

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1898th  
MEETING

Tuesday, 21 November 1972,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 26, 31 and 34: World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> )	1
Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament ( <i>concluded</i> )	
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> )	
Agenda item 35 ( <i>continued</i> ): Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Secretary-General	4

Chairman: Mr. Radha Krishna RAMPHUL  
(Mauritius).

AGENDA ITEMS 26, 31 AND 34

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8654, A/8668, A/8681, A/8693 and Corr.1, A/8757, A/8817 and Add.1, A/C.1/1027, A/C.1/L.618 and 629)

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*concluded*) (A/8818, A/C.1/L.628)

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8809)

1. The CHAIRMAN: As has been agreed the Committee will first take up agenda item 31. Under that item the Committee has before it draft resolution A/C.1/L.628 sponsored by 18 Powers. I wish to inform the Committee that Czechoslovakia, Kenya, Pakistan and Finland have added their names to the list of sponsors. The first name inscribed on the list of speakers on this draft resolution is that of the representative of Hungary, upon whom I now call.

2. Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation would like only to add some words to the eloquent introduction of the draft resolution made yesterday by the representative of Egypt.

3. The Hungarian delegation, as one of the sponsors, regards the draft resolution as a carefully elaborated, balanced one which truly reflects the widespread agreement in the Committee's deliberations concerning the need to reach agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction. The draft resolution will thus, when adopted, serve as a good basis for further

negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

4. I do not want to go into details by explaining all the provisions of the draft resolution, because that has already been done by the representative of Egypt. I should like only to touch upon some points.

5. The second preambular paragraph places in a broader context the banning of chemical weapons, connecting it with our final goal, general and complete disarmament, and stressing the prohibition and elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction. The draft deals appropriately, both in the preamble and in the operative part, with the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

6. The sixth preambular paragraph recalls that "the General Assembly has repeatedly condemned all actions contrary to the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol" while operative paragraph 5 invites all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Protocol.

7. The operative part of the draft resolution reaffirms the recognized objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons, as stated in article IX of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and reiterates, to that end, the request made to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue, as a matter of high priority, negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction.

8. The text of the draft resolution was arrived at after lengthy and wide consultations in a spirit of co-operation and compromise. The sponsors of the draft tried to accommodate as many observations and comments as possible. We believe that the draft before the Committee is a balanced one and we hope it will be adopted unanimously. We are convinced that a unanimous, or near unanimous, resolution on this subject would contribute greatly to the success of the negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which we believe would be in the common interest of us all.

9. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that Costa Rica and Cyprus have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

10. As there are no explanations of vote before the vote, I shall put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.628.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

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

12. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Mexican delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.628. We did so because we consider that its text, basically, coincides with the position that we have advocated for a number of years. In this respect I shall quote the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

13. The second preambular paragraph reads:

“Expressing its determination to act with a view to achieving effective progress towards general and complete disarmament, including the prohibition and elimination of all types”—and I should like to stress the word “all”—“of weapons of mass destruction, such as those using chemical or bacteriological (biological) agents”.

14. Operative paragraph 3 reads:

“Stresses the importance of working towards the complete realization of the objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons”—and “of chemical weapons”, as used in Spanish, implies all chemical weapons—“as set forth in the present resolution and urges Governments to work to that end”.

15. I believe it also appropriate to recall what I said at the 1888th meeting of the First Committee, namely, that the Mexican delegation

“...is convinced that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament next year should consider very seriously its express commitment to come to an ‘early agreement’ on the elimination of chemical weapons, as set forth in article IX of the Convention on biological weapons, and also the appeals to that end by the Assembly in its resolutions 2826 (XXVI) and 2827 (XXVI).” [1888th meeting, para. 2].

16. We also stated then that we were also convinced that:

“What is required is that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament change the approach that it has adopted in this matter of late, that it put an end to the period of academic exploration of all foreseeable and unforeseeable hypotheses and that it endeavour, by utilizing a procedure similar to the one that was used in the preparation of the Convention on biological weapons, to submit to the Assembly, at its twenty-eighth session, a draft convention on the elimination of chemical weapons.” [Ibid., para. 29.]

17. Mr. LIN (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to make the following comments on the question of prohibiting chemical and bacteriological weapons.

18. First, explicit provisions were made early in the Geneva Protocol of 1925 on the question of prohibiting chemical and bacteriological weapons. On 5 December 1966 the General Assembly adopted resolution 2162 B (XXI) calling for the strict observance by all States of the

principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and inviting all States to accede to it. On 16 December 1969 the Assembly adopted another resolution [2603 A (XXIV)] declaring as contrary to the generally recognized rules of international law, as embodied in the Geneva Protocol of 1925, the use in international armed conflicts of any chemical or biological agents of warfare and urging all States to accede to or ratify the Geneva Protocol in 1970. On 7 December 1970 the Assembly reaffirmed at its twenty-fifth session [resolution 2662 (XXV)] its resolution of 5 December 1966 and pointed out that both chemical and bacteriological weapons should be prohibited simultaneously.

19. It must be pointed out here that the United States Government has thus far refused to ratify the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and, in disregard of the relevant United Nations resolutions, has been using toxic chemicals and gases on a large scale in barbarously slaughtering the Viet-Nameese people in its war of aggression against Viet-Nam. The Portuguese colonialists have also frenziedly resorted to chemical warfare in brutally suppressing the African people's struggle for national independence. They have both committed towering crimes; they should both be severely condemned.

20. Secondly, the so-called Convention on the Prohibition of Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction is a product manufactured by the two super-Powers after long backstage deals and is another fraud of sham disarmament that they have concocted. As is known to all, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 declares in explicit terms that the contracting parties accept the principle of prohibiting the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and agree to be bound as between themselves according to the terms of the Protocol. In disregard of the objection of many countries which uphold justice and in violation of the relevant provisions of United Nations resolutions, the two super-Powers concocted in separate forms this so-called Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction in which there is no mention at all of the prohibition of the use of such weapons, thus leaving a leeway for their using bacteriological weapons to commit aggression.

21. The two super-Powers also talk glibly about prohibiting biological weapons first, while leaving aside the chemical weapons which are being used on a large scale and whose simultaneous prohibition has been urgently demanded by the peoples of all countries. The true purpose of the super-Powers is to enable them to continue their own possession and development of chemical weapons so that these weapons can be used freely. Evidently, all this constitutes a violation of and retrogression from the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Such a convention is intended only to deceive the people and it has no practical meaning at all.

22. Thirdly, the Chinese delegation deems it necessary to point out in all seriousness that when the so-called Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction was opened for signature in Washington, Moscow and London after its

production, the Chiang Kai-shek clique, a political corpse long repudiated by the Chinese people, was even allowed to put its signature on the Convention. The Chinese delegation expresses its utmost indignation at this. The Chiang Kai-shek clique has no right at all to represent the Chinese people. The signature of the Chiang Kai-shek clique is illegal, null and void. No scheme of creating "two Chinas" will ever succeed.

23. Fourthly, the Chinese delegation solemnly declares: The Chinese Government and people have consistently stood for the prohibition of the use of all biological and chemical weapons and, in 1952, recognized the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. The Chinese people will, as always, continue to work together with the people of all countries and persevere in the struggle for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all biological and chemical weapons.

24. In view of the fraud concocted by the two super-Powers on the question of prohibiting biological and chemical weapons and, at the same time, in consideration of the goodwill of the people of all countries for the true prohibition of biological and chemical weapons, the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution before us.

25. Mr. SCALABRE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The abstention by my delegation should not be interpreted as an indication of lack of interest on the part of France vis-à-vis the prohibition, manufacture and possession of chemical weapons. At the 1882nd meeting, during the general debate in our Committee on disarmament, Senator Taittinger set forth the position of France on this subject in detail, and the fact alone that my country should be the depositary of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 shows sufficiently the importance that we attach to this problem. If we abstained, it was because of the well-known reservations of France with respect to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to which the essential paragraph of the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/L.628 refers as the body for negotiating an agreement on the total prohibition of chemical weapons. We nevertheless remain in favour of the prohibition—and I wish to state this here—under effective international control, of the use, manufacture and possession of biological and chemical weapons.

26. Mr. MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have asked for the floor merely to point out that when the votes were counted on the draft resolution which has just been adopted, the affirmative vote of Honduras was not recorded.

27. Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.628. We did so bearing in mind the spirit of this document and the idea that it is the basis for a comprehensive and careful study in order to satisfy the desires of all peace-loving peoples with regard to the vital question of the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

28. At the 1889th meeting my delegation stated that this Committee was in duty bound to act, but in full understanding of the tangible reality that surrounds us. It is a reality which affects all and that was extremely well defined by the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Myrdal, when she said that this era of ours "may be judged as one of neo-barbarism".

29. The draft resolution that the Committee has just adopted should contribute to leading all Governments devoted to the cause of international peace and security to use their best efforts to achieve the total and complete prohibition of the stockpiling, production and utilization of chemical weapons. It is high time for Governments to meet the universal requirement of peoples that are horrified at the use of these weapons and to call for their total prohibition and destruction. I do not wish to tax the patience of representatives. The head of the Cuban delegation spoke at length on the brutal and ruthless use of chemical weapons by Yankee imperialism against the people of Viet-Nam. I merely wish once again to stress the following passage of that statement:

"The first step towards the creation of an international climate conducive to disarmament negotiations should be a most categorical condemnation of North American imperialism for its aggression against the Indo-Chinese peoples. If we truly wish to create a world of peace, a unanimous cry must be raised demanding an end to the war and the signing of the promised agreement with the Vietnamese peoples." [1889th meeting, para. 64.]

30. Mr. SARAIVA GUERREIRO (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation is not explaining its vote, but wishes to say, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, that it is very happy that the Committee has adopted it by near unanimity. In fact, at this juncture we thought that this near unanimity would be important for further progress in the consideration of this matter.

31. I just want to make a very short statement on our understanding of this text, an understanding that I believe is quite clear. As the Committee may recall, the Brazilian delegation favours a solution of the question of the effective prohibition of chemical weapons by means of one instrument, or one decision, the execution of such agreement to be, however, in different or successive phases, the first being the destruction of stockpiles, to be followed by the effective prohibition of development and production. We understand that the text of the draft resolution just approved does not prejudice in any manner the form of execution of any eventual agreement that may be reached in the negotiations.

32. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now resume consideration of agenda item 26. With regard to this item, there is a draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/L.629, sponsored by 49 Powers, which was introduced by the representative of Zambia at our last meeting. I have been requested to inform the Committee that the following countries have since become sponsors of this draft resolution: Cameroon, Singapore, Costa Rica, Pakistan, Czechoslovakia, Guinea and Niger.



33. Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I should like to make a brief explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.629.

34. First of all, we appreciate the fact that many of the sponsors of the draft resolution worked very hard to try to take into account divergent views with regard to the world disarmament conference item. We recognize that they were motivated by a desire to act constructively in this admittedly difficult area.

35. The views of my delegation on the general subject of a world disarmament conference are well known. While we do not believe that the draft resolution before us can be interpreted as deciding that a world disarmament conference should be held, the organizational aspects envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/L.629 remain related to the question of a world disarmament conference. For that reason, my delegation will abstain from voting.

36. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil is happy to be among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.629, related to the convening of a world disarmament conference, which was introduced yesterday by the representative of Zambia, my colleague and friend Mr. Lusaka.

37. The intense efforts undertaken by a number of delegations have been crowned with what we could greet as a large measure of success. My delegation considers that the gist of the positive results achieved is to be found in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft, where the outcome of the negotiations is accurately and succinctly described, thus paving the way for the establishment, in operative paragraph 3, of a special committee made up of 35 Member States.

38. It is the understanding of my delegation that the further negotiation efforts towards the convening of a world disarmament conference envisaged in this draft will be carried out within the broad framework of the strengthening of international security. We are also convinced that, when the stage of the conference is actually reached, our common efforts will have to proceed with the goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control particularly in mind.

39. My delegation is led to believe that the reference to adequate political and geographical representation made in operative paragraph 3, *in fine*, does not depart from the requirement of equitable geographical distribution set forth in the Charter, being in fact merely another way to describe that requirement. Similarly, we believe that the reference to consensus in operative paragraph 2 is included purely to dispel any fears that some Powers might have of being outvoted on decision or recommendations to be arrived at by the special committee. It certainly does not imply that we are acquiescing in any way in the eventual transfer to the General Assembly or to any of its committees of the prerogative established in Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter. That could be considered to be very obvious, but sometimes it is wise to spell out the very obvious.

40. As for the composition of the special committee, we cannot but share the clear-cut interpretation given yesterday by Mr. Lusaka regarding the value and meaning of the

guidelines set forth in the last two preambular paragraphs of the draft.

41. Having said that, I conclude these brief remarks by reiterating our appreciation for the efforts undertaken under the leadership of Mr. Lusaka and by stating that my delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/L.629 represents important and welcome procedural progress that was achieved without impairing the principles we defend; therefore we commend it to the unanimous approval of the Committee and of the General Assembly.

42. The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further speakers at this stage on draft resolution A/C.1/L.629, I would suggest that we postpone further consideration of it until our next meeting. It is my intention that the Committee should proceed to the vote at that meeting.

### AGENDA ITEM 35 (continued)

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Secretary-General (A/8661, A/8665 and Corr.1, A/8673, A/8680, A/8749 and Add.1, A/8775 and Add.1-3, A/C.1/1024, A/C.1/L.627)**

43. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil): Ours is an era of restlessness. Man, in all fields of his endeavours, is obsessed with the unfolding of the present into the future, that is to say, with the impact of change on his destiny. This state of mind is proper to all transitional epochs, when the clashes between the new and the old are decisively heightened, when long-established values are suddenly challenged and when, above all, new and unexpected alternatives to the prevailing state of affairs are first articulated as apparently unattainable objectives and then become practical and immediate tasks.

44. That is particularly true in international politics. Political arrangements established in the aftermath of the Second World War, which in the course of time brought back the theories of power politics that the Charter had sought to abate, were increasingly perceived by the international community as obstacles barring evolution towards the fulfilment of its inherent right to peace and security. In this closing third of the twentieth century, power politics should no longer be accepted as the be-all and the cure-all of international life, nor can they continue to clutter the field of international relations.

45. The exercise of international relations in the course of the 27 years of life of our Organization provides a dramatic illustration of the interaction between what has been emerging on the global political scene and what should be kept or discarded from the conceptual and operational system of the Charter of the United Nations. The purposes and principles of the Charter reflect all the progress it was possible to make against the background of unrelenting world war, while the mechanisms of the Charter embody to a large extent the concessions that the overwhelming majority of the international community was forced to make to the oft-praised realities of power, that is to say, to the position of a few countries in the system.



46. Now, 27 years after the San Francisco Conference, and after having undergone all the pains incurred in the settlement of the political inheritance left by the Second World War, the international community is ready to transform the teleological content of the purposes and principles of the Charter into an effective and detailed code of ethical and political behaviour—in fact, into the new law of international security.

47. In the United Nations the first heartening sign of the emerging trends was the adoption two years ago of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)]. In addition to its undeniable intrinsic value and normative vocation, the Declaration stands as a turning point in our work. For the first time, because of the selfless efforts of the medium-sized and small States, it was possible for the First Committee to delve into a political item that had been couched in the usual language of power confrontation and to rid it of its cold-war clichés, while creating an opportunity for the consideration of vital questions of peace and security. In this way, we hailed in the United Nations the fading of an era haunted by nightmares engendered by power, and gave renewed impetus to the search for viable alternatives.

48. If it is true that the grammar and the rhetoric employed by today's powerful still impose inescapable constraints on the course of international politics, it is no less true that the first step towards the overcoming of those constraints must be a determined effort on the part of the United Nations to check that language, to expose its underlying logic, and to elucidate its evil political implications. Or, to put it briefly, an accurate understanding of the prevailing reality, its genetic origin and systemic organization is an essential prerequisite of the identification and eventual shaping of its patterns of evolution.

49. Ever since the question of the strengthening of international security was first placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, at its twenty-fourth session, my delegation, with those considerations in mind, has endeavoured in this and other forums to scrutinize the key phenomenon of international power, both as a concept and as an operational device.

50. The efforts we have undertaken, together with many other delegations, have been politically fruitful in so far as they have served to highlight ambiguities, fallacies and even loop-holes in the present political structure that are doubtless detrimental to the peaceful and unimpeded building-up of a new, equitable international order.

51. Political discourse continues to be burdened by the language of power. The very concept of legitimacy has in many instances been perverted into an untenable justification of the *status quo*, while the idea of international community has often been used not to promote equitable and co-operative relations among States, but to condone obsolete forms of political pre-eminence, to affirm a vertical hierarchy in international life, and, under the guise of interdependence, to seek to consolidate spheres of influence.

52. The implementation of the ideals of the United Nations, which are at the core of our common political

enterprise, is constantly thwarted by the brandishing of vetoes, by the promotion of systematic reverence for power, and by the enforcement of compliance with its dictates. As the Charter is declared untouchable, the review of its provisions is objected to and our Organization is arbitrarily prevented from keeping pace with contemporary political change. The benefits that change may bring are thus confined to a few leading countries, while the adverse effects of the present state of affairs plague mankind as a whole. It cannot be expected, therefore, that Member States will tamely conform to a stand that, besides being rather negative and unyielding, is contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter itself.

53. Willingness to compromise and to co-operate is one of the prerequisites of normal political interaction and diplomatic activity. We should be prepared to prevent the ideals and the system of the Charter from being pushed into obsolescence, since it is the best instrument to check effectively the emergence of unequal political arrangements, or at least to contrast them with a set of universally shared political goals.

54. The system of the Charter is based on the vital principle of the sovereign equality of all Member States. The Charter does not admit the primacy of any State or group of States, whatever their power, nor does it ascribe to them any so-called special responsibilities. On the contrary, to oppose these fallacious concepts, the Charter offers the principles of sovereignty, political independence and, if required, the inherent right mentioned in Article 51.

55. Claims of individual or joint special responsibilities are uttered by those who are seeking to acquire a *jus utendi et abutendi* deriving from the present structure of power. Such claims are politically unacceptable, juridically flawed and historically anachronistic. There is nothing more naïve than to imagine that it will be possible to make the future play back the past, and by that I mean, to restore in the future outmoded power configurations.

56. It is quite obvious that the alleged primacy of the security interests of the super-Powers is no valid reason to place these interests over and above the law of international security grounded on the purposes and principles of the Charter. In this era of pragmatism, of balance of power and of relaxation of tensions, it should be universally recognized that if events in the developing countries actually or potentially affect the security interests of the big and super-Powers, developments at the level of those Powers are, for their part, also increasingly affecting the political and economic interests, as well as the security needs, of the medium-sized and small Powers. Therefore, if our common political enterprise really aims at global peace and security, attempts at establishing any primacy in this field should be definitely abandoned, and the international community should concentrate rather on the task of effectively ensuring respect for the principles of sovereign equality, equality of opportunities and equal participation.

57. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security recognizes that all these matters are interrelated, and it implies that they should not be dealt with separately. It affirms, accordingly—and this is an idea that has been dear to the delegation of Brazil for many years—that there

is a close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of countries, and it asserts that any progress made towards any of those objectives will constitute progress towards all of them. By this token, the Declaration goes well beyond useless and platitudinous statements on which of those objectives are merely instrumental and which are end goals; or whether, for instance, an atmosphere of détente is conducive to effective measures of disarmament, or vice versa.

58. From the Declaration it can be inferred that the strengthening of international security is a protracted process, that the Declaration in itself is only a moment, albeit a fundamental one, in a dynamic process, and, as such, is a document attuned to the onset of a period of relaxation of international tensions.

59. In the current international environment, absolute certainties, rigid alignments and predictability are no longer detectable. Allegiances and alignments are being increasingly qualified, while so far obstinate confrontations are deliberately toned down. In order to attenuate the most glaring antagonisms, Governments are constantly initiating and emphasizing dialogues and negotiations, especially at the level of the major and super Powers.

60. Since the fundamental infrastructure of conflict remains in place as is dramatized by the unrelenting nuclear arms race, we continue to live on volcanic ground and cannot feel secure in the face of the possibility of a sudden eruption. The international community is still forced to rely on Fortune, and, as is known, Fortune is the most whimsical of all deities.

61. Therefore, the present climate of relaxation is supported by rather fragile beams: while hostilities in South-East Asia seem to be in a process of steady abatement, peace in the Middle East still remains unattainable and defies the skills of negotiators at all levels; while measures of arms control and arms limitation have been agreed upon by the super-Powers, questions relating to a halt and reversal of the nuclear arms race; as a first step towards general and complete disarmament, remain unsolved; while bilateral ties are reinforced and certain schemes of regional security are no longer decried but rather are energetically promoted, no actual strengthening of the capabilities of the Organization in the field of peace and security has occurred, and this is most true in the sphere of peace-keeping operations; while, finally, unprecedented economic expansion enriches the developed world, only now is co-operation with developing countries discarding the sluggish and routine methods that have yielded scarce and fragmentary results to date.

62. The Declaration should therefore be understood as constituting a springboard for the institutionalization of a more equitable and supple international system under the conceptual umbrella of the purposes and principles of the Charter. To that end, it is essential gradually to seek broader areas of understanding among States, to enlarge participation in the international decision-making process and to establish or activate operational mechanisms in the field of peace and security.

63. To that end we hope that those who have been somewhat reticent will come to participate wholeheartedly

in the debate on the strengthening of international security. Such a debate will certainly dispel the impression that this item is bound to create points of attrition, when in fact it is intended to ease them. A co-operative attitude will give the First Committee the benefit of undoubtedly important views, and will allay the suspicion that those views correspond to an attitude of disengagement. Let me add that this open and frank invitation to debate does not mean that the General Assembly should be called upon every year to adopt resolutions as comprehensive in nature and as far-reaching in scope as the Declaration.

64. The point is that, although they may involve a certain amount of positive reiteration, debates on this item need not be repetitious. Our contention is that, being a document proper to an era of change and transition, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security cannot be shelved as long as its objectives remain to be implemented. On the contrary, in order to meet its objectives and to fulfil the expectations it has indeed aroused, the Declaration must undergo permanent exposure to the facts of international life, to new trends, events and concepts.

65. The effectiveness of the law of international security is contingent upon its capacity to keep constant pace with the reality of international politics. So long as the normative gap which my Foreign Minister alluded to in his speech in the 2038th plenary meeting at the current session of the General Assembly, continues to widen unchecked; so long as law and politics are considered mutually preclusive realms, little hope will be left—particularly for the medium-sized and small countries—that national interests and the fundamental rights of States will be duly safeguarded and asserted on the international scene.

66. In view of its intrinsic significance for medium-sized and small States, the instrumentality of the Declaration depends essentially upon its ability to pass the test of implementation. Like the Charter whence it springs, the Declaration was never intended to float in space or to pose any insurmountable obstacle to change, but on the contrary, to foster change. That was explicitly acknowledged by the General Assembly last year in resolution 2880 (XXVI) on the implementation of the Declaration. The Assembly was of the opinion that broad exchange of views on the question of the strengthening of international security, undertaken annually, would make it possible to review the changing international situation and to seek areas of negotiation and agreement, thereby helping to improve the prospects for peace and international security.

67. I submit that last year's debate in this Committee was particularly fruitful. Besides having led to the actual adoption of a resolution incorporating many new provisions of a declaratory and operational nature, the debates afforded the opportunity for a constructive exchange of views, as well as consultations and negotiations among the various groups of Member States. Last year, the First Committee also played a role in the development of a concept which, although couched in economic language, stems directly from the political context of the Declaration. I refer to the concept of collective economic security that was suitably inscribed in paragraph 8 of the resolution on the implementation of the Declaration.

68. Collective economic security, as I had the opportunity to argue recently before the Second Committee, should be understood to integrate the concepts of orderly and purposeful change and perfecting of results in the international economic field. It presupposes clear and unmistakable ultimate ends and goal-oriented action. The Economic and Social Council would resume its leading role in the economic order, providing the general policy directives and acting as a forum for the settlement of short-term economic misunderstandings or conflicts among States that might be caused by rapid development and expansion. According to this view of political and economic security, a revitalized Economic and Social Council could be convened in regular and emergency sessions and entrusted with the task of defining the rules of the game of international economic life, in its broader sense, and of superintending their implementation.

69. Let me stress that the concept of collective economic security cannot and should not be construed as consecration of the *status quo*, as an attempt at generating stability for stability's sake, for stability implies an uncritical maintenance of that *status quo*. Let us not forget that stability is but a euphonic substitute for stagnation. The global concept of collective economic security recognizes that, to achieve a just and lasting world peace, the stability and expansion of mature economies will no longer co-exist with the growing relative under-development of poor countries.

70. Furthermore, the concept of collective economic security presupposes that decisions are taken with truly universal participation, with due respect to the very basic assumption that the weaker sectors of the world economy are precisely those which are bound to suffer most from any possible disruption of international financial and economic structures; it is based, finally, on a concept of an international community that contradicts the very idea of isles of affluence in an ocean of poverty.

71. I am convinced that the Declaration, as well as the exercise on its implementation, was instrumental in providing a sort of conceptual and political framework for some quite important initiatives that have either arisen or gained momentum since 1970. In this connexion, I have particularly in mind the questions of the convening of a world disarmament conference, of the review of the Charter, of the non-use of force in international relations, and of peace-keeping operations, and, more recently, the item on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations.

72. In view of the interrelationship between these items and the Declaration, it should be possible to devise ways and means to enable the General Assembly to engage next year in a comprehensive debate thereon. In point of fact, progress towards the convening of a world disarmament conference, as well as towards the growing acceptance of and participation in the process of the review of the Charter and towards the establishment of a comprehensive set of norms to activate the role of the United Nations, including its peace-keeping potential, are some of the crucial elements in the context of the implementation of the Declaration. Under this systemic approach, consideration could also be given to two most interesting and thought-provoking ideas which have been raised at the present session by the

delegations of Romania and Sri Lanka respectively, concerning the opportuneness of negotiating a universal agreement on principles of conduct and action of States in their international relations and the advisability of convening a world peace and security conference.

73. Why not, then, consider some of these issues in an orderly, coherent and systematic manner, against the back-drop of the Declaration? That might be the most appropriate perspective under which the Assembly could take up the implementation of the Declaration, since it would render possible a clearer identification of critical bottlenecks and the pinpointing of areas where progress might be more easily achieved.

74. The other day, while re-reading the *Pensées* of Pascal, I came across a passage which, by its level of abstraction and extreme relevance to the gist of our debates on international security, I deemed it opportune to cite. With Gallic precision, Pascal synthesizes the inner paradox of political commerce:

"Justice without might is helpless; might without justice is tyrannical... We must therefore combine justice and might, and to this end make what is just strong, or what is strong just... Being unable to cause might to obey justice, men have made it just to obey might. Unable to strengthen justice, they have justified strength."

75. Those words starkly illustrate the dilemma of current-day international life, in which the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security stands as a marker. By rendering explicit what is just, and for that matter desirable, the Declaration has the undeniable merit of interposing itself against the fatalism one might unfortunately be led to indulge in when dealing with nothing but the facts of power.

76. In sharp contrast to the fatalistic attitude of those who preach unqualified pragmatism as the standard for international behaviour, the Declaration, while surveying the whole range of present-day international issues, identifying the values relevant for change and laying down precise guidelines for future action, makes no concession whatsoever to power politics. The course has been plotted. The task ahead is to follow and implement it.

77. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The First Committee has again embarked upon consideration of the question of the strengthening of international security. The Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, and the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, have systematically and persistently been advocating the speedy solution of this problem, which is one of the most urgent problems of modern times. We proceed from the premise that the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security, the saving of present and future generations from the scourge of war, and the adoption of effective measures to this end is the most important task of the United Nations.

78. The question of the strengthening of international security, which was introduced by the Soviet Union four



years ago for the consideration of the General Assembly, has now become the common cause of the United Nations and of all peace-loving States. We attribute particular significance to the wide support which this question was given, first of all on the part of the non-aligned countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. This support has taken the form of the well-known decisions of the Third Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Lusaka in September of 1970. It was confirmed recently in the decisions of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of those countries, which took place in Georgetown in August of this year.

79. The adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] was a major event in the struggle of peace-loving and democratic forces in the United Nations for the implementation of the central task of the Organization. The Declaration has confirmed the most important purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides important stimulus for the mobilization of the efforts of States for the implementation of these purposes and principles. Among such purposes and principles we should include the principle of the inadmissibility of acquiring territory by means of the use of force—in other words the principle which is an expression of the condemnation of a policy of aggression and international piracy—as well as the requirement that all Members of the United Nations implement the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with their obligations under the Charter.

80. The principal task of the United Nations at the present stage lies in achieving further implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and in this connexion the Soviet delegation supports the appeal of the representative of Brazil, Mr. Frazão, for a wide exchange of views and an extensive debate on the question of the strengthening of international security.

81. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that in spite of the continuing attempts on the part of the aggressive imperialist forces, which are countering the relaxation of tensions, the trend towards improving international relations and normalizing the situation between States on the basis of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems has recently been progressing favourably.

82. Governed by the programme of peace and friendship between peoples which was adopted at the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government has come forward with a broad spectrum of concrete proposals and has taken a series of important actions aimed at achieving serious and positive changes in the international arena.

83. Everyone knows that for a number of years the Soviet Union and the other States members of the Warsaw Pact have worked unremittingly to achieve a relaxation of tensions in Europe and the convening of a European conference on questions of security and co-operation. It was precisely the socialist countries which were the first to advance the idea of the convening of such a conference and

they have formulated concrete and realistic proposals aimed at the strengthening of peace and security in Europe. Tomorrow, 22 November, in the capital of Finland, Helsinki, multilateral consultations of European States and of the United States and Canada will begin. It is expected that specific dates will be set and that the programme for the holding of a European conference will also be mapped out.

84. The Soviet Union welcomes this transition to the practical preparation of a European conference which we are convinced can and must make an important contribution to the strengthening of the basis for European peace, security and co-operation for a long time to come.

85. The trend towards normalization in Europe has been given concrete impetus by the entry into force of the treaties between the Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR on 12 August 1970 and the Polish People's Republic on 7 December 1970, which are based on the recognition of the political and territorial realities that have emerged in Europe as a result of post-war developments, based on the principle of the inviolability of the existing borders of all European States. As the result of diplomatic talks, a four-Power agreement was reached on questions relating to West Berlin. At the present time all of us can see how two German States have achieved important agreements with the aim of normalizing relations between the Democratic Republic of Germany and the Federal Republic of Germany as sovereign and independent States, ensuring their entry into the United Nations. It stands to reason that in order to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations as a universal organ it is necessary to admit both German States to the United Nations at an early stage.

86. As is known, the Governments of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States and France have stated that they are in favour of the admission of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic to membership in the United Nations. In the statement published on 10 November of this year it is indicated that the Governments of these four States: "are in agreement that they will support the applications for membership in the United Nations when submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic . . .".

87. It should be pointed out that the German Democratic Republic, a sovereign State located in the heart of Europe, is devoting, together with other socialist countries, considerable attention to the cause of strengthening security and peaceful co-operation on the European continent. In the statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the General Assembly on the agenda item now being considered by the First Committee [*A/C.1/1024*], details are given on the measures being implemented by the German Democratic Republic, in pursuance of the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, to contribute to the improvement of the political situation in Europe. The time has now come to complete the process of the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by all countries on the basis of the rules of international law and to put an end to discrimination against that country in the

United Nations and in other international organizations and to accept the German Democratic Republic as a Member of the United Nations.

88. Genuine possibilities are now beginning to emerge in Europe to establish a situation in which the tensions of the military confrontation of the two blocs will progressively yield to a reliable peace and fruitful and mutually beneficial co-operation and where there will be ever increasing implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the strengthening of the security of peoples. The peoples of Europe—not only those on the European continent but the peoples of the whole world—are tired of the tensions that existed for a number of years during the time of the cold war and that were fomented by the defunct instigators and promulgators of that cold war. Unfortunately, it is true that there are still a few elements here and there in Europe—and not only in Europe—which prefer tension to relaxation of tension. With their slanderous propaganda they sow hatred and enmity, but there is no doubt that all of their endeavours and attempts are doomed to failure. The peoples of Europe and of the whole world yearn for the strengthening of international peace and security. They hate tension and war, they condemn and despise the bearers of tension and the fomenters of war.

89. The trend towards the relaxation of international tension and the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems is now more surely gaining ground.

90. Guided by Leninist principles of foreign policy, the Soviet Union is strengthening comprehensive co-operation and friendly relations with the countries of the European continent and of other continents and with those who highly value peace and the strengthening of security among peoples. The conclusion in recent years of treaties between the Soviet Union and a number of such States has had great political significance for the consolidation of the peace-loving forces in the struggle for the improvement of the international situation as a whole. These international agreements are aimed at the further strengthening of friendship and comprehensive co-operation between the Soviet Union and the peoples of those countries. They serve the cause of strengthening the position of all the forces acting against the nefarious designs of imperialism and great-Power chauvinism and for peace and national independence.

91. The implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence of States with different social structures has great importance for the fruitful search for specific ways to relax tensions and strengthen international security. Differences in ideology and social systems should not become obstacles to the development of normal relations based upon the principle of the non-use of force, the principles of sovereignty, equality, mutual respect, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries and mutual profit. Such a development of relations between States independently of their social structures, and in particular through the conclusion on this basis of appropriate treaties and agreements, would contribute in a tangible manner to ensuring the security of States and to strengthening peace and relaxing tensions throughout the world.

92. An important form of the affirmation of the principles of peaceful coexistence was their recent inclusion, in binding international legal form, in certain well-known international documents regulating relations between the Soviet Union and a number of countries of Europe and other continents. Those instruments were signed as a result of meetings of the leaders of the Soviet Union with the leaders of other countries, particularly France, Canada, Turkey, Iran and Italy. Of considerable importance is the inclusion of the principle of peaceful coexistence in the document entitled "Basic principles of mutual relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America",<sup>1</sup> signed on 29 May 1972 during the Soviet-American talks at the summit in Moscow.

93. It is necessary to emphasize that in concluding bilateral agreements on questions of co-operation the Soviet Union has systematically practised the policy whereby such agreements should include the most important principle of peaceful coexistence: that of the non-use of force. Not only has the Soviet Union enshrined that principle in bilateral agreements with other countries but it strives to confirm it as a law of international life. Guided by that policy the Soviet Union, as is well known to all, proposes the inclusion at this twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly of an item on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

94. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that a large number of countries, including the non-aligned countries, have supported that proposal and it expresses the hope that the discussion on this question in plenary meetings of the General Assembly will lead to the adoption of a constructive decision on the substance of the question, in accordance with the interests of all States and of the whole of mankind.

95. The Soviet Union has been systematically and steadfastly fighting for the implementation of treaties already concluded and for the normalization and improvement of relations on the basis of good neighbourliness and friendship with all States. At the same time the Soviet Union will continue to rebuff any attempts to sow distrust and enmity in relations between peoples and any attempt to complicate relations between States.

96. The Soviet Union considers disarmament as one of the most important problems of modern times, the solution of which would to a large extent govern the ensuring of genuine international security. The position of the Soviet Union in this respect has already been stated in detail by the Soviet delegation during the discussion in the First Committee on the convening of a world disarmament conference and questions of disarmament in general. We wish to express our satisfaction that the idea of preparing and convening a world disarmament conference has been broadly supported by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations and, first of all, by the developing countries, which, like the socialist countries, are interested in peace.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1972*, document S/10674.

97. In noting with satisfaction the definite successes in the relaxation of international tensions and the strengthening of international security, the Soviet Government at the same time expresses serious concern over the fact that in international relations at present there still remain a number of acute problems born of the aggressive policies of imperialism which poison the international atmosphere and hamper the relaxation of tension. No one can forget that so far the question of South-East Asia has not been solved and that a complicated and dangerous situation still persists in the Near East.

98. In speaking firmly for the speedy liquidation of the hot-bed of imperialist aggression in Indo-China, the Soviet Union has steadfastly supported, and still supports, the just struggle of the peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia for their freedom and independence and for social progress. The peoples of Indo-China must have the possibility to define for themselves what their fate should be, without any interference from outside. For readily understandable reasons the attention of world public opinion has now been attracted to the question of the peaceful settlement of the situation in Viet-Nam. The peoples of the whole world are calling for the elimination of the obstacles created by the United States virtually on the eve of the signing of an agreement, and for an end to the war against the freedom-loving people of Viet-Nam at an early date. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have always actively supported the just cause of the patriots of Viet-Nam, who are fighting against United States aggression. We are trying to co-operate in bringing the war to an end and we shall welcome the restoration of peace in Indo-China. When that takes place the world will breathe a sigh of relief and the international climate as a whole will definitely improve. An agreement must be signed as soon as possible.

99. If in a number of regions of the world dangerous situations and conflicts are gradually being resolved and peaceful prospects are beginning to be outlined more definitely, that cannot be said, unfortunately, of the Near East. The situation there continues to be unsatisfactory. It is fraught with further explosions. In striving to translate into concrete actions the provisions of the Declaration dealing with the liquidation of threats to international peace and security, the inadmissibility of military occupation and the acquisition of territories of States as the result of the use or threat of the use of force, the Soviet Union will continue firmly and systematically to strive for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories, since it considers this to be an integral component of a political settlement in the Near East, and also for the fulfilment of the just demands of the Arab peoples that are fighting for the liquidation of the consequences of Israeli aggression, including the ensuring of the lawful rights of the Arab peoples of Palestine. There is one way, and only one, to the solution of that problem: the cessation of aggression and the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from occupied Arab soil.

100. The establishment of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, its recognition by more than 90 States of the world and the process of normalization of the situation on the Indian subcontinent which took place after the Simla talks in July 1972 are so many pledges for ensuring lasting peace and good-neighbourly relations between the States of

Southern Asia. The early admission to the United Nations of Bangladesh, which is becoming a fully fledged participant in an increasingly large number of international organizations, could only contribute to the normalization of the situation in that important region of the world.

101. The Soviet Government continues systematically to adhere to the aim of total implementation of the United Nations decisions concerning liquidation of remaining colonial régimes and the need for the general condemnation and boycott of all manifestations of racism and *apartheid*. The Soviet delegation has stated in detail the position of the USSR on this subject in the General Assembly during the discussion of the problem of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*], and in the Security Council during its consideration of the situation in Portuguese colonies and in Southern Rhodesia.

102. Unfortunately, certain States continue to hamper the efforts of the United Nations to put an end to the remnants of colonialism and racism in general, and in the southern portion of the African continent in particular. It is the duty of all States Members of the United Nations to increase their efforts towards the speedy conclusion of decolonization and the elimination of barriers on the way towards this goal erected by colonialists and their protectors. The Soviet Union stands side by side with the peoples fighting for their national liberation. It has always been and will continue providing them with the necessary moral support and material assistance.

103. A substantial part of the general effort to strengthen international security should be measures aimed at supporting the United Nations as an important instrument of peace. The broad consultations recently concluded between members of the Security Council which dealt with the question of measures adopted by the Council to implement the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security have shown that that principal organ of the United Nations attaches great importance to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security in all its provisions. In its agreed document special emphasis is laid on the fact that this will depend upon the strict and total compliance by all States Members of the United Nations with the purposes, principles and obligations under the Charter as a whole and also upon the implementation of Security Council decisions, in accordance with their obligations under Article 25 of the Charter.

104. An important practical contribution to the cause of increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations would be the attainment of an early agreement on governing principles for United Nations peace-keeping operations in strict compliance with the Charter. This will be served by the proposal of the Soviet Union of 17 March of this year concerning basic governing principles for such operations, including missions of United Nations observers.<sup>2</sup>

105. It stands to reason that, in view of the importance of problems of international co-operation in the economic, social and other spheres, these problems—and in particular

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 41, document A/8669.*



the ensuring of collective economic security, which is referred to in the previous statement—should not conceal the principal task of all the activities of the United Nations, namely, support of international peace and security, without which it is not possible to carry out successfully any economic development plans.

106. As will be seen from the experience of the last three sessions and the present session of the General Assembly, the need for extensive all-round consideration of the problem of the strengthening of international peace is very broadly supported by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations, and first and foremost by the non-aligned countries.

107. The Soviet Union is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.627 on the agenda item now under consideration, which has been introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, by the representative of the Polish People's Republic, Mr. Eugeniusz Kulaga, and the Soviet delegation calls on all other delegations to support this draft.

108. The present session of the General Assembly must address to all States of the world an urgent appeal to adopt effective steps aimed at the liquidation of the military hotbeds which still remain in various parts of the world and at an all-round contribution to the political settlement of the situations in those regions on the basis of respect for the lawful rights of States and peoples which have suffered aggression, and also for the purpose of preventing armed conflicts and situations which give rise to tensions and threats to peace.

109. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the document adopted by the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly on this question should include an appeal to States concerning the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements on co-operation in supporting peace and strengthening international security on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence of States which have been so extensively recognized, and in the first instance on the basis of the principle of the non-use of force in relations between States. In speaking of how broad a recognition the

principle of peaceful coexistence has received, like the principle of the non-use of force, mention should be made of the Declaration of the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries at Georgetown. In that Declaration the participants in the Conference have especially highlighted among the number of problems involved in the strengthening of international security its most important and effective idea: the prohibition of the use of force. In the decisions of the conference it is stated that: "In particular, States must refrain from the threat or use of force in their international relations."

110. It is well known what an extensive, positive response has been received by the practical steps made to strengthen collective security in Europe. I have already spoken of this in some considerable detail in the course of the present session of the General Assembly. Particular interest was also displayed in the recently advanced idea of collective security in Asia; the idea of ensuring a security that would respond equally to the interests of all Asian States is gradually beginning to come to the fore. The Soviet delegation considers it necessary for the General Assembly, at its present session, to support the efforts of States in establishing regional collective security systems in various parts of the world as one of the realistic ways of strengthening international security. Such regional systems, in the opinion of the Soviet Union, should fully correspond with the provisions of the Charter, should be based upon the principle of peaceful coexistence and should under no circumstances be aimed against any other States. A realistic way of ensuring genuine collective security is that of good-neighbourly collaboration and consultation—not the way of military blocs or groupings, not the way of confrontations and of pitting one group of States against another.

111. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, at the present session the General Assembly must consider the whole situation concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and map out concrete ways for its further implementation.

*The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.*