shall adopt should provide a new incentive to their implementation and the achievement of real progress in the strengthening of international security. Our deliberations would thereby have the merit of contributing to the relaxation of international tension and to a resumption of the policy of détente and of respect for the independence of all peoples.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): On behalf of the nine States members of the European Community, I should like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/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 regional levels. Not least, within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, we played and continue to play a full part in efforts designed to encourage a relaxation of tension and the development of co-operation in Europe.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

I now wish to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1. Allow me first to express our appreciation for certain positive elements contained in the draft resolution before us and the improvement of the text as compared to last year's resolution. In this regard, we welcome the fact that the seventh preambular paragraph implies recognition of the principle of universality and the indivisibility of détente. Furthermore, operative paragraphs 5 and 6 clearly imply rejection of, inter alia, the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan. Also, some controversial elements contained in resolution 34/100 have disappeared, to our satisfaction.

We also appreciate the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas, which elaborated the report contained in document A/35/505. While that report has certain shortcomings, we wish to underline that it is in many respects in line with our assessment of the international situation.

At the same time, we deem it necessary to make clear our reservations on the requirement that the First Committee continue to debate year after year the implementation of the 1970 Declaration. We seriously doubt the contribution which these debates can make to the achievement of the goals established in the Declaration. The Nine have noted on previous occasions in this Committee that we are far from convinced that the practice of debating this issue year after year in the First Committee has served any useful purpose. Many speakers in this debate have underlined the importance which they attach to the 1970 Declaration. We share to a large extent the preoccupations of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1. However, our concern is that to offer a selective presentation of certain aspects of the Declaration, as tends to happen during this annual debate, risks seriously weakening the importance of the 1970 text and distorting the general understanding upon which it was based. It is because we feel that this is a contentious and not necessarily productive exercise that the Nine decided not to respond to the Secretary-General's call for the submission of written comments on resolution 34/100. Members of the Committee will recall that the Nine abstained on resolution 34/100 last year.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

There are a few specific ideas contained in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 that create difficulties for the nine delegations on whose behalf I have the honour to speak.

In several cases throughout the draft resolution, the notion of non-interference is mentioned where, in our view, the exclusive use of the phrase "non-intervention" would have been appropriate.

The third and fourth preambular paragraphs appear to us to be contradictory. Whereas the third preambular paragraph states that the vast majority of Member States has adhered to the provisions of the Declaration, the fourth preambular paragraph refers to the "escalation" of acts in violation of the same provisions.

We have difficulty with operative paragraph 4, where an appeal is made to consolidate the foundations of non-use of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes between States. It is the view of the Nine that, rather than repeating those principles, which are inter alia embodied in the United Nations Charter, in yet new documents, emphasis should be placed on investigation into the failure to implement them in practice and ways of enhancing the respect that those principles demand.

In so far as operative paragraph 8 is concerned, I would recall that we abstained on the 1970 resolution on the "Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". We cannot therefore subscribe to the reaffirmation of that Declaration.

In operative paragraph 9, the Nine feel it would have been more appropriate to refer to all sections of the Helsinki Final Act.

As to operative paragraph 10, commending the transformation of the region of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation, we are puzzled by the conceptual vagueness of the idea advocated therein. We are convinced that ideas and proposals relating to any specific area, particularly a very complex and non-homogeneous one such as the Mediterranean, should be dealt with in the appropriate regional frameworks. Furthermore, questions concerning security and the Mediterranean area cannot be considered in isolation.

We cannot subscribe to certain sometimes explicit criticisms of the functioning of the Security Council, as follows, for example, from the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 12.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Last but not least, we regret the continued absence of any reference to the recognition of the importance of respect for human rights as a constitutive element of the desirable reinforcement of international security. We recall that the freedoms of expression of opinion and of information formed an essential part of the 1970 Declaration and constituted an important element of international peace and security.

In consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1, we have discussed the possibility of amendments to meet our difficulties. We appreciate the efforts made by the authors in this direction. As a result, a number of controversial elements have disappeared from the draft resolution. However, the text still contains objectionable items, which are not acceptable.

The Nine will therefore abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1.

Mr. MOINI (Iran): We have listened with great interest to the statements made in this Committee under agenda item 50, entitled "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

It is obvious that international security is in the interest of all nations of the world, the strong and the weak alike. But is it honestly taken as seriously as it should be by the representatives of those nations in international forums such as ours? Unfortunately, there is no clear and positive answer to that crucial question. A major cause for the deterioration of international security is the use or the threat of use of force in international relations, the manifestations of which we witness every day. Everyone preaches the need for the peaceful settlement of disputes between States and the necessity to reduce international tension and to promote international security, as if it were up to an external power from somewhere in the universe to impose peace and security upon mankind. Everyone is sitting idly and praying for the improvement of the general atmosphere. Meanwhile aggressors and invaders, misinterpreting international inaction as tacit support, proceed to threaten international security in the most dangerous ways, and the world stands watching, discussing, analysing and giving advice. Here lies the answer to the question that I have just raised. This answer clarifies certain realities about our international community. Bilateral interests and rivalries for hegemony still dominate international relations and it seems that States have no chance in depending upon international organs in defending their independence and territorial integrity. The Security Council, which is the supreme organ entrusted with the grave responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, is more interested in adopting resolutions which all parties will be happy about, regardless of the fact that an aggressor cannot be equated with a victim and that the imposition of one-sided solutions does not remove tensions and does not settle conflicts.

(Mr. Moini, Iran)

The people of Iran have understood those unfortunate conditions. They have accepted the fact that in order to defend their independence and territorial integrity they have to make tremendous sacrifices in life and property, and that is exactly what they are doing. We shall continue our faith in the invincibility of the will of a people that has risen to defeat injustice and, until the day that we feel the international community is prepared to accept its responsibilities and to see realities as they are, regardless of what other unrelated factors may be, we are going to proceed in our present course.

We believe strongly that we are justified in having such a view towards international relations. When the struggle of the Iranian people against tyranny and subordination triumphed, revolutionary Iran decided to end the dreams of the Shah to be the enforcer of dictated peace in the Persian Gulf region. We immediately withdrew from the Central Treaty Organization and we cancelled the latest orders of sophisticated armaments that the previous régime had placed with Western manufacturers. Our belief was that by taking the initiative we would be abolishing one of the causes of the regional arms race that had been going on between the States of the area, and we expected that others would welcome such a move towards reducing tension among neighbours and thus follow suit. We never suspected that others were actually waiting to exploit the movement that had started in Iran towards demilitarization. What the Iranian people experienced was that good faith brought about foreign occupation and that, unfortunately, there was no way out except armed struggle.

The Iranian people has not yet lost all hope that some day international security may be taken seriously by the international community. As we continue to sacrifice the lives of our brave men in defence of our territorial integrity we can only pray that such a day may come soon.

The CHAIRMAN: We have reached the end of the list of speakers on agenda item 50. The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1. Zaire has become a sponsor of that draft resolution, and Congo and Qatar have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62.

I shall now call on those members who wish to explain their votes before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation understands and fully shares the concerns that the problem of security causes the international community. We believe that it is for the General Assembly, and in particular for the First Committee, to recall the principles and conditions without which that security cannot be ensured. We feel that this task is made more imperative by the circumstances with which we are all familiar.

The draft resolution before us reflects, in fairly broad measure, our own position in this connexion. We should like to congratulate the Chairman of the Group of governmental experts, Ambassador Hepburn, for the quality of the report and for the efforts undertaken in order to present a draft resolution which can obtain general agreement.

The French delegation would be prepared to join a consensus on the revised text. We would welcome the unanimous adoption of a draft resolution on international security which would mark in a significant way the tenth anniversary of the Declaration adopted in 1970 and would reaffirm the common will of States in this field. If, to our regret, that consensus seemed unlikely to emerge, the taking of a vote on the draft resolution would make it necessary for us to abstain, a course justified by our reservations concerning certain provisions of the text.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

I refer here to the statement just made on behalf of the States members of the European Community by the representative of the Netherlands. The French delegation would in particular like to stress the reservations which we have with regard to certain assessments or views relating to the Security Council, the treatment given to General Assembly resolutions which would place them on a level which should be reserved for the provisions of the Charter and, lastly, the wording of operative paragraph 9 which, as far as the problem of European security is concerned, takes a position quite different from that of the French Government, a position which is well known to our partners in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The French delegation sincerely hopes that the Assembly will be able, at its next session, to express the unanimous will of the international community on the fundamental question which is the subject of our debate. It is determined to contribute to this result in a most constructive spirit.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria has from the outset supported the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We continue to regard this Declaration as an important achievement and a valuable framework for efforts directed towards the enhancement of international security and the promotion of peaceful co-operation between States.

It was therefore with regret that the Austrian delegation has decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1. While we appreciate the efforts undertaken by the sponsors of the present draft resolution, which have led to substantial improvements on last year's resolution 34/100, we still have serious reservations concerning certain elements of the present text.

With regard to operative paragraph 2, containing the condemnation of actions detrimental to international security, we regret that the sponsors have not incorporated a reference to human rights violations. The persistent non-observance of human rights in various areas of the world constitutes in our view a serious obstacle to the strengthening of international security.

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

Furthermore, we believe that in operative paragraph 9 concerning the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, all major areas of work of the Conference should have been explicitly mentioned. In its present form this provision does not sufficiently reflect the carefully balanced nature of the process of that Conference.

The Austrian delegation has also certain reservations about the rather vague and ambiguous formulations of operative paragraph 10.

Mr. SOULIOTIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The Declaration adopted by the General Assembly 10 years ago continues to be an instrument of great importance. Greece profoundly believes in the provisions of the Declaration which it has always championed, respect for which indubitably constitutes an essential condition for achievement of the objectives contained in this document. At the same time, my delegation would like to make some comments and state its reservations on the draft resolution.

Our remarks relate to the third and fourth preambular paragraphs, which seem to us to be contradictory. Indeed, satisfaction is expressed at the implementation of the Declaration by the vast majority of Member States while, on the other hand, mention is made of the escalation of acts of violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principles and provisions stated in the Declaration.

Furthermore, my delegation finds operative part 9 incomplete. We should have preferred to find hope expressed for the success of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, not only for the success of the first "basket" but of the other two as well.

Moreover, although my delegation endorses most of the principles in operative paragraph 10 we should, however, like to make clear once again our position with regard to the transformation of the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace and co-operation. My delegation firmly believes that the free consent of the Mediterranean States is essential

(Mr. Souliotis, Greece)

if this area is to be transformed into a zone of peace and co-operation.

For the above reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): As many delegations might recall, the United States voted "no" on last year's resolution on the strengthening of international security. This year we shall abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1, primarily because the sponsors made an attempt in good faith to meet some of the concerns we have expressed about the content of previous resolutions on strengthening international security. At the same time, however, I must point out that the changes made in this year's text, in the view of the United States, leave many of its basic defects uncorrected. In general, the United States continues to have serious reservations about the utility of the many resolutions on the subject that have been brought before the General Assembly since the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security in 1970.

We understand the motives that have induced the sponsors to bring this draft resolution forward again this year, and we share their dismay that the security of all States is not as strong as it might be. We continue to believe, however, that the problem lies in the failure of States to observe existing rules and to make use of the Charter's machinery for peaceful resolution of disputes. The Charter itself provides the best guidelines under which Member States can take practical, concrete and effective measures to strengthen international peace and security. The United States is not convinced that adding yet another resolution to the collection of resolutions, declarations and other instruments on this subject will contribute to any nation's security.

In addition, we see a danger that recurring exercises such as this one run a very real risk of producing nothing but confusion as to the precise nature of the obligations of the Charter, a confusion which can only aid those whose policies are inconsistent with world order under its terms.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

Beyond this, the United States notes that many of the concepts which we found objectionable in previous resolutions on strengthening international security are still present in this year's version. The fifth preambular paragraph, for example, has been somewhat improved but still contains an unclear reference to the policy of dividing the world into spheres of influence and domination.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

We have also consistently objected to such language as that contained in the present operative paragraph 7, calling for support of national liberation movements without at least also recognizing the role that peaceful settlements of disputes ought to play in resolving differences and strengthening international security.

In addition, the call in operative paragraph 6 for avoiding acts which may aggravate the international situation is unbalanced. We of course recognize the special responsibilities the permanent members of the Security Council have under the Charter, but it is surely misleading to suggest that it is primarily within the power of those States alone to affect the course of the international situation. As current events remind us, the actions of all States can affect the course of international events for good or ill.

The CHAIRMAN There are no further requests for explanations of vote before the voting. The Committee will therefore now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1. There has been no request for a recorded vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. ELMER (Sweden): Sweden is thoroughly committed to the principle that States in their international relations should settle their disputes by peaceful means and refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

That principle is well reflected in the draft resolution just adopted. However, as in previous years, my delegation finds that the draft resolution

(Mr. Elmer, Sweden)

lacking in balance, and that elements reflected in the 1970 Declaration to which we attach equally great importance have been omitted. Notably, any reference to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms has been left out.

There are also some other elements in the draft resolution about which we have reservations or which we would have preferred to see expressed differently. For these reasons, my delegation has abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 just adopted because of its general purpose, which we find to be consistent with the original Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Let me in this connexion express my delegation's appreciation for the report of the working group which was introduced to the Committee by its Chairman, Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas.

Finland voted for the draft resolution despite the fact that many of the formulations contained in it are both vague and ill-conceived. The draft resolution would have benefited from formulations more in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was achieved through an elaborate consensus procedure ten years ago. This constitutes our general reservation.

As to specific reservations, we consider a number of formulations at the end of operative paragraph 10 to be both objectionable and irrelevant. We would have voted against them had they been put to a separate vote. With regard to the regional arrangement envisaged in that operative paragraph, it is our view that such an arrangement can only be arrived at freely among the States of the region concerned, with undiminished security for all.

We agreed in principle with the main contents of operative paragraph 9, which strives to emphasize the importance of the European Security Conference process. However, we do not believe it to be within the purview of this

(Mr. Blomberg, Finland)

Committee, and particularly of countries not participating in the Madrid Conference, to set goals for the Conference or to agree on explicit formulations dealing with it.

Mr. DABO (Guinea)(interpretation from French): Perhaps a more senior or authoritative voice might have been more appropriate, but I should like to state that my delegation was unable to take part in the vote on the draft resolution because several delegations, including my own, had wished to submit a very important amendment to the draft resolution the Committee has just voted upon, but we were not able to do so. We hope that we will be more successful in due course when the matter comes before the Assembly. In the meantime, my delegation had no alternative other than not to take part in the vote at this time.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): My delegation supports the position stated by the representative of Guinea, and as a result we did not participate in the vote. I should like the record to reflect that.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali)(interpretation from French): The same holds true for the delegation of Mali. We did not participate in the vote because we considered that we had an important amendment to this text. Since the rules of procedure prevented us from submitting that amendment, we were unable to participate. We hope to be able to submit our amendment in due course so that the text may reflect all tendencies. We regret that we were unable to participate at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the Chair must explain its position. The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 had already begun when the Chair's attention was drawn to the fact that certain members of

(The Chairman)

the Committee wished to propose an amendment. I believe that the Chair must abide by the rules of procedure, and since the voting procedure had begun, the Chair had no other option but to proceed with the voting on the draft resolution. Of course, any delegation is free to submit amendments to this draft resolution when the item is taken up by the General Assembly.

Mr. RAHHALI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation did not participate in the vote on this important draft resolution for the reasons already stated by the representative of Guinea.

Mr. JEICHANDE (Mozambique) (interpretation from French): My delegation joins with Guinea and Mali in stating that we did not participate in the vote for the reasons they gave, and we hope that the amendment can be submitted when the matter comes before the General Assembly.

Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Zaire did not take part in the vote on the draft resolution for the reasons fully explained by the representative of Guinea. Should an amendment be submitted to this draft resolution in the plenary Assembly, we shall explain our views at that time.

Mr. SANGARET (Ivory Coast) (interpretation from French): Although present, my delegation did not take part in the vote for the reasons which have already been stated at length, by the representative of Guinea in particular.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like to say that my delegation associates itself with the statements made by the members of the African Group.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1, notwithstanding the important omission pointed out by a group of its sponsors and which, for lack of adequate time, was not considered. However, we feel that the subject of the amendment has been taken care of in other more specific and pertinent resolutions and, therefore, we voted in favour of it.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation did not participate in the vote on this draft resolution for the same reasons as those stated by the representative of Guinea.

Mr. KAREM (Egypt): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 for obvious reasons. We have a governmental expert in the Group which prepared this report. However, we attribute cardinal importance to the amendments that are being worked out; in fact, we are ourselves involved in the negotiations on those amendments to which the representative of Guinea referred.

Mr. MOLLOMB (Congo) (interpretation from French): As a member of the African Group we took part in the attempt to have these amendments included in the draft resolution; however, that was not done. Nevertheless we voted for the draft resolution for reasons of principle, because we thought, as the representative of Ethiopia put it, that the question had been dealt with in other more relevant resolutions and that in due course it will still be possible to correct the omission that has occurred this time. We stand by our friends of the African Group and therefore felt that we ought to explain clearly our position on this matter.

Mr. SAID (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution although we feel that it contains important omissions. We hope that we can remedy this situation in the plenary Assembly by means of the amendments which have been submitted.

Mr. BENYAMINA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which was just adopted, and I should like to say that we are grateful to the sponsors for the effort that they made to meet the suggestions that we put forward. However, we regret that the amendments presented by the African Group could not be adopted due to lack of time. My delegation would like to say that we fully support those amendments and we shall continue to do so when they are resubmitted in due course.

Mr. OSMAN (Djibouti) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Djibouti voted for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 for reasons of principle. Nevertheless, we very much regret that the amendments presented by the African Group were not accepted due to lack of time. We shall vote in favour of those amendments in due course.

The CHAIRMAN: I must make it clear that the so-called amendments to which members of the African Group have been referring were not handed over to the Secretariat nor to the Chairman; perhaps they were handed over to the sponsors of the draft resolution. Therefore, once the general debate was over I announced that the voting procedure had started. It is really for the members of the African Group to take up the matter with the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. ALMEIDA (Angola): My delegation did not take part in the vote for the reasons given by the delegations of Guinea and Mozambique.

Mr. BOUM (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): We voted in favour of the draft resolution to demonstrate our interest in the problems of international security; but that favourable vote should not be taken as indicating any lack of solidarity with the African Group. As the Chairman said, we learned of the African Group's amendments and we are certainly ready to support them when they come up for examination in the plenary Assembly. If it had been possible, we might have been able to spare the Assembly's having to re-examine this draft resolution. But I am sure that our African friends will do everything in their power to ensure a large measure of understanding between ourselves and the sponsors so that the debate is not repeated in the General Assembly and that the new text which will be proposed can be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ZIDOUEMBA (Upper Volta) (interpretation from French): Although my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48/Rev.1 to express our interest in the subject, we are firmly committed to the amendments to be submitted by the African Group in the plenary Assembly.

On this subject, I wish to state that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, as amended, and we hope that when the Assembly meets in plenary session no problem will arise with regard to inclusion of those amendments in the text of the resolution we have adopted in the First Committee.

Mr. ANIAMBOSSOU (Benin) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution, on the understanding that it had not been amended for lack of time. We still fully support the amendments proposed by the African Group and believe that the sponsors will take them into account in due course.

Mr. KHALAF (Somalia): My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution, but that does not mean we are happy with it in its present form. After the amendments are introduced, Somalia will vote for the amended draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to comment on it before the voting procedure begins.

Mr. THOMAS (Guyana): I wish, first of all, to present a brief report on the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee on the question of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

The report was prepared by me and, as such, is largely a factual record of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group during that period.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 34/101, of 14 December 1979, the General Assembly decided to establish an Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee at its thirty-fifth session,

(Mr. Thomas, Guyana)

with a view to elaborating and finalizing a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

The Ad Hoc Working Group held two meetings, on 5 and 6 November 1980 respectively. A working document (A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1) was presented to assist the Working Group in its work. General statements were made on the document, and a number of preliminary points of a procedural nature were made. Discussions and negotiations are continuing on the working document, and it was not possible for the Working Group to complete its work at this session. It is my expectation as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group that, with a renewed mandate, it will complete its work at the thirty-sixth session.

I wish to take this opportunity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group to make a few general observations on a number of matters pertaining to the work of the Working Group as they appeared to me during my consultations with a number of delegations.

My understanding is that it is the wish of the sponsors of the draft declaration to so co-operate with delegations within the Working Group that I will be enabled to guide the deliberations of the Working Group to consensus decisions. It is also the wish of the sponsors that the draft declaration itself be adopted by consensus. I feel, too, that I am in a position to make some observations on the objectives of the sponsors in proposing the adoption of such a declaration.

As I understand it, it is the aspiration of the sponsors to achieve a declaration that can be seen as a political statement on the question of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and one which would set a standard by which States would endeavour to regulate their relationships with one another in the very vital area of inter-State relations, with all their many implications for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It is my understanding, too, that there is concern among a number of delegations that there are, or may be, legal implications flowing from certain provisions of the declaration. I consider it my responsibility as Chairman

(Mr. Thomas, Guyana)

of the Working Group to react to such concern and intend to provide, within the context of that Group a mechanism that would ensure, with the co-operation of delegations, the fullest examination of the legal implications of those particular provisions.

It is also my estimation that the vast majority of delegations view a declaration on non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States as an important instrument. Nevertheless, some delegations would have preferred, during the current session, to distance themselves, at least formally, from any substantive discussions, if such discussions had taken place. Those delegations, however, have reservations on the document with which the Working Group was concerned, but have not so far identified or made clear the particular provisions of that document on which they have reservations. Should those delegations, during the thirty-sixth session, make known in detail their reservations on the working document and work together with the sponsors, through the Working Group, to achieve that common ground, they will be demonstrating a significant degree of co-operation for the common good.

Such co-operation, together with that to which the sponsors of the declaration are already committed, would ensure speedy progress for the work of the Working Group.

Mr. KHALAF (Somalia): In giving the Committee the background to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62, the representative of Guyana has referred to document A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1. My delegation is aware that initial discussions have begun on that document in the Non-Aligned Group, but I wish to make it clear that those discussions have not yet been finalized.

For that reason, so far as my delegation is concerned, document A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1 has no status pending its finalization and endorsement by the Non-Aligned Group.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Guyana to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62.

Mr. THOMAS (Guyana): On behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Kuwait, Madagascar and Yugoslavia and my own delegation I have the honour to present draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62, entitled "Non-interference in the internal affairs of States".

The draft is purely procedural, and contains in its preambular part much that is not new. The first preambular paragraph focuses on that provision of resolution 34/101 of 14 December 1979 by which the Ad Hoc Working Group was established, and contents itself with a general reference to previous resolutions.

Reference is made in the fifth preambular paragraph to the report of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group as being a factual record of the work of that Group. The report, which was just delivered, contains nothing either difficult or controversial. It should be pointed out that, as an act of good faith and as an expression of their desire to work with other delegations on this very important question, the sponsors have omitted from the draft resolution any reference to the working paper which was presented to assist the work of the Working Group. The sponsors were aware of the reservations of some delegations and did not feel that they should in their references go beyond the single reference to the report of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

(Mr. Thomas, Guyana)

The draft resolution has three objectives: to ensure continuation of the item as one of concern for the United Nations; to ensure the continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group; and to ensure the continued availability of the facilities previously provided for the Working Group.

My delegation would like to announce that the delegations of the Congo and Zambia are among the original sponsors. Because of technical difficulties their names could not be submitted in time to be included in the present list.

The sponsors of the draft are aware that, given the fact that the First Committee intends to end its work today, this draft resolution has not been available for the required period set out in rule 120. They hope, however, that delegations will overlook this purely formal defect in what is a purely procedural draft resolution, and that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. TRAUTWEIN (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation is unfortunately not in a position to support the proposal just made by the representative of Guyana that the Committee vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62 today, as the text was brought to the notice of this Committee less than 12 hours ago. The report of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group, to which the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.62 refers, has just been delivered orally by the representative of Guyana. My delegation is therefore not in a position to agree to waive rule 120 of the rules of procedure, which requires, as a general rule, that

"no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the Committee unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting."

To my delegation's understanding this rule ensures that sufficient discussion of a draft resolution by the Committee, as well as communications with one's capital, are possible before a vote is taken. My delegation therefore requests you, Mr. Chairman to postpone the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62 in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure, which I have just quoted.

Mr. GOULDING (United Kingdom): My delegation has very carefully considered the appeal that you, Mr. Chairman, and the representative of Guyana have just made that we should agree to a vote being taken tonight on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62. The United Kingdom delegation had shared your hope that the Committee would be able to complete its work today, but the late submission of the draft resolution, which reached my mission only this morning, and the proposal that it should be voted on today, cause us real problems. Were it not for those problems we might have been able to consider a waiver of rule 120 at this late stage in the Committee's proceedings. But the fact is that it is only this evening that we have heard the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group present orally the report that is referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. That oral report contained references to the Working Group's work in terms that may influence my authorities' decision on how the United Kingdom should vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62.

It will be recalled that last year we voted against resolution 34/101, which set up the Ad Hoc Working Group. As it was already midnight in London when the Chairman of the Working Group began to speak, we have had no opportunity to consult our authorities and are therefore without instructions on how to vote.

In these circumstances my delegation is obliged to ask that the vote should not be taken tonight.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I should like, as a purely personal gesture to our colleague of Guyana, simply to ask whether, if the sponsors are genuinely seeking a considered opinion on their draft resolution, with the benefit of instructions from our capitals, would it not be possible to ask them to present the draft tomorrow, or the day after, directly in the plenary Assembly.

The draft itself raises certain difficulties, but ultimately it would appear in the documentation of the Assembly as a resolution of the Assembly, not as a resolution of the First Committee. In effect the First Committee merely adopts draft resolutions that are then referred to the plenary Assembly. Ultimately the decision would be made by the Assembly in any event, so that in the end it would amount to the same thing.

It is just that, from the point of view of my delegation and other delegations, because of the difficulty in getting voting instructions we should not be able to vote as we would wish on this particular matter.

Mr. SILOVIC (Yugoslavia): We would have wished that this problem had not arisen here. As the sponsor of this draft resolution we found ourselves in a situation beyond our control in which we were forced to submit the draft resolution at such a late hour. Members are all aware that this Committee lost a good deal of time in procedural debates and also on some other important issues, and that we could therefore not tackle these problems.

On the other hand it is my understanding that after the date for the conclusion of the Committee's work was announced the time for completing that work was shortened, in order to accommodate other meetings.

It is also true that the problems with which we are dealing in the draft resolution are familiar to all the members of the Committee. It is a question which was carried over from last year. Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62 seeks only to keep alive work on the declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, so that this Committee may be seized of the question next year, and we do wish to be able to continue work on that declaration.

I therefore wonder if we could meet the proposal of the representative of Ireland half-way, perhaps by having a meeting of the First Committee tomorrow morning in order to vote on the draft resolution - unless we can do so tonight.

The CHAIRMAN: As Chairman I see the position as follows. I have announced that the First Committee would complete its work for the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly today, 3 December, so as to enable the first organizational meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to take place on 4 and 5 December. The first of those meetings has been scheduled for tomorrow morning and, as I think all members of the Committee know, the Secretary-General will be present then to open the proceedings and address the Preparatory Committee.

The cut-off date for the conclusion of the work of all the Main Committees of the General Assembly is 5 December. Given these constraints of time, the Committee might give serious consideration to the proposal made by the representative of Ireland.

There is nothing relevant in the rules of procedure but, to elaborate further on the representative of Ireland's suggestion, the report of the Rapporteur could reflect, as is the customary practice in such circumstances, that a draft resolution sponsored by the delegations concerned was introduced on 3 December at the First Committee's final meeting, and that because of lack of time the Committee was unable to consider it. The report would not make any recommendation but would simply bring that fact to the attention of the General Assembly. When the item came up in the General Assembly the sponsors would have to reintroduce their draft resolution as a document of the General Assembly on which the General Assembly could then take a decision.

That is the sense of the proposal made by the representative of Ireland, and I should welcome a response by any of the sponsors.

Mr. THOMAS (Guyana): The sponsors of the draft resolution are very willing to assist the work of the Committee as far as they can. We have heard observations by two delegations on the draft resolution, and an appeal by the representative of Ireland cast in a certain vein. We should like an opportunity to consider them and to see what response we can give.

We would therefore ask for a short recess to allow the sponsors time to have a brief consultation on the suggestions which were made.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall suspend the meeting briefly to allow the sponsors of the draft resolution time to consider the Irish proposal.

The meeting was suspended at 7.25 p.m. and resumed at 7.45 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62 have had time during the brief recess to consult among themselves and are now in a position to respond to the proposal made by the representative of Ireland.

Mr. THOMAS (Guyana): In considering the suggestion made by the representative of Ireland the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62 have tried to find a way in which they could assist the work of the Committee and, of course, co-operate with the Chairman.

We have agreed that it is entirely possible for the draft resolution as it stands to appear in the report of the Rapporteur of the Committee and for the sponsors to introduce it in the General Assembly under item 50 and have it considered there. We understand that nothing will be lost by such a procedure.

We would wish therefore to express our appreciation to the Ambassador of Ireland for his very helpful suggestion of a way out of the problem, and to say that we accept it on the understanding that the draft resolution will in no way be affected.

The CHAIRMAN: What the representative of Guyana has stated on behalf of the sponsors, in effect, is that the Rapporteur's report on agenda item 50, subitem (b), will include a paragraph stating that at this meeting of the First Committee the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.62, sponsored by the delegations concerned, whose names will be included, was introduced by the delegation of Guyana, but that because of lack of time the Committee could not consider it. Then the text of the draft resolution as it appears in document A/C.1/35/L.62 will be reproduced in the report, but without any recommendation. This is to ensure that when it is reintroduced in the General Assembly by the sponsors as a document of the General Assembly under subitem (b) of agenda item 50 it will be exactly the same draft resolution that is now contained in document A/C.1/35/L.62.

(The Chairman)

I hope I have been able to project faithfully what the representative of Guyana has stated, and I must consult the Committee to ascertain whether it accepts the proposal made by the representative of Ireland and agreed to by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.62. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that proposal.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Ireland, and the representative of Guyana representing the sponsors, for having assisted our work and for having made it possible for me to announce that we have now concluded the consideration of agenda item 50.

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

The CHAIRMAN: With the conclusion of the consideration of agenda item 50, the deliberations of the First Committee during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly have been completed.

I am grateful to all members of the Committee for their co-operation with the Chair and the Bureau in the consideration of all questions before the Committee during the present session. The matters discussed in the Committee, namely, all disarmament items and the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, are essential for the achievement of one of the basic purposes of the United Nations - to maintain international peace and security.

When I opened the general debate of the First Committee on 15 October I noted that, in spite of the anxieties caused by recent trends in international relations, or maybe precisely because of them, disarmament efforts needed to be intensified. The Committee was entrusted with very important tasks reflected in an agenda of 21 items which were considered at 52 meetings during the present session. It is to the credit of the Committee that the target date established in our programme of work has been maintained and, in spite of difficulties encountered in our deliberations, we have been able to dispose of all of the questions referred to us by the General Assembly.

The Committee adopted 43 draft resolutions on disarmament items, a significant increase over the number of decisions taken in 1979. In spite of this heavier programme of work, the Committee was able to adopt no fewer than 20 draft resolutions on disarmament without a vote. I am happy to note that in connexion with those draft resolutions the Committee was able to develop an effective negotiating process which has led to basic agreements on important questions. A number of those draft resolutions adopted without a vote dealt with subjects relevant to substantive disarmament negotiations, and I hope that this augurs well for future negotiations, both within the framework of the United Nations and outside it.

(The Chairman)

The importance of the decisions taken by the Committee in connexion with preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should also be stressed. The Committee has been able to launch smoothly a process which will have an important bearing on the future of disarmament efforts.

While taking note of this positive development, I should not fail, however, to express the view that the area of consensus in the Committee, although enlarged with respect to previous sessions, still leaves room for further improvement. This certainly is not the responsibility of the Committee. But we might wish to reflect on our methods of work so that, while maintaining the deliberative character of the Committee, we could exploit every opportunity for consultations and negotiations.

The present session has also provided us with an opportunity to explore further the main issues underlying the strengthening of international security. This is an ongoing process, and the Chair hopes that it will continue to deserve the special attention of the First Committee.

As I said a little while ago, the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will, from now on, be a continuing process. As members of the Committee are aware, the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee will start tomorrow, and I was particularly pleased to announce that the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee will be opened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I welcome this news because it reflects once again the commitment of the Secretary-General to the advancement of disarmament efforts.

I wish to express my personal thanks to all the members who participated in our debates, either by submitting proposals or by expressing views on issues before the Committee, and I am particularly grateful to the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, Ambassador Leopold Oyono of the United Republic of Cameroon and Mr. Aidan Mulloy of Ireland, as well as to the Rapporteur, Mr. Kensmil of Suriname. Their invaluable co-operation and assistance to the Chairman have been crucial for the effective functioning of the First Committee.

(The Chairman)

I am also grateful to all the officers of the Secretariat, so ably led by the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Sytenko, and the Assistant Secretary-General for the Centre for Disarmament, Mr. Martenson.

I would also like to thank the interpreters, translators, verbatim and Department of Public Information reporters and the conference and document officers, as well as all the technical staff, for their hard work and the help that I have received from them on many occasions.

I extend to all of you my sincere Season's greetings. I wish you personal success in your future endeavours and a prosperous and a very happy New Year.

With these words, the last meeting of the First Committee during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly is now closed and the Committee stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.