



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 47TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)  
later: Mr. KOCHUBEY (Ukrainian SSR)  
(Vice-Chairman)

UN LIBRARY

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 122: SETTLEMENT BY PEACEFUL MEANS OF DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Sy (Senegal)  
Mr. Zelada (Spain)  
Mr. Mujezinović (Yugoslavia)  
Mr. Diez (Chile)  
Mr. Fernando (Sri Lanka)  
Mr. Sumner (Sierra Leone)

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

Statements were made by:

Mr. Shevel (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)  
Mr. Razafindratovo (Madagascar)  
Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.1/34/PV.47  
4 December 1979

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEM 122 (continued)

SETTLEMENT BY PEACEFUL MEANS OF DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES (A/34/143; A/C.1/34/L.45 and L.49)

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States is of basic importance to Senegal. Indeed, since its accession to independence my country has resorted to dialogue as a basic principle governing its relations with other States. In so doing we intended to express our profound conviction that frank and loyal discussions carried out in good faith in a desire to achieve/<sup>a</sup>mutually beneficial solution can always result in a peaceful settlement of disputes between States, however difficult those disputes may be. Therefore my country can only note with apprehension the more and more frequent use of force in international relations. Aggression, armed intervention and subversion are the order of the day, despite the Charter of the United Nations. Senegal has often had to deplore that state of affairs, has condemned flagrant violations of the Charter and urged the adoption of effective political, legal and economic measures to remedy the situation.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

Hence, the proposal submitted by Romania for the elaboration of a declaration on the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States seems to us to be very timely. We feel that this is a most appropriate and useful initiative that will contribute in a most effective way to the solution of disputes between States.

At the present stage of our debate my delegation intends to make a few preliminary comments and should like to reserve its right to make more detailed remarks at some later stage.

The question of the application of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States has a long history behind it. In fact, attempts to develop and codify the principle began before the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations; suffice it to cite the Hague Convention of 1907. Therefore, my delegation considers that the main problem which we face and which the international community has been facing in the matter of the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States is the failure by States to apply that principle. Legal instruments are not lacking. Methods and techniques for settling by peaceful means disputes between States have long been developed. What seems to be lacking is the sincere will to settle those disputes peacefully. That is why my delegation believes that a declaration on settlement of disputes by peaceful means should be intended primarily to induce a new momentum and lead to a firmer commitment by the international community to seek peaceful ways for solving disputes.

To do that my delegation considers we should take into account the fact that the principle of settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States cannot be applied effectively if divorced from other principles, such as non-recourse to force in international relations, the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and, finally, respect for human rights. Indeed, to apply those principles to the peaceful settlement of disputes between States does not necessarily mean to negotiate under military pressure, yield to apartheid, surrender or tolerate armed aggression. This principle cannot and should not be applied except in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Charter and respectful of international law and morality.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

Thus, we believe that the implementation of United Nations resolutions and decisions could help in encouraging the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. This approach to the problem leads us to consider that the strengthening or reorganization of the machinery set up by the Charter for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance of international peace and security should be one of the main goals of this declaration. Indeed, if that machinery operates properly it would contribute to the creation of an international atmosphere more conducive to the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Furthermore, respect for and application of the provisions of the Charter would bring into play all the necessary basic principles bearing on the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States. In addition, my delegation is convinced that, because of the close ties between the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes and that of non-recourse to force in international relations, we should strengthen that latter principle. The definition in Article 2 (4) of the Charter is far too general; it has already allowed many abuses on the pretext of legitimate self-defence. Development and codification of the principle of non-recourse to force through one or more binding legal instruments, could help ensure the implementation of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Another matter that will have to be borne in mind in the preparation of the draft declaration is the diversity of situations and problems. We wish to point out, in this connexion, that in this specific area effective methods and techniques in one region will not necessarily apply to another. As an example, we draw this Committee's attention to the situation in the African continent, where personal mediation by friendly Heads of State was found more effective than other more traditional methods for the settlement of disputes. A number of conflicts were thus avoided and solutions found for them, because the choice of method was freely made by the States concerned and, furthermore, were adapted to the nature of the problems themselves and to the regional context in which they had arisen.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

Accordingly, in elaborating the draft declaration our aim should be to lay down the basic principles that will promote implementation of the fundamental tenets of the Charter. We should try to avoid detailing methods and procedures in a declaration, since in general that seems to have been done already. On the other hand, much remains to be done in the regional field.

One last point which my delegation would like to stress is the role to be played by the great Powers in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Those Powers bear a heavy responsibility for the paralysis afflicting the Security Council machinery. The tendency to shift their rivalries to conflicts in the third world has been an important factor in the aggravation of those conflicts. A number of disputes could well have been settled peacefully had those great Powers not provided assistance of every kind to the colonialist, racist, expansionist régimes.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

These Powers, therefore, should end their interference in the affairs of other peoples and regions and encourage the search for regional solutions to the conflicts that arise.

In conclusion, I should like to say that my delegation will support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.45. Because of its procedural nature and non-controversial character we believe that it should be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ZELADA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): In various guiding sections of its Charter, the United Nations enshrines the concept of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Indeed, this is one of its purposes, that is to say one of the objectives or goals sought by the Organization. But it is also one of its principles, that is one of the fundamental rules which the Organization must obey in carrying out its purposes. The Charter, in order to facilitate the achievement of the purpose of peaceful settlement of disputes and at the same time to require adherence to it as a principle, establishes an organic system for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. This system is reflected in a number of its Articles. It is reflected in Article 11, paragraphs 2 and 3, and Article 14, which relate to the General Assembly; in Article 24, paragraphs 1 and 2, which relates to the Security Council; in Article 92, which relates to the International Court of Justice; in Article 99, which relates to the Secretary-General; and, finally, in Chapter VI, which is entitled "Peaceful settlement of disputes".

After 34 years, it is time to examine the meaning, scope and functioning of the system for the peaceful settlement of disputes provided in the Charter. The results achieved by the Organization in this field have not, we believe, met the hopes which were placed in it, for we are very far from having brought about the true legal system for the international community that was envisaged originally. Nor has the International Court of Justice in its field of activity, made all the contributions that were to be expected of it in the sphere of the peaceful settlement of disputes. In this respect, the exclusively voluntary basis of jurisdiction continues to be the greatest obstacle to progress towards legal procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States continues unfortunately to be a manifest reality in international relations today, in clear contravention of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes. Therefore my delegation feels that this is an appropriate moment for the re-examination, both on the regional and universal levels, of the operation of the procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

At the regional level, my delegation notes, among other things, the debates at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, in whose successive meetings in Geneva, Belgrade and Montreux it had the opportunity to participate. We trust that this process, now underway for some time, may one day lead to new contributions in the field of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

At the universal level, my delegation feels that the United Nations is the most appropriate forum for the study of the methods for peaceful settlement of disputes with a view to reaffirming or, eventually, to developing them. In this context, my delegation places great value on the initiative of the delegation of Romania which is largely in agreement with what the Spanish delegation stated in the Committee on the Charter, and we believe that a proposal of this sort may make a valuable contribution to a joint reconsideration of the means for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the delegation of Romania for its extremely valuable initiative in proposing the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States". In this initiative we see proof of Romania's dedication to the principles and objectives of the United Nations, and an expression of its readiness to contribute to the improvement of the system and mechanism for the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States.

This initiative comes at a time when a number of disputes between States -- some of which have turned into armed conflicts and aggressions and have led to the overthrow of legal Governments by means of foreign intervention -- have been exacerbated. The international community, and the United Nations in particular, are under an obligation to take all necessary measures with a view to preventing international disputes from degenerating into armed conflicts that threaten the independence of States and peace and security in the world.

(Mr. Mujezinovic, Yugoslavia)

As the settlement of disputes between States is one of the fundamental functions of the United Nations, especially in view of negative tendencies in contemporary international relations, much greater attention should be devoted to this question. It is necessary to examine in greater detail both past experience and the role played by the world Organization, with a view to encouraging - on the basis of positive and negative experiences - concerted efforts to improve the system and mechanism for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and for the prevention of the outbreak of armed conflicts.

Since the founding of the United Nations, my country has devoted the greatest attention to the Organization's efforts in the field of peaceful settlement of disputes and, in connexion with the consideration of all disputes, it has always stressed the necessity to find the most acceptable, equitable and effective ways for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. In this context we advocate the consistent implementation of the provisions of the Charter, especially of those contained in Chapter VI, and the use of existing mechanisms for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. Consequently, we are prepared to take an active part in actions enjoying general support and truly reflecting agreement within the appropriate organs of the United Nations system, with a view to elaborating and implementing more effectively the principles of the settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

The non-aligned countries have always considered it to be of the greatest importance that the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes should command full and decisive support in the world. The principles of active and peaceful coexistence were debated at the second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Cairo as early as in 1964. Among these principles, special attention was devoted to the formulation of the principle of the obligatory settlement of disputes by peaceful means. The text approved by that Conference was one of the sources for the elaboration of this principle in the well known Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (resolution 2625 (XXV)).



Special attention has also been devoted to this problem at all the other conferences of non-aligned countries, so that there is practically no final document that does not include a call for the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States. Aware of the difficulty of some of the problems arising in relations among the non-aligned countries themselves, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of those countries declared at their Conference held in Belgrade in July 1978 that they

"observe with concern that recently there has been an exacerbation of disputes which lead even to armed conflicts between some non-aligned countries. Unless these conflicts are settled, they could endanger the unity of the non-aligned countries and weaken their capability for action. It is therefore of enduring importance that in their mutual relations all non-aligned countries should be consistently guided by the principles of non-alignment and the Charter of the United Nations" (A/33/206, Annex I, para. 41),

and the Conference addressed

"a special appeal to the Governments of non-aligned countries involved in mutual disputes to make every effort themselves to reach peaceful settlements, primarily by bilateral means". (ibid., para. 42)

(Mr. Mujezinovic, Yugoslavia)

In this sense, the non-aligned countries expressed their readiness, through various forms of good offices, to help parties to a dispute to solve the conflicts that may arise between them and underlined the importance of the role of regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity. They also expressed their readiness to establish informal ad hoc groups to provide good offices to parties in disputes and encourage peaceful settlements through negotiations, mediation, good offices and other measures embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. The composition of such groups would be determined in the light of concrete situations, the nature of a given conflict and the views of the countries involved in the dispute.

At their sixth Conference, in Havana, the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries called upon all the non-aligned countries to settle their disputes by peaceful means and to refrain in their mutual relations and in their relations with other States from the threat or use of force against the national sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of any country. In this connexion the Conference noted the working paper circulated by Sri Lanka regarding a commission for the settlement of border disputes within the Non-Aligned Movement and commended it to the members of the movement for serious and careful consideration. Together with the delegations of Bangladesh and Iraq, my country submitted to the Sixth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana a separate resolution on the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between non-aligned countries. Although the initiatives of one group of States Members of the United Nations are involved here, they clearly reflect a desire to improve the mechanism for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means embodied in the Charter and to ensure its wider use. It is obvious that all the steps taken within the Non-Aligned Movement for the settlement of disputes are based on the Charter and the experience of our Organization, so the consideration of this question in the General Assembly, as well as further work concerned with it, should not evolve without taking into account the activity of the non-aligned movement in this field.

Yugoslavia has constantly and consistently advocated implementation of the provisions of the Charter relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes between States. In its practical actions at sessions of the General Assembly

(Mr. Mujezinovic, Yugoslavia)

and in the Security Council Yugoslavia has always urged the taking of appropriate measures for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and more rapid, effective and just liquidation of consequences of aggressions perpetrated against sovereign States. Within the framework of the Special Committee on the Charter and the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, Yugoslavia has submitted a number of proposals, and it is actively participating in the study of proposals submitted by other Member States aimed at strengthening the mechanism of the United Nations for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance and safeguarding of peace in areas of crisis.

Yugoslavia is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.45. The contents of that draft resolution are clear and generally acceptable as they are based on positions that have been endorsed repeatedly within the framework of the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and many other regional and international organizations, including the European Conference on Co-operation and Security.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution reaffirms the obligation of all States to settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered. The actual substance of the initiative is embodied in this demand. In this connexion it is proposed that the General Assembly of the United Nations should adopt a decision on the elaboration of a declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States. The Romanian delegation has submitted the first working draft of the declaration as its contribution to the elaboration within the framework of such a document of the principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes. My country supports the text in principle. However, in its reply to the Secretary-General, and, later, during concrete work on the finalization of the declaration, it will make more detailed and specific proposals.

I should like to point out that the idea of elaborating a declaration had already been discussed in the Committee on the Charter, where it met with wide support. It is one of the proposals agreed upon in this Committee during the last session. In our opinion the other proposals submitted to the Committee on *the Charter within the framework* of this set of problems also deserve greater attention. Among them, I should like to draw attention to the two proposals submitted by Yugoslavia.

(Mr. Mujezinovic, Yugoslavia)

First, regarding the role of the Security Council in the field of the maintenance of international peace and security and in the field of the peaceful settlement of disputes, my country has always insisted that the Security Council should be involved in preventive diplomatic activity - that is, it should conduct informal consultations on every question that, in the opinion of a Member State, is likely to threaten international peace, as well as making greater use of the mechanisms embodied in the Charter for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Security Council should strengthen its functions as a negotiating body and make increasing use of the right accorded to it by the Charter to request that States parties to a dispute start negotiations directly or within the framework of the Security Council or of a group of members of the Security Council. The Security Council should also hold periodic meetings devoted to the consideration or review of outstanding disputes. We believe that it would be useful to hold such meetings at the ministerial level, as that could open the way towards effective preventive diplomacy and help settle dangerous international conflicts and crises by peaceful means.

Secondly, the Charter provides that the General Assembly of the United Nations, as the most representative organ in which all Member States are represented on a footing of equality, should constantly discuss all questions of interest to the international community. Experience has shown that through the broadest consideration of the most complex problems the General Assembly has made an irreplaceable contribution to the general identification of problems and the creation of conditions for the better understanding of those problems and encouragement of action to solve them. For that reason we feel that the General Assembly should intensify its work concerning the elaboration of the mechanism for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for the drafting of a declaration that would contribute to the improvement of conditions for the use of this mechanism in all circumstances. It is a useful initiative that all peace-loving countries can only welcome. We consider that at the next session of the General Assembly the Sixth Committee should devote due attention to the debate on the draft declaration and determine the modalities of further work on its finalization.

(Mr. Mujezinovic, Yugoslavia)

Proceeding from the aforementioned considerations, my delegation is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution that is before the Committee, and it will fully co-operate in the elaboration of the proposed declaration on the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States.

Finally, I should like to thank the representative of Mauritius, Mr. Ramphul, for the remarks he made yesterday concerning an early Yugoslav initiative aimed at facilitating good offices in the process of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States.

Mr. DIEZ (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The evolution of the international community requires a new and major effort by the United Nations to codify and develop the machinery, procedures and ways and means for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The item before the Committee, proposed by the delegation of Romania, stresses the elaboration of an international instrument that will meet this general aspiration of States. Chile will actively participate in the work that may be required in order to achieve those objectives, and it hopes that this initiative may culminate in an effective instrument that will guarantee the peaceful and lawful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Diez, Chile)

As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile pointed out in his statement at a plenary meeting of this session of the General Assembly:

"Precisely because my country has an honourable tradition of settling its disputes by peaceful and legal means, we view with satisfaction the inclusion in our agenda of an item on the peaceful settlement of disputes among States, proposed by the Government of Romania. We shall therefore make every endeavour to see that positive results are achieved in this field." (A/34/PV.16, p. 58)

The domestic controversies of States, and the matters that fall essentially within their domestic jurisdiction, are included in the reservation contained in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter which sets forth the principle of non-intervention. The San Francisco Conference nevertheless decided to add the word "international" to the formulation of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes in order to make it perfectly clear that the application of that principle was limited in scope. The greater conceptual precision introduced by the San Francisco Conference into the Dumbarton Oaks proposal made it absolutely clear that under no circumstances could Member States seek exemption from their clear obligation to settle their international disputes solely by peaceful means.

At the present session of the General Assembly, in the course of the debate on agenda item 116 in the Sixth Committee, the concept of the "categorical imperative" was introduced with reference to the obligation of States to settle their international disputes peacefully. The Chilean delegation welcomes the introduction of this Kantian concept which we believe to be fully valid and revealing of the true meaning and scope of the obligation incumbent upon all States to fulfil the principle set forth in Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter. In fact, the existence of a "categorical imperative" is tantamount to an absolute rule the fulfilment of which is required regardless of its conditions or consequences.

In a world composed of human beings, it is inevitable that differences and situations will emerge that derive from controversies likely to lead to a breach of international peace and security. Thus the existence of effective machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes is the only way of responding to the determination of the peoples of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

(Mr. Diez, Chile)

The principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes set forth in Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter, is a jus cogens and, as such, does not admit of any violation since an act in breach of it would be internationally illegal and cause international responsibility to be brought into play.

Compliance with the obligation peacefully to solve their disputes leaves States free to choose any of the methods indicated in Article 33 of the Charter. The parties are free to decide which of these methods they will employ, whether it be negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement or recourse to regional bodies or arrangements. As some representatives have pointed out, the problem arises when parties cannot come to an agreement on the method to use or, once having selected a particular method, it breaks down because it does not guarantee a binding solution. In such cases an impasse is created which must be resolved. It was to such a contingency that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile referred in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, when he pointed out:

"The establishment of effective, mandatory systems for the settlement of disputes would contribute to the elimination of violence and establish the rule of law in international relations." (ibid.)

In that regard, arbitration and judicial settlement must be stressed as peaceful methods of settling disputes, characterized by the participation of impartial judges who base their decisions on the law. In the present stage of development of international law, recourse to these methods is voluntary, although the decision is binding, and compliance is therefore compulsory. Our task must therefore be to create new foundations for the exercise of international jurisdiction going beyond or somehow supplementing the consent of States as the sole source of jurisdiction.

Thus we consider very interesting the study and development of certain proposals that have been made on this subject in the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization which tend basically to strengthen the role of the International Court of Justice, to enhance its effectiveness, and to increase the number of parties and the cases it can deal with, in an advisory or judicial capacity.

(Mr. Diez, Chile)

Although it is absolutely true that we recognize the universal, binding and final nature of arbitration and of decisions by arbitration tribunals, it would not be superfluous to consider the proposal made by the Special Committee on the Charter in this regard, which states:

"States should be reminded that where parties to a dispute have resorted voluntarily to a procedure for the peaceful settlement of disputes leading to a decision which they have agreed should be binding on them, the decision rendered should be complied with." (A/34/33, p. 7)

In the view of my delegation, the settlement of international disputes must not only be brought about by peaceful means but must be sought in conformity with the principles of international law. In fact, the matter can be considered in no other way if we understand that the basic function of international law is to preserve the community of nations from violence and to safeguard them from the use of force, thus creating the conditions of order, peace and tranquillity which are necessary for the promotion of the common good and to enable the members of the international community to achieve their own goals.

As St. Thomas Aquinas pointed out, law is an ordering of reason for the common good, laid down and promulgated by those responsible for safeguarding the community. Reason is intrinsic in law: it is its formal cause as the welfare of the community is its final goal. Hence, there is no reason to fear or distrust law nor can there be any reason to do so. No one, believing in the justice of his own cause, can doubt the law. It is only he who doubts reason himself who fears the law. Moreover, I think that it is appropriate to mention here the wise advice of the Latin American jurist and humanist, Don Andrés Bello, who said that law was the safeguard of the weak. To a certain extent history itself has been a constant struggle between right and wrong.

In the words of an eminent jurist, Latin America constitutes a living example of this struggle for law. In fact, when Latin America was in great danger from the "big stick" represented by compulsory payment of international public debts, by foreign interference and by the domination of force, the Governments of that period very wisely took refuge behind the principles of law that, from the days of Grotius and Vitoria, had been proclaimed by the great jurists.

This stubborn struggle for the rule of law was arduous and quite often thankless, but by virtue of the tenacity and perseverance shown, the postulates of justice prevailed.



(Mr. Diez, Chile)

The suppression of the use of force in international relations and its replacement by the legal settlement of controversies was one of the most important battles and undoubtedly one of the most significant in the campaign for the prevalence of law undertaken by the fledgling American republics.

The Congresses of Panama in 1826 and of Lima in 1848, the Continental Congress of Santiago in 1856, of Lima in 1864, the Pan-American Congress of Mexico in 1902, of Rio de Janeiro in 1906, of Buenos Aires in 1910, of Santiago in 1923, of Havana in 1928, of Montevideo in 1933, the Conference on the Strengthening of Peace in 1939, the Pan-American Congress of Lima in 1938, of Bogota in 1948 and of Caracas in 1954 followed as they were by other annual Pan-American meetings after the revision of the charter of the Organization of American States at the Conferences of Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires in 1965 and 1967, all sought to create conditions conducive to the development of relations among the Latin American republics on a basis of justice and friendship and to the settlement of their disputes by application of the rules of law.

Some of the conventions signed by the American nations were particularly significant in the development of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes. These included the Anti-War Treaty of 1933 between Argentina and Chile, which was the work of Mr. Saavedra Lamas, Foreign Minister of Argentina. It enjoins the parties to settle their differences by peaceful means and condemns war as an instrument of international policy.

I could go on referring to this honourable Latin American tradition, but to save time I will limit myself to pointing out to those who say sceptically that law is of little use without force, that to abdicate in this campaign for the law would be only to return to barbarism and to renounce the values underlying the creation of the United Nations and which it is bound to protect.

(Mr. Diez, Chile)

My country is convinced that the only road leading to true international peace and security is the road of reason, whose greatest expression and guarantee are represented by law.

This is one more opportunity, and a most propitious one, to reiterate in this forum, which brings together the community of nations, the trust and faith of my country in international legal and arbitral procedures for the solution of disputes, more particularly in our own International Court of Justice. My delegation is convinced that by strengthening international arbitration organs and procedures we shall be contributing to the peaceful settlement of disputes and, at the same time, guaranteeing that such solutions will be the result of reason and law, unaffected by influence or other forms of pressure which are no less effective for being more subtle.

I should like to conclude this statement by quoting the very wise words of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, uttered in 1965 when he addressed the Diplomatic Corps:

"The first unconditional affirmation, which has been repeatedly stated by Popes through history, is the absolute rule of law in relations among men and among peoples. It is not violence, it is not the use of force, it is not the blind search for egotistical interests, for these can never lead to a true disarmament of the mind and of the spirit, to a true fraternity or to a lasting and solid peace. Pacta sunt servanda. Not only is the old legal adage still valid; it shines with a new light in view of the tragic experiences of recent decades, for the more we forget the law, the more we spurn it and trample on it, the clearer is its beauty and its greatness and the absolute need for it in the orderly existence of society, and the more obvious it is that reason, a feeling for humanity, and quiet, dispassionate negotiation must govern human relations, for they alone can build the edifice of peace."

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Sri Lanka, Mr. Fernando, who wishes to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.52.

Mr. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka): On behalf of the sponsors, the delegations of Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Yugoslavia and Sri Lanka, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, entitled "The inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations".

Before introducing the individual paragraphs of the resolution, I should like to make a few brief explanatory comments about the concept of hegemonism - a concept which has been the subject of considerable controversy. Hegemony is a subject which is difficult to define but easy to identify in its many manifestations, most of which have been covered in the draft resolution. For the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, to which Sri Lanka belongs, resolute rejection of the concept as an unequal and inequitable means of conducting relations between States is of cardinal importance. In opposition to domination and hegemony, the Non-Aligned States have positively affirmed the sovereignty of all States irrespective of their size, geographical location, power or socio-political system. This is a principle which is enshrined in the United Nations Charter and one which is of universal validity because relations between nations can be just only if they are conducted on a freely established, peacefully maintained, co-operative and equitable basis without any compulsion, force or pressure. I shall resist the temptation to quote passages from the summit declarations of the Non-Aligned issued by Heads of State at Havana, Colombo, Algiers and earlier calling for the participation of all countries on an equal basis in the conduct of international relations and the solution of international problems.

As members are no doubt aware, this subject has been inscribed on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly for the first time this year, and we have heard statements from the representatives of some of the States interested in this subject.

As can be seen from the preambular section of the draft resolution, the United Nations stands at the centre of our aspirations to live in an

(Mr. Fernando, Sri Lanka)

atmosphere of international peace and security on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter, particularly those relating to the concept of sovereignty, sovereign equality and national independence of States. No State wishes to be subservient to another State or group of States or to be controlled politically, economically, ideologically, militarily or culturally. Hence any form of hegemonism that seeks to perpetuate unequal relations or privileges is anathema, whether this is sought by direct or indirect means. In no way can hegemonism seek to control or to limit the freedom of any State, to determine its political system or to pursue its own economic, social or cultural development. Hence, also, our search for an acceptable international order should ensure equal security for all States and peace and progress through the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

(Mr. Fernando, Sri Lanka)

The co-sponsors, therefore, seek in this draft resolution to voice their aspirations in all these matters so that all States, in the conduct of their international relations, strictly observe the principles of the United Nations Charter respecting the sovereignty, sovereign equality, national independence, unity and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in their internal affairs, non-aggression, peaceful settlement of disputes, and the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination. This draft resolution also seeks the withdrawal of all occupation forces to their own territories so as to enable the peoples of all States to determine and administer their own affairs. I do not have to recall that the Non-Aligned countries have, in various Declarations issued at various summit meetings, culminating with the Sixth Summit Conference in Havana recently, expressed this sentiment in unequivocal language. Suffice it to say that we have in this draft resolution before the Committee expressed it in language which, we hope, can command the most widespread support. Hegemonism, whatever its form, stands condemned, and it is the hope of the sponsors that this Committee will overwhelmingly endorse this draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52.

This draft resolution, drafted by a group of Non-Aligned countries, has been negotiated with a number of other groups and has struck a balance which steers clear of any polemical or "loaded" use of the term "hegemony". The co-sponsors do not intend this draft resolution to be, in any way, a narrow or negative condemnation of this or that group of countries: our purpose - in full conformity with the United Nations Charter and the Declarations of the Non-Aligned countries - is to re-affirm the sovereign equality of all States and the need to conduct international relations with the participation of all countries on an equal basis.

The sponsors expect that many other delegations will soon join as additional sponsors. On behalf of the sponsors I also wish to state that our aim is to obtain a consensus, and thus we would be willing to negotiate with delegations on any suggestions they may have for the purpose of obtaining that consensus.

It is my expectation that draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.1 and L.8 on this subject will be either withdrawn or not pressed to a vote.

Mr. SUMNER (Sierra Leone): To the delegation of Sierra Leone, representing a small country which has only recently gained its independence and whose very survival depends on peaceful co-existence with its neighbours and other countries of the world, the item entitled "Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States" is both vital and extremely relevant. My delegation's interest in this item is far from theoretical; indeed, during the recent Monrovia Summit Meeting of Heads of African States and Governments, my President, Dr. Siaka Stevens, recommended the establishment of a machinery that will be in a position to intervene and settle peacefully disputes between African States before such disputes could assume armed dimensions.

Furthermore, as a law-abiding Member of this Organization and of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Sierra Leone continues to stand by and uphold the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes enshrined in the charters of those organizations in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered. However, that is not to say that that principle has always been observed by all. In fact, we are informed that, since the founding of this Organization some 34 years ago, more than 100 wars have been fought - almost all of them in developing countries, to the trial and tribulation of the peoples of those countries.

(Mr. Sumner, Sierra Leone)

So any measure that would strengthen international peace and security and lead to the abolition of military conflicts deserves support. Hence the urgent need for a declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States. Such a declaration, it is hoped, would prevent the present unbridled and wasteful competition in military arms build-up in the developing countries. It should also enable us to divert our scarce resources to meaningful development so as to alleviate the scourges which continue to afflict our peoples.

Of course, the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes should not prevent peoples fighting for their independence and freedom from using all means available to gain that freedom, that would be a consummation of Articles 2 and 3 of the Charter itself.

In the light of the above considerations, my delegation has decided to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.45, and would recommend that it be adopted by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM 126 (continued)

INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (A/34/243; A/C.1/34/L.1, L.8 and L.52)

Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The present stage in the development of international relations shows that the struggle for peace and the security of peoples, for limitation of the arms race, for disarmament and for socio-economic progress presupposes as its most important condition a mobilization of the efforts of all States and peoples to promote a relaxation of international tensions that shall be irreversible. Détente has many achievements to its credit. In spite of the counteractions of a whole series of negative factors, the peace-loving States have succeeded in decreasing the threat of the outbreak of a new world war and in broadening good-neighbourly relations and co-operation between countries and peoples.

The international agreements elaborated in recent years on limitation of the arms race, which is the material basis for the waging of war, have become an organic component of international relations. A major step in this very direction was the signing of the new Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms - namely, SALT II. That Treaty convincingly shows that where there is good will it is entirely possible to find mutually acceptable solutions to the most complex questions directly affecting the security of States. A positive contribution to improvement of the international political situation and the strengthening of the climate of trust among States has been made also by the United Nations, which has adopted a number of important international documents aimed at the further strengthening of the peace and security of peoples in all parts of our planet and at the development of trust and friendship among peoples. These include the Declaration on the Granting



(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and the resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition for all time of the use of nuclear weapons, among others.

A serious negative factor hampering the further development and expansion of relaxation of international tensions and the strengthening of peace and the security of peoples has been the policy of those States that aspire to a dominant role in individual regions and in the world at large. As is known, in politics the end result is what counts. The policy of hegemonism, which neglects the sovereignty and the rights of States to an equal existence and development, has frequently brought incalculable sorrow and suffering to the peoples of the whole world. After all, the principal instrument for promoting the plans of the hegemonists, no matter how it may be disguised, is military force. They are unleashing military conflicts and are pushing the world to the brink of catastrophe.

Over three decades ago, the United Nations dealt a crushing blow to Hitler's policy of world division and the enslavement of peoples. Centuries will pass, but future generations will still remember the sacrifices made by many peoples in the victory over the Fascist attempts to achieve world hegemony. The Ukrainian people learned from personal experience what Hitler's hegemonism was all about. During the temporary Fascist occupation, which lasted more than three years, approximately 5 million people died in the Ukraine. Grievous losses were inflicted by Hitler's aggressors on the national economy of the Republic: they destroyed and burned more than 700 cities and towns and approximately 30,000 villages. Indeed, in October of this year the people of the Ukraine marked the thirty-fifth anniversary of the liberation of its territory from Fascist aggression.

Hegemonism in its Fascist manifestation has been routed; thus a very good lesson was taught to those who, impelled by militant chauvinism, tried by force of arms to impose their will upon the peoples of other nations and to pursue a policy of diktat and pressure in international relations.

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

However, here and there, to this day, there are still forces which in their attempt to dominate the world are not taking into account the sovereign right of peoples to an independent existence and development, but are interfering in their internal affairs and creating hotbeds of tension. They covet the territories of other States, and moreover, are trying to dictate the policies those countries should follow and are striving to prevent countries and peoples from exploiting their own natural resources and building their lives according to their own decisions. In this connexion, very often hegemonist aspirations are being masked by means of the rather simplistic technique of hurling groundless, false accusations of hegemonism at other States. The enemies of an easing of international tensions, who are striving to hold back the process of timely, positive change in the world, so sorely needed by the people, refuse to recognize the fact that in this nuclear missile age any attempts to solve world-wide problems by duress may lead to an irreversible catastrophe.

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

The policy of the hegemonism and domination has many aspects. Over the centuries many countries have had colonial exploitation forced upon them. The fate of their peoples was decided in metropolitan capitals. But the just national liberation struggle against hegemonism in the form of colonial oppression and the irrepressible thrust towards equality of rights and freedom have almost everywhere been crowned with success.

In the international arena we have seen the appearance of liberated States which were formerly dependent. They play an increasingly important role in international development and have become an active factor in the strengthening of international peace and security and in the liquidation of neo-colonialism and similar forms of domination.

The Sixth Conference of Heads of State and Governments of the Non-Aligned Countries, which was recently concluded in Havana, Cuba, again confirmed the striving of these peoples firmly to follow the principles of sovereign equality and to continue the struggle against any manifestations of diktat and hegemony in international relations.

Having won their political independence, the young States are giving top priority to questions of social and economic development and the liquidation of backwardness which has been brought about by centuries-old domination and exploitation. The serious situation in the economies of developing countries is frequently used by certain States and their transnational monopolies for neo-colonialist, hegemonist purposes. They use their strength and even the provision of economic assistance, further to enslave young States and to pursue their policy of exerting further pressure on such States. This in itself constitutes a most flagrant violation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which was adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

We note with satisfaction that the proposal introduced by the Soviet Union on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations has met with extensive support and understanding by many States. We see therein further confirmation of the truth that all those who favour peace, wish to make the relaxation of international tensions irreversible and favour the development of mutually profitable co-operation cannot but come out

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

against the policy of hegemonism.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that such a political phenomenon as hegemonism, in all its forms, must be condemned in that most resolute fashion by all States. Relations between States and peoples must be built on the basis of one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, namely, the principle of sovereign equality in international relations. The United Nations must come out authoritatively against the policy of hegemonism. It must establish a reliable barrier in the way of hegemonist aspirations, regardless of where they may arise.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that the adoption of such an important political decision would make it possible to raise the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism to the level of a universal principle in international relations and to condemn this policy in all its forms and manifestations and thus to open up a new direction in the struggle to promote relaxation in international tensions. Such a decision would be totally in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter, it would be a notable contribution by the United Nations to the strengthening of peace and security and it would effectively contribute to the improvement of the international climate.

Mr. RAZAFINDRATOVO (Madagascar) (interpretation from French):

My delegation is particularly happy at the inclusion in the agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations of the item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" and at the importance which is assigned to that item in this Committee.

Indeed, how can a country such as Madagascar - which was the victim - first of colonial annexation in 1896, although its international existence was recognized by the principal Powers of that period, such as France, Italy, Germany, Great Britain and the United States of America, and then of the neo-colonial take-over until the upheaval of 1972 - not associate itself with such an initiative?

Colonialism, which is the extreme manifestation of hegemonism, has always resorted to a policy of force and intimidation not only in order to appropriate the territories of others and to impose the law of the stronger, but also to export its own values in the name of an alleged civilizing mission.

When, under the battering effect of the liberation struggles, of which my country was proud to be one of the pioneers in 1947, and as a result of the ever-increasing nationalist demands, the colonial Powers were obliged to recognize the national identity and the independence of these oppressed and exploited peoples, a more subtle, and therefore more dangerous, form of domination appeared in the guise of trade, investment and technical assistance. Thus neo-colonialism, another form of hegemony, is fundamentally an attempt to influence the behaviour and the decision-making process of other States.

Madagascar is in this respect, unfortunately, is well placed to know this because from 1960, which was the date of the restoration of its independence, until 1972 when the people decided to take their destiny into their own hands, the real power was in the hands of foreign technicians strategically placed at all levels of the Government and the administration, who saw to it that the interests of the supervising Powers were constantly protected. These were frequently, if not always, considered as taking precedence over national interests. Foreign military bases, nominally intended to defend the sovereignty of the country were in fact bridgeheads designed to serve the former colonial Power in order to ensure its presence and authority in the region.

Hegemony can thus be defined as an aspiration to dominate other States and peoples - an attempt at leadership over the weaker nations in economic and military terms.

The delimitation of spheres of influence, the pursuit of a dominant position, the concept of private preserve, the alleged defence of vital interests, the frequently artificial creation of hotbeds of tension, the use of force, or the threat to use force and the attempts to destabilize are in our eyes the most evident manifestations of a policy of hegemony in international relations.

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

Detente which has established itself between the great Powers as a result of the holding of the Helsinki Conference and the conclusion of numerous treaties and agreements on the limitation of the arms race, notably the signing of SALT II between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, unfortunately, has not manifested itself at planetary level. Hotbeds of tension which frequently flare into open wars perpetuated in the so-called third world, thereby illustrating through the proxy of other peoples the rivalries between the great Powers. Thus it is that the adherents of racist hegemony in southern Africa do not hesitate to defy world opinion, and in particular the many resolutions which have been adopted by our Organization, and continue to trample underfoot the rights of the African majority in order to maintain the privileges of the white minority.

In the Middle East, Israel arrogates to itself the right to deny the existence of the Palestinian people and continue to establish Jewish settlements on lands which all the world Powers, including that which assures Israel's survival, recognize as Arab land.

Finally, in South-East Asia we are impotent witnesses of the fratricidal struggles which are being waged in the region.

Thus, the great majority of mankind -- in other words we, the peoples of the third world -- are still far from living under the banners of détente and peaceful co-existence. Régimes which are not lucky enough to please certain Powers are often the targets of various kinds of destabilization manoeuvres which extend even to the use of mercenaries whose melancholy reputation needs no confirmation. Hence, we see the practices of intimidation, exploitation and blackmail or direct or indirect interference in our internal affairs, which unfortunately are still our daily lot.

Hence, that we should be called upon to debate "the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" here in the United Nations is in itself an extremely positive phenomenon and may be considered as the fruit of the new awareness of the peoples of the third world and the culmination of the struggle against all forms of domination which we have undertaken since the awakening of Bandung.

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

Accordingly, both within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77 we have not stopped denouncing the manifestations of political, economic and cultural hegemony which persist in international relations. This awakening and growing awareness have taught us better to analyse the mechanism of international relations and to expose the patent contradictions existing between fair words and real facts.

Thus the just claims of the third world countries to establish a more equitable New International Economic Order are still being ignored by the defenders of the status quo and the failure of the various United Nations Conferences on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) need no further demonstration because, as was shown by the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar at the recent Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries which has just finished in Havana:

"We have heard the rich countries of the centre pay lip service to the concept of dialogue whereas their real intentions were to maintain at all costs the iniquitous mechanism which allows them to safeguard their domination and to export their crisis and their inflation to the peripheral countries."

The representative of Jordan, during the presentation of the item we are now debating, quoted at length the Final Declaration of the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries which was held in Havana, Cuba, in September 1979 which, in our opinion, perfectly defines what can be understood by hegemony.

I shall limit myself to recalling here the key-words of that quotation: "national independence", "territorial integrity", "sovereign equality and free social development of all countries", "establishment of a New International Economic Order", "right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial or foreign domination" and "non-use of force or of the threat to use force".

Those fundamental concepts solemnly reaffirmed by the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries are an echo of General Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX), which reminds States of their duty not to "attempt to seek hegemony and spheres of influence" and resolution 2625 (XXV) concerning the principles of international law relating to friendly relations and co-operation between States which states that "the use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity constitutes a violation of their inalienable rights and of the principle of non-intervention."

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

Those concepts also echo what is stated in Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, namely that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State ..."

Accordingly my delegation is satisfied with the initiative taken by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to draw the attention of all Member States to the gravity, importance and urgency of this item.

The Democratic Republic of Madagascar, worried about the fact that the policy of hegemony, whether it be world-wide or regional, is designed to limit the freedom of States to choose their political system and method of social and economic development, will firmly support any action aimed at denouncing the ~~the~~ desire of certain States to dominate other States and other peoples. We believe that the policy of hegemony is incompatible with the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that the attempt to set up relations of dependence constitutes a factor which disturbs world peace and international security.

Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): There is almost unanimous agreement that hegemony means domination and irrespective of the academic meaning of the word, its general concept is the domination by a State or group of States over another State or group of States. Domination is carried out by using all means available and particularly the use of force. Hegemony is a phenomenon that was born with mankind, as it is one of the evil instincts in the human soul. Religions, laws and social customs have restricted and limited such instincts and have attempted to strike a moral balance which would grant equal protection to individuals and societies.

Hegemony emerged very clearly during the first half of this century, particularly in Europe and it led to the outbreak of two world wars. In spite of the scourges of those two wars, the awareness of the peoples of the world of the dangers of war and their agreement to save succeeding generations increased through the Charter of the United Nations, which embodies high ideals and principles, and through the declarations and resolutions such as Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in resolution 1514(XV) of 14 December 1960; Declaration on Principles of International Law



(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, contained in resolution 2625(XXV) of 24 October 1970; Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, contained in resolution 2734(XXV) of 16 December 1970; Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States, contained in resolution 2925 (XXVII) of 27 November 1972; the Declaration on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, contained in resolution 2936 (XXVII) of 29 November 1972; and the Declaration of the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, contained in resolution 32/155 of 19 December 1977. All those declarations and statements reject the policy of force and hegemony. However, some aspects of hegemony have not disappeared and some countries still use them. It is known that hegemony takes place through the use of all means of pressure and basically through the use of force and therefore we have had the creation of the United Nations, its Charter and the various related statements and declarations from it, while the peace-loving peoples have continued to find the best means of rejecting such hegemonism. Amongst the bodies that have taken some concrete action outside the United Nations and have tried to set up a new international order based on justice, equality and sovereignty, we refer to the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Islamic Conference.

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries which, since its inception in 1961, has tried to base international relations on national independence, sovereign equality and non-alignment with any of the world Powers, groups or alliances, has tried freely to allow every State to set up the political and economic system that is most suitable for it. It has also joined the struggle against imperialism and racial discrimination and has supported liberation movements throughout the world and has also tried to set up a New International Economic Order based on justice. The Non-Aligned Movement continues to develop and increase its effectiveness in international relations and constitutes a serious and important element in world stability and has contributed positively to the decision-making process relating to the democratization of international life.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In its conferences in Algiers, Cairo and Colombo and recently in Havana, in September 1979, it affirmed all those principles in the text of its Final Declaration. It endorsed the principle of national independence and sovereign equality and the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism including zionism and all forms of expansion and foreign domination, occupation and hegemony, as well as the principle of the non-use of force or the threat to use it and the non-recognition of situations resulting from the use of force or the threat to use it.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The Non-Aligned Movement has continued to fight against hegemony and for the democratic process.

There are various forms of hegemony - military, political, economic, cultural ideological and racial. The most prevalent form in ancient times was military hegemony, supported by advisers who studied the peoples of the land. They wanted to dominate their traditions and religions to make easier the process of domination. We have also political hegemony, represented in the practice of the policy of pressure, influence, imposition of particular types of political systems, interference in the decision-making process, the imposition of attitudes, treaties and military bases.

The presence of monopolistic companies which exploit the natural resources of other States is also considered a type of hegemony, because those companies work for the prosperity of the nationals of one State at the expense of others which are treated unfairly. The threat of some major Powers to interfere in the territorial waters of other States or to impose prices for raw materials that the developing countries produce are also forms of hegemonism that must be resisted, as the representative of Zaire, Mr. Kamanda, said in his statement on this item in this Committee on 17 October 1979:

"... the disappearance of the colonial empires did not uproot the evil ...

"Opposition and obstructions to the right of peoples to self-determination, neo-colonialism, ... the imposition of ideologies, repeated attempts to destabilize régimes and Governments ... frequent interference in the internal and external affairs of States, ... the refusal to pay just, equitable and remunerative prices for the primary commodities from the developing countries, the use of the force of arms and especially of nuclear weapons for the purpose of intimidation, reprisal and subjection, and the primacy of political, military and strategic interests of the great concerning the fundamental needs, aspirations and vital concerns of the less privileged peoples - these give proof of the fact that the myth has not yet disappeared." (A/C.1/34/PV.7, pp. 46 and 47)

All those things to which I have referred are still applied in international life today and there are still peoples under colonial rule. There is still interference by the major Powers; evidence of this is very clear in Africa where

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Governments are overthrown and others from outside are imposed. There are also the mercenaries. In addition, big industrial States threaten to interfere in the territorial waters of other Powers and to send their vessels and military planes. There is also the threat directed at the oil-producing countries and the small Powers whose marine resources are taken from their shores under the threat or use of force.

Hegemony is still present at the United Nations level in its organs where one finds inequality amongst the Member States in the granting of attributes to some countries while denying them to others, such as the right of veto and permanent membership in the Security Council.

Hegemony appears also in foreign bases abroad, particularly in South-East Asia, and in the presence of military fleets, either in the Mediterranean, the Arab Gulf or the Indian Ocean. Hegemony emerges also in the present atmosphere of imperialism and in the settler policy in South Africa and occupied Palestine and other parts of the third world such as Belize in Central America.

My country, which is a smaller Power, has suffered considerably from hegemony. We have lost half of our population as a result of the two world wars and our resistance against Italian hegemony which, at that time, adopted the policy of considering Libya the fourth shore of Italy. That resistance continued from 1911 until 1931; it was renewed during the Second World War until it emerged victorious. Libya almost fell once again under hegemony as a result of the ambitions of Britain, France and Italy at that time. But as a result of international conflicts and the importance of Libya's strategic position, as well as the fact that the major Powers did not agree, and because of the determination of the Libyan people to achieve independence, Libya succeeded in gaining its independence.

However, Libya continues to suffer from the problems created by European hegemony and the two world wars as a result of the destruction caused by mines. The parties to the conflicts did not, unfortunately, even bother to give us maps *showing the minefields*.

It would appear, therefore, that hegemony is the basis of all evils and the real reason for wars and, thus, a violation of international laws and principles and charters. It should be condemned, resisted and ended so that it will not appear again in relations among peoples and States. This important matter deserves serious consideration.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

My delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations because it is comprehensive and takes into consideration the various views expressed. However, I should like to propose the addition of the words "culturally or racially" in the third preambular paragraph, which would then read:

"Noting that hegemonism is a manifestation of the policy of a State, or a group of States, to control, dominate and subjugate, politically, economically, ideologically or militarily, culturally or racially, other States, peoples or regions of the world."

Secondly, we also propose the addition of the words "or racial" after the word "cultural" in operative paragraph 3.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): Before we adjourn I should like to announce that the delegations of the Ivory Coast and Niger have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.45, and the delegation of Guinea of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52.

The voting on the draft resolutions on the Indian Ocean will take place tomorrow, Friday, at 3 p.m. The document setting forth the financial implications of those draft resolutions is now available to members of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.