

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records*



JAN 14 1982

FIRST COMMITTEE

45th meeting

held on

Friday, 27 November 1981

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 45TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 57: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 58: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING
OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY;
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES;
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE PREPARATION OF SOCIETIES FOR LIFE IN PEACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Diaconu (Romania) - A/C.1/36/L.59
Mr. Scotland (Guyana) - A/C.1/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1
Mr. Wyzner (Poland) - A/C.1/36/L.58

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.45
8 January 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 57 AND 58

DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.1/36/11, 13; A/C.1/36/L.59; A/36/358, 376 and Add.1, 457, 552 and 672)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (A/C.1/36/L.58; A/C.1/36/3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12; A/36/65, 68, 80, 83, 86, 97, 103, 106, 111, 112, 113, 118, 119, 133, 151, 170, 206, 223, 228, 238, 257, 332, 347, 348, 349, 358, 359, 365, 386 and Add.1 and 2, 388, 391, 396, 405, 456, 457, 465, 473, 481, 528, 552, 586, 616, 620, 650, 672):

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY;
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES;
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE PREPARATION OF SOCIETIES FOR LIFE IN PEACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The CHAIRMAN: We are proceeding today to consideration of the two remaining items on our agenda. One of them, entitled "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States", has been included on our agenda on the basis of resolution 34/99, initiated by Romania and adopted by consensus two years ago. For the discussion of the subject at this session, the Committee has before it a report by the Secretary-General which has been circulated as document A/36/376 and Add.1.

The other item, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", which has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for the last 11 years, consists of three related subitems: implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; non-interference in the internal affairs of States; and implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.

As far as the first subitem is concerned, the General Assembly in its resolution 35/158 reaffirmed the universal and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(The Chairman)

As far as the second subitem is concerned, the Committee will recall that last year it established an open-ended Ad Hoc Working Group to work out the text of a declaration of the General Assembly on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. Under resolution 35/159 the Assembly requested the Ad Hoc Working Group to continue its discussions and negotiations with a view to finalizing the elaboration of such a declaration and adopting it at the present session. The non-aligned countries worked out a draft declaration which will be introduced this morning by the representative of Guyana. The texts of the resolution and of the draft declaration have already been circulated to all members of the Committee.

With regard to the third subitem, the Committee will recall that three years ago the General Assembly adopted on Poland's initiative the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. At the present session the Committee has before it the first report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of that Declaration by States and also by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The report has been circulated as document A/36/386 and Add.1 and 2.

Participants in the general debate can address themselves to any of the individual items on the agenda or to all of them at the same time.

Mr. DIACONU (Romania) (interpretation from French): First, I should like to express the gratification of the Romanian delegation at the fact that the First Committee is starting what we hope will be a very fruitful substantive debate on the item "Development and Strengthening of Good-neighbourliness between States".

The rich harvest of ideas and suggestions found in the replies of States and international organizations, contained in document A/36/376 of 25 September 1981 and Add.1 thereto, and the broad field for investigation and action which it offers Member States and our Organization make us confident that the debate on this topic at the present session of the General Assembly will mark progress in the efforts to ensure wide recognition and general acceptance of the concept of good-neighbourliness between States.

As we know, at its 1979 session the General Assembly adopted, on the initiative of Romania and 19 other countries, a draft resolution on "Development and Strengthening of Good-neighbourliness between States", and decided to have this question included in the agenda of the present session. In taking this initiative, Romania based itself on the consideration that the promotion of good-neighbourliness between all nations is a decisive factor in creating a climate of understanding and mutual respect, and in strengthening and safeguarding peace and security throughout the world. As emphasized in its reply, the Romanian Government is convinced that the constant enhancement of good-neighbourly relations between States and the solution in that same spirit of all the problems involved in living together and in the co-existence of States is the most effective way to prevent international conflicts and deal peacefully with disputes, which are potential sources of tension and war.

Therefore, we believe that the time has come to make efforts to develop and clarify the content of good-neighbourliness as one of the fundamental purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, along with friendly relations and co-operation among States, to explore effective ways of promoting more harmonious relations between neighbours, and to ensure their concern always to find solutions by peaceful means based on understanding and respect for the legitimate interests of the other party.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

There can be no doubt that many of the current conflicts and disputes in the world are rooted in tension and differences between neighbouring States and in political and military confrontation between them.

The promotion of the policy of good-neighbourliness is an imperative need especially under the present circumstances where the international situation is progressively deteriorating because many existing problems have remained unsolved and because new sources of crises and armed conflict have emerged in various parts of the world. There can be no doubt that this is due to policies of force and domination, the all too frequent recourse to intervention and interference in the affairs of others, the tendency to re-divide the world into spheres of influence, and to the continuation of the spirally arms race. All of these factors contribute to generating dissension and mistrust between neighbours, and to the poisoning of their relations.

Moreover, colonial domination has left a heritage of particularly complex problems in many countries, including territorial problems which can be exploited to prevent co-operation between them and to provoke a state of tension or even conflict with particularly serious consequences for the peoples concerned and for world peace.

We are profoundly convinced that the strengthening and expansion of friendship and co-operation between neighbours is the only way to foster the peaceful solution of any problem, on the basis of respect for the legitimate interests of all States and all peoples and on the basis of the fundamental principles which should govern the conduct of States in today's world. It is only in this way that we can avoid the appearance of new areas of discord and a worsening of those already existing, and can usher in a climate in which peace, co-operation and security are considered, and safeguarded, as the common heritage of mankind.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

To cultivate good-neighbourly relations is at the same time an indispensable condition to developing fruitful co-operation in all fields of activity so as to serve the interest and benefit of all. This has become a vital necessity in a world which has become more and more interdependent and where a number of extremely varied and important problems for the life, well-being and civilization of peoples - whether political, economic, cultural, technical, scientific or of any other nature - cannot be solved because there is a lack of close co-operation and active participation on a completely equal footing between all States and all peoples. This, quite obviously, lends a fresh dimension to the concept of good-neighbourliness, since it is only through good-neighbourly relations that there can develop fruitful co-operation in which all peoples of the world can freely make their own ample and distinctive contribution and from which they can derive benefits in their turn.

That is why the Romanian delegation believes that consideration of the numerous aspects of good-neighbourliness, as well as ways and means to develop and further strengthen good-neighbourliness in relations between States, would indeed be a signal contribution to improving the international climate, to promoting relations of understanding and co-operation, and to maintaining world peace and security.

Good-neighbourliness is a global problem, of prime concern to all States and all geographical areas, even though relations between States assume specific forms, and situations differ from one area to another.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

For its part, Romania has made the development of relations of friendship, mutual understanding and broad co-operation with all neighbouring States one of the fundamental guidelines of its foreign policy. As has been frequently emphasized by President Nicolae Ceausescu, Romania, in the framework of its policy of broad development of relations of co-operation with all countries, attaches central importance to the strengthening of its relations with neighbouring countries, and is firmly resolved to do all it can to expand its relations of good-neighbourliness and co-operation with those countries.

The systematic meetings and exchanges of views of the President of Romania with heads of State and Government of neighbouring countries, and with those of most of the countries of the world, have played a determinant role in deepening those relations, in identifying new ways and means of developing mutually advantageous co-operation, and in strengthening friendship, understanding, and mutual esteem and respect among neighbouring States and peoples.

Romania's good-neighbourly relations with neighbouring countries -- both those in the area in which we live and those in somewhat more remote areas -- are most directly embodied in a great number of treaties of friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance, treaties of friendship and co-operation, joint declarations, and communiqués signed at the very highest level. Many other treaties and agreements govern our co-operation with other countries in the broadest of fields and ensure the continual expansion and diversification of relations and an ongoing exchange of material and spiritual values, for the benefit of all our peoples. Intergovernmental committees, joint commissions and other bodies for economic, scientific, technological and cultural co-operation, joint projects for the development of resources in the frontier or nearby areas, and other forms of co-operation and joint defence against climatic phenomena and natural catastrophes are aimed at ensuring the solution by mutual efforts of problems of common interest on the basis of good understanding and mutual benefit.

Romania's relations with neighbouring countries, as with all other countries in the world, are based on the strictest respect for the fundamental principles of national sovereignty and independence, equal rights, the non-use or threat of use of force, non-interference in internal affairs, the peaceful settlement of all problems and disputes among States, and the sacred right of peoples to decide for themselves on their destinies with no external interference or pressure.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

It is in that spirit that Romania has unceasingly cultivated relations of good-neighbourliness with all the States in its geographical region.

As is known, the General Assembly, in 1965, adopted unanimously, on the proposal of Romania, its resolution 2100 (XX) regarding the adoption of measures on the regional level with a view to improving good-neighbourly relations among European States.

My country has always attached great importance to the building of genuine security and the broadening of co-operation in Europe. As was recently emphasized by President Nicolae Ceausescu, the European countries, regardless of their social systems or the area in which they are located, have many common interests and should act in complete unity in order to assure economic and social progress, the well being of their peoples as well as their independence, sovereignty, peace and security. As an active participant in the Helsinki Conference, Romania attaches special importance to the consistent and complete implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act. Therefore, we believe that the Madrid meeting should culminate in concrete results and the adoption of specific and constructive measures which could give new impetus to the implementation of the Final Act of Helsinki as a whole. The meeting should reaffirm the obligation of all participating States to respect, both in their relations among themselves and in those with other States, the principles set out in that document. It should adopt effective measures likely to build confidence and to achieve disarmament in Europe, to foster expansion of economic, scientific, technical and cultural co-operation among participating States as well as the continuation of the process of forging security, development and co-operation.

As is known, Romania has offered to host the next general European meeting and, as a participant in the Madrid meeting, it is acting resolutely for the complete success of that meeting, and particularly for the holding of a conference on disarmament and confidence-building measures in Europe as an integral part of the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to which we attach paramount importance. Romania is strongly in favour of a united Europe, in conditions of respect for the social system and independence of each country.

Similarly, Romania has worked tirelessly for the establishment of a climate of bilateral and multilateral co-operation in the Balkans and for the transformation of that region into a zone of peace and good-neighbourliness. We have also come out in favour of the creation of denuclearized zones in other regions of Europe.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

At the end of the 1950s, my country proposed the creation of a nuclear-weapon free zone of peace and co-operation in the Balkans, and favoured the consideration of this idea by the Balkan countries at the highest political level. These ideas are still relevant. Romania continues to promote multilateral co-operation with the Balkan countries in various fields of mutual interest, such as those of the economy, science and technology, culture, education and tourism; this is in perfect harmony with the letter and the spirit of the Final Act. In this connexion, Romania has proposed the convening in 1982 in Bucharest of a meeting of experts devoted to multilateral co-operation in the Balkans in the fields of energy and raw materials.

In keeping with its policy of promoting peace, security and co-operation throughout the world, Romania has, for years, supported proposals by other States aimed at fostering good-neighbourly relations among the countries of various regions of the world, at developing regional and sub-regional co-operation, and at resolving problems of local interest by agreement among all the States and parties concerned.

The dynamic development and the diversification of relations among neighbouring States, particularly given the present technological and scientific revolution, give rise to increasingly varied and complex problems. At the same time, there can be no doubt that good neighbourliness is a world-wide issue, one of paramount importance for all States and all geographic regions, that many problems are of concern to an ever greater number of States, and that they cannot be resolved without broad international co-operation.

As can be seen from the consideration of practices of relations among States and of bilateral and multilateral international instruments, the basis for good-neighbourliness is strict respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, equal rights, non-interference in internal affairs, non-recourse to the use or threat of use of force, peaceful political settlement of all international disputes, territorial integrity and the inviolability of frontiers, respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, and the faithful fulfilment of obligations undertaken under international law.

History has shown that respect for those principles is the sine qua non for the establishment and development of normal relations of good understanding and co-operation among States, and particularly between neighbouring States. Whenever

those principles have been disregarded, and there has been recourse to the use of force or the threat of use of force or to various forms of constraint in order to solve problems between neighbours, whenever the legitimate rights and interests of every people have not been respected, the very foundations of good-neighbourliness have been placed in jeopardy.

Consequently, absolute respect for those principles and the promotion of their effective application in relations among States constitute the basic requirement for the establishment and development of good-neighbourly relations among States, irrespective of their social and political systems, their size, their geographic location or the level of their development.

Therefore, as we see it, good-neighbourliness absolutely rules out relations based on domination, acts of force or aggression, the occupation of foreign territories by force, the criminal policy of apartheid, or the anachronistic practices of colonialism or neo-colonialism.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

At the same time, the growth and diversity of relations among neighbouring States, in particular under present conditions of developing co-operation in various fields following application of the scientific and technological advances achieved for the benefit of development, require, apart from strict respect for the fundamental principles of international law and as a practical embodiment of those principles, the observance of norms of conduct that are proper to good-neighbourly relations. In point of fact, State practice over the years in solving problems that arise from their political, geographical, economic or cultural proximity has made it possible for a series of specific norms to become crystallized which can be generalized as applying to good neighbourliness. The consistent promotion of such norms, the constant effort to enrich the content of such good neighbourliness, are part and parcel of the efforts to found relations among all States on strict respect for the principles and norms of international law. At the same time, they make a significant contribution to the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

Among the specific norms of good neighbourliness, the Romanian Government considers, for example, as being of particular importance the requirement for neighbouring States to resolve all problems arising from their relations exclusively by peaceful means, on the basis of equality and respect; the obligation not to encourage or to foment or to support action by various groups by the use of armed force which have risen up against the legal Governments of neighbouring States and the obligation not to encourage or support by armed force the actions of groups opposed to the lawful Governments of neighbouring States. It must be made a general obligation incumbent upon all States, in full respect of the principles of the Charter and international law, to refrain from any action that may adversely affect the development of good-neighbourly relations or to act in a way so as to avoid any dispute and to resolve peacefully those disputes that may arise and to eliminate any obstacles that prevent the establishment and development of such relations. This also means promoting broad co-operation in all areas by making full use of the favourable conditions that have been created by geographical proximity in order jointly to resolve, on the basis of mutual advantage, the various problems engendered by that geographical relationship, including that of co-operating and granting each other mutual aid and assistance

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

in difficult situations, such as natural catastrophes and other conditions that may affect neighbouring countries and peoples. At the same time, it is essential to eliminate any barriers that impede the free development of co-operation between States.

A series of norms and examples of this type are mentioned in the replies given by other States. The examination of State practice should of course make it possible to identify other norms that would be generally applicable. Furthermore, the improvement of political relations and of economic and social development as a result of progress made in science and technology will undoubtedly require new norms of conduct between neighbours to be worked out.

There is, therefore, a twofold duty: first that of acting in a positive way to promote practical and effective good-neighbourly relations in all fields and at the same time to refrain from any action or to avoid any situation that might in any way impede or be a let or hindrance to the establishment and development of such relations.

As a result of this consideration of the matter, it would, in the first place, appear to be necessary, in the opinion of the Romanian Government, for the United Nations to reaffirm the fact that Member States are devoted to the idea of good neighbourliness as one of the fundamental purposes of the Charter and at the same time to express the determination of States to act in a spirit of good neighbourliness in their relations.

More specifically, the General Assembly should give expression to the crucial importance of respect for the fundamental principles of international law in promoting a policy of good neighbourliness and at the same time to reaffirm the need for relations among neighbours to be fully in keeping with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and to ensure that they do not in any way lead to violation of the sovereignty and independence of other States.

Secondly, consideration of the problem of good neighbourliness should result in the crystallization of specific norms governing good neighbourliness which are generally applicable and which would help to solve any difficulties that might arise among countries and peoples which live in neighbouring countries or areas, norms that will help to rule out any actions or practices likely to prevent co-operation, as well as any actions contrary to the essential aims and principles of good neighbourliness.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

It is also essential to spell out clearly the obligation of States to respect good-neighbourly relations between other States, not to encourage or to commit any acts which will produce dissention among neighbours and not to interfere in their method of regulating their own good neighbourly relations.

The Romanian delegation believes essentially that good neighbourliness is an integral part of the broader topic of maintaining and strengthening international security. We therefore believe that it is particularly important that, while spelling out the norms and principles underlying good-neighbourliness, the General Assembly should focus its attention, as suggested in resolution 34/99 of 1979, on ways and means of strengthening good neighbourliness between States and in so doing further strengthen their security.

As has been proved by experience, it is not enough simply to proclaim principles and norms. We have to establish and utilize appropriate ways and means which will ensure their effective practical application in relations between States.

A number of methods likely to strengthen good neighbourliness that might well be recommended to States for possible application are to be found in the replies that have been sent in by Member States. The Romanian delegation believes that this category could include, inter alia, the conclusion of treaties of friendship and other instruments having political and juridical value which clearly lay down the obligation not to resort to force or to the threat of force in mutual relations, to refrain from any act of interference in the internal affairs of other States and to resolve all disputes by political methods, negotiations and other peaceful means, as well as other principles and norms to which they agree as the basis of their mutual relations.

Likewise, States might consider the creation of mixed bodies for co-operation consultation and negotiation whose task it would be periodically to take up specific issues arising from mutual relations. Such bodies together with the relevant agreements, can constitute the institutional and juridical framework required to ensure the normal functioning of good-neighbourly relations in order to stimulate co-operation and to prevent disputes and ensure that they do not degenerate into conflicts.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

Elsewhere, particular importance attaches to the ensuring of relations of good neighbourliness and the creating in various parts of the world of zones of peace and co-operation. By their very nature the purpose of those zones is to ensure among States of the regions concerned relations of close co-operation, understanding and mutual respect, as well as the solution of any problem that may arise between them by peaceful means alone and in the final analysis, good neighbourly relations. They should naturally be further supplemented by guarantees on the part of those States which are outside that area that they will not interfere in the domestic affairs of the countries concerned nor in their mutual interrelations and that they will refrain from any action that would be likely to damage the good-neighbourly relations between the States in the area. In this connexion, I am sure that delegations are familiar with the Romanian proposals concerning the creation of such a zone in our particular region, as well as the support given by Romania to similar proposals that would cover other parts of the world.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

Other means for strengthening good-neighbourly relations, particularly in the areas where opposing political and military alliances find themselves face to face, are to be found in measures for strengthening confidence and for military disengagement. The adoption and the implementation of such measures would undoubtedly have a beneficial influence on reducing military confrontation and would also promote the consideration and adoption of disarmament measures. Similarly, we might well contemplate the creation of demilitarized zones at the boundaries between States and States agreeing to refrain from military manoeuvres near the frontiers of other States, notification of other manoeuvres or large-scale troop movements within the respective States, and also a moderate attitude with regard to military expenditures and the freezing of same until agreements are reached on reducing military budgets.

Adoption of such measures would help to improve the political climate both regionally and internationally and to resume and further the process of détente and would encourage new efforts aimed at strengthening security and preserving peace.

Of particular interest, we believe, is the broad range of the methods advocated in the replies sent in by international organizations, each in their own sphere of activity, regarding the development of good-neighbourly relations.

The Romanian delegation shares the conviction that if States and the United Nations really were to focus their attention on ways to increase the effectiveness of the concept of good-neighbourliness, and on the proposals and ideas that stem from such an examination, it could result in useful initiatives leading to concrete measures and programmes of co-operation which will help to further rapprochement and mutual understanding among nations.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

I should like to express our sincere thanks to the States and the international organizations that have drafted and sent in replies as well as our gratification at the fact that most of those replies contain ideas, suggestions and specific proposals that are extremely important if we are to begin the process of examining good-neighbourliness.

In view of the fact that every country has accumulated a long and rich experience of relations with its neighbours and that each can share that experience with others and learn from the practice of other States in turn, the replies received show that it is quite possible to undertake a process of clarifying various aspects and norms of good-neighbourliness, its positive and common elements, which undoubtedly can have a favourable influence on relations among States and on the maintenance of international peace and security.

Proximity in our world, will remain an objective situation which cannot be changed because of geographical circumstances but which can be improved from the political, juridical and moral point of view. The United Nations, which has included good-neighbourliness in the Charter as one of its fundamental objectives, should play a decisive role to that end.

On the basis of consultations I have undertaken with a large number of delegations, and with the consent of the delegations of the following countries -- Bangladesh, Burundi, Colombia, Guinea, Indonesia, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Upper Volta, Uruguay and Yugoslavia -- I have the honour to present to the Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.59 entitled Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States.

(Mr. Diaconu Romania)

The purpose of this draft resolution is to initiate a process of clarifying and further developing the various aspects of good neighbourliness, to consider and to implement ways and means which will help to increase effectiveness in relations among States. To this end, the draft resolution reaffirms the need to spread the practice, the principles and the norms of good neighbourliness and spells out the possibility of incorporating the result of such a consideration and clarifications of these in an appropriate document in due course.

Likewise, an invitation is extended to States and international organizations to send in their replies on the subject of good-neighbourliness and to update those which they have already sent in so that the process which we are contemplating can benefit from the participation, the experience and the contribution which can be made by all States, specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations. Further, the Secretary-General is requested, on the basis of all these replies, as well as the comments and ideas expressed by delegations, to submit a report containing a systematic presentation of the views and suggestions received.

May we express our conviction that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus and that the debate which will take place this year, as well as the efforts which we intend to promote in the future, will make a signal contribution to clarifying the connotation of the term good-neighbourliness, as well as the ways and means of strengthening its effectiveness and improving relations among neighbours and international relations in general, thus furthering the cause of peace and security for all States.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Ambassador Scotland, who is the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee, to introduce the non aligned draft resolution and non aligned draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. The document to which he will refer is A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1 of 19 November 1981.

Mr. SCOTLAND (Guyana), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group:
I have asked to speak so that I may formally introduce in this Committee the draft declaration and its accompanying draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1. That draft declaration and its draft resolution are being introduced in this Committee on behalf of all States members of the Non-Aligned Movement.

It will be recalled that this document in its unrevised form was laid before the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee on non-interference in the internal affairs of States last year as document A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1. This new document which I am now introducing represents an attempt within the Non-Aligned Movement to present a text which, while expressing the concerns of non-aligned members on the question of interference in their internal affairs, also attempts to take account of some of the concerns which were expressed by States not members of the Movement during the inter-sessional period - that is, between last session, when A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1 was issued, and this session, when A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1 was issued and made available to this Committee, last Friday, 20 November.

It may be useful to remind the Committee that the item "Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of States" was first proposed to the General Assembly during its thirty-first session.

(Mr. Scotland Chairman of the
Ad Hoc Working Group)

At its thirty-fourth session, the text of a draft declaration was proposed as document A/C.1/34/L.56, and document A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1, which I am now introducing, is the result of the refinements which that document has seen in the intervening period, in response to suggestions both within and outside the Movement.

The issue of interference in the internal affairs of States, threatened or actual, has become one of increasing concern to all States - large or small, politically powerful or politically weak, militarily superior or militarily weak, economically strong or economically weak - and with each passing year events unfolding on the international scene are gradually moving the question of interference in the internal affairs of States to centre stage. A review of the statements made in the general debate in the General Assembly reveals that the vast majority voiced concern for the increasing evidence of interference or threats of interference in the internal affairs of States which now infect the international community.

In presenting this draft declaration, the members of the Non-Aligned Movement see it, in the words of a very distinguished member of our Movement, "as a very useful instrument, a very helpful standard by which States can conduct their international relations and assist in the maintenance of international peace and security".

The States members of the Non-Aligned Movement are presenting this draft declaration in good faith. They see it as a shield to be used by all States, rather than as a sword. The members of the Movement seek and require the co-operation of all States outside the Movement to ensure the adoption of this draft declaration at this session. They see the draft declaration as being very necessary, the circumstances as favourable and the time as propitious for its adoption.

I should like to quote from a public document, which was published recently and which very accurately reflects the feelings of the non-aligned on the question of co-operation on this matter of the draft declaration:

"We are convinced that there is no real alternative to this peaceful and equitable co-operation, which must be founded on the basis of equality, respect for the independence and sovereignty of States and non-interference in the internal affairs of States."

(Mr. Scotland, Chairman of the
Ad Hoc Working Group)

That quotation was taken not from a non-aligned document but from the communiqué published recently at the end of the meeting between President Brezhnev of the USSR and Chancellor Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany. The members of the Movement feel that this quotation does accurately reflect their view on the question of co-operation on this matter of the draft declaration.

At the appropriate time, I shall consult with the Secretariat to give the document its formal status in the Committee.

Mr. SILOVIC (Yugoslavia): The state of the world today gives cause for grave concern. Peace and security are seriously threatened due to the evermore frequent use of force, armed interventions, interference in the internal affairs of States, the lack of solutions to major international problems and crises, the continuation of foreign occupation, the absence of disarmament negotiations, the escalation of bloc rivalries and of the struggle for spheres of influence between great Powers, the continued existence of colonial domination and racism and the exacerbation of international economic problems leading to the increasingly difficult, even critical, position of the developing countries. The recent general debate held at the beginning of this session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which clearly showed that tensions in the world are growing, unequivocally led to such an assessment.

Therefore, it is not necessary for me to elaborate on all this in detail. Such a situation in the world today confirms, perhaps more than ever before, the importance of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Undoubtedly, it is an international document of lasting value. The Declaration constitutes a necessary supplement to the Charter of the United Nations and, at the same time, a code of conduct in international affairs. Regrettably, we must say that many States fail to keep to the letter and the spirit of this document and that many of its important provisions are still not implemented.

The non-aligned countries have always paid great attention to the issue of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

(Mr. Silovic Yugoslavia)

The principles and the policy of non-alignment are based on the struggle for peace in the world, for the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, for the equality and equal security of all members of the International community and for the right of all countries to decide on their own destiny. Since the non-aligned countries actively participated in the elaboration of the Declaration, to a great extent they inspired it with their policy and their views in defining its noble task - the maintenance of world peace and the strengthening of international security. From September 1961, in Belgrade, up to the present day, the non-aligned countries have consistently struggled for peace and security in the world and for the establishment of a new and more equitable system of political and economic relations. As they did at their summit meetings in Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka, Algiers, Colombo and Havana, the non-aligned countries, at their most recent Ministerial Conference held in February 1981 in New Delhi, again expressed their grave concern over the threats to peace and the increase of tensions, and called upon all countries of the world, particularly the great Powers, to engage in the preservation of peace and in the strengthening of international security.

Although the accomplishments achieved since the adoption of the Declaration cannot be disregarded, particularly in the field of decolonization, the emancipation of States and peoples and their liberation from foreign domination and influence, crises and problems throughout the world are still jeopardizing peace and security, today perhaps more than ever.

The Middle East crisis is deepening and the people of Palestine continue to be deprived of the rights enjoyed by almost all other peoples of the world.

The shameful South African régime continues with its policy of racism and apartheid, usurping the freedom of the people of Namibia and perpetrating acts of aggression against its neighbours, particularly Angola.

Foreign military forces are still in Afghanistan and in Kampuchea.

The issue of Cyprus remains unresolved and the island divided.

Security in North-East Asia is endangered by the continuation of the imposed division of Korea and by the stubborn refusal of the régime in the South to accept substantive negotiations.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

Instead of engaging in disarmament, the world - particularly the great Powers - is arming. The arms race has been squandering enormous resources which are indispensable for the stabilization of the world economy and for the speeding up of the development of the developing countries.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

That is the picture of the world as it is today, but we cannot accept that that reality should remain unchanged. For that reason, we underline the significance and the lasting value of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We request the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination, including the right to its own State. We want South Africa to abandon the shameful system of apartheid and racism and to liberate Namibia, so that the people of that country may finally attain its freedom and independence. We call for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea, so that the peoples of those two countries, too, may, without outside interference, decide on their internal affairs. We demand that the problem of Cyprus be settled on the basis of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, through inter-communal negotiations. We support a peaceful unification of the people of Korea, and consider that the initiatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constitute a constructive basis to that end. We insist on urgent disarmament negotiations and on the adoption of appropriate decisions in this direction at the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We demand the urgent launching of global negotiations aimed at solving the enormous economic problems with which all countries, and particularly the developing ones, are faced.

The United Nations has a very important place and role in seeking solutions to these problems. The possibilities provided for on the basis of the Charter are far from being exhausted. We are referring here, first, to two major organs of the United Nations - the General Assembly and the Security Council.

While the General Assembly is and should be the major negotiating body of the activities of the United Nations, the Security Council should in our opinion be far more active and efficient in defence of peace and in the search for solutions, particularly for all the crucial international crises. Regrettably, there is neither initiative nor concrete action within the Security Council ... particularly not from the Permanent Members, which have special responsibilities - which would make that body more efficient in the exercise of its primary role, which is the preservation of peace and security in the world.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

We deplore the fact that the Security Council did not respond to the demand of the General Assembly, contained in resolution 35/158, to consider its methods and mechanism of work and action, with the aim of increasing its authority and enforcement capacity. We hope that this demand will not be left without response again, and that the Security Council will take into account other constructive recommendations and suggestions as well, especially those submitted in the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization.

The Yugoslav delegation would like to stress again the significance that the implementation of the concept of zones of peace and co-operation in various parts of the world has for the strengthening of international security. It goes without saying that this is a delicate and complex political issue, first, because it involves direct and sometimes diverse interests of States in particular regions, as well as their common interests. This does not mean, however, that we are not to discuss the matter. On the contrary, we should do our utmost to enable the implementation of this concept in the nearest future. In doing so, we must proceed from the basic principles on which international relations should be founded: non-use of force, non-intervention and non-interference, equality and equal security for all, peaceful settlement of disputes, good-neighbourliness and peaceful co-existence.

We note with regret that the implementation of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is blocked. Yugoslavia fully supports the justified demands of the littoral and hinterland States to stop the arms race, military build-up, the growing military presence of great Powers and increased bloc-rivalries, which have been intensified in this region. The situation is particularly tense owing to the wide international implications of the existing adjacent crises in South-East and in South-West Asia. For that very reason we consider the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean even more significant. We hope that the preparations within the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean will gain momentum and that the Conference on the Indian Ocean will be held at Colombo, Sri Lanka, in 1983.

Yugoslavia, as a non-aligned and Mediterranean country, pays particular attention to the questions of peace and security in the Mediterranean.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

Throughout the years, many problems have accumulated in this relatively small region. Besides the existing and unresolved crises, new conflict situations keep breaking out, all of which bear exceptional weight when seen within the context of the presence and the ever-more intensified great-Power and bloc-rivalry in the area.

Yugoslavia has always worked for the affirmation of the idea of the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation, and has called for joint efforts to be exerted to this end. We are aware that this is a complex and long-term objective and that its implementation can be achieved only through the just and lasting solution of, or arrangements on, various existing problems. None the less, we are also aware that there is no alternative but the search for peace and security, particularly in relations among neighbouring States. In saying so, we wish neither to prejudice solutions and agreements, nor, even less, to let the problems which concern security and co-operation in the Mediterranean, and which are of vital importance to us, get out of control. In our opinion, a constructive dialogue should be conducted on this important question, and we are certain that it will not be unsuccessful.

Security in the Mediterranean cannot be considered a separate problem, but must be considered within the wider context of the situation in Europe and even in the world. The Mediterranean links three continents. Many cultures, political concepts and interests are present in it. The situation in the Mediterranean is certainly of primary importance to the littoral States. It is also strongly affected by the relations between great Powers. Therefore, questions of peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean should be dealt with with great care and responsibility. Our efforts should be aimed at creating a sea of peace, a sea which will link rather than divide us.

More than a year has passed since the beginning of the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Unfortunately, its deliberations have been burdened with increased deterioration of the international situation, particularly in the relations between major Powers. From this place we would like to appeal to all participants in the Madrid meeting not to view the world from the standpoint of their individual interests. We also

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

appeal to them to exert their utmost efforts and the maximum of political will to achieve an agreement on the crucial problems on its agenda, in order to provide the continuity of this process, which is exceptionally significant for peace not only in Europe but also in the world at large.

Yugoslavia has participated in the preparation of a resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security with a group of non-aligned countries. This resolution will soon be introduced and we are ready to start consultations on it immediately with all interested delegations.

I should like now to turn briefly to two additional particularly important questions which are now under consideration.

First, this year we have before us a draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States, which has just been introduced and elaborated on by the representative of Guyana, our good friend Mr. Barton Scotland. As he has already pointed out, this draft carries the support of all non-aligned countries which in this way wanted to express once again their great concern about the ever more frequent resort to the threat or use of force in international relations.

By submitting this draft, the non-aligned countries want clearly and unequivocally to point out their determination not to accept intervention and interference in any form and under any pretext whatsoever.

We consider this declaration an indispensable political document which fills the gap in the existing international political and legal structure. With its adoption the international community will gain an important instrument which will in a clear and explicit way outlaw all forms of intervention and interference in the affairs of other States. The draft declaration contains precise definitions of all unlawful acts which fall under the category of intervention and interference, and it should serve as a standard for the political assessment of such behaviour from whatever quarter it may come.

Today, when we are faced with numerous interventions and continued foreign military presence in various parts of the world, the General Assembly should adopt this draft declaration, and thus, once again, confirm the inadmissibility and the unlawfulness of interventions and interference in the internal affairs of States. Although we are aware that only a short time is left for negotiations, we expect that agreement will be reached, and that this exceptionally important political document will be adopted.

(Mr. Silovich, Yugoslavia)

Finally I should like to point out that my country fully supports the consideration of the question of development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States by the General Assembly and considers that it will contribute to the promotion of good-neighbourly relations and co-operation, as well as to the solution of problems among States in general and between neighbouring ones in particular. Relations between neighbours are most directly connected with efforts exerted towards the promotion of international co-operation in general and with the democratization of international relations.

We consider that the generalization of the long practice and certain norms of good-neighbourliness is likely to strengthen friendly relations and co-operation among States. Together with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the provisions of the Declaration on Principles on International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, especially the principles of peaceful settlement of disputes and non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States are of great importance for the development of good-neighbourliness. In this context Yugoslavia renders particular importance to national minorities, which are greatly significant for the development of good-neighbourly relations. They constitute bridges of friendship, better mutual understanding and co-operation among all countries and peoples in the world and between neighbours in particular.

We believe that the consideration of this question at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly should result in the adoption of a decision in which the significance of good-neighbourly relations between States would be reaffirmed and which would provide for the continuation of work in this area. This should be another contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. WYJEWER (Poland): The disarmament debate which the First Committee held prior to its consideration of agenda item 50 has offered ample evidence that the focal premise of the security system as it obtains in the world at present is a balance or equilibrium of forces. The debate has also confirmed that such a system can be workable only insofar as it can adequately assure unimpaired and equal security to all concerned.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

The Polish delegation is not alone in believing that the ultimate efficacy of such a system - the sense of real security which it can generate - depends to a far greater extent on mutual confidence between States and peoples than on a drive to reach ever higher levels of armament. Indeed, as we know only too well, the international community seems now to attach critical importance mutual confidence and security based on balance at the lowest possible level of force rather than on sophisticated armoury.

The doctrine of military superiority and the accelerating arms race which it entails are totally incompatible with security perceptions, especially in Europe. The cutting edge of the plans for the production or deployment of new weapons systems aims first of all at mutual confidence, both in the military and non-military spheres. A reduced confidence leaves international security more precarious and uncertain than ever.

To turn to specifics as we in Poland see them, the standing plans of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to expand its nuclear arsenal in Western Europe represent a direct threat to security in Europe, hence to our own national security and that of our allies. It is for this reason that Poland welcomes the forthcoming USSR-United States negotiations in Geneva on nuclear weapons in Europe and looks forward to their constructive and early outcome.

We share the view that international security, just like peace, is indivisible. As a State located in Central Europe we are, however, interested first and foremost in the security situation which prevails in Europe, if only because that part of the globe has the highest concentration of nuclear and conventional weapons, sufficient to ignite a global conflict.

It was precisely such consideration which motivated Poland when, a quarter of a century ago, it put forward the Rapacki Plan for an atom-free zone in the centre of Europe. For reasons which are known only too well, Europe still badly needs effective disarmament measures to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear conflict that could engulf the whole world.

It is in order to prevent such a theoretical possibility that, together with our allies, we are engaged in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

Let me restate most emphatically that Poland, just like other States members of the Warsaw Pact, is strongly in favour of mutual reductions of armed forces and armaments, in accordance with the proposals we have submitted in Vienna.

We believe that the so-called new generation of confidence-building measures now being discussed in Vienna in no case must be regarded as a goal in themselves, but rather as a vehicle towards the promotion of a climate of détente and a contribution to the accomplishment of the ultimate objective - the limitation of the means of waging war and effective disarmament.

Commenting on our efforts to strengthen security, I should like to turn for a moment to the proposal to convene a conference on military aspects of security in Europe, a proposal which currently is being discussed at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe follow-up meeting held in Madrid. Poland is one of five countries that have submitted specific proposals on this subject. Seconded by other members of the Warsaw Pact, that proposal calls for the convening in Warsaw of a conference on military détente and disarmament in order to provide, inter alia, through a system of confidence-building and security-building measures, for conditions conducive to the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe and the beginning of a tangible process of European disarmament. We are pleased to note that similar motives have also prompted the presentation of proposals in that respect by Romania, Yugoslavia and Sweden.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

In formulating our proposal we are particularly anxious that the future Conference take into account the following principles:

First, the arrangements to be agreed upon should be without prejudice to the security of any State; this principle should be applicable within the context of efforts to determine the geographical scope of a future confidence and security-building measures zone. A Western response to reciprocate for the Soviet offer of March 1981, which extends the zone on the European part of the USSR, is yet to be formulated.

Secondly, the convening of the conference and its consideration of specific proposals and measures must in no way be directed against the interests of third countries, nor be to the detriment of other negotiations on the limitation of armaments and disarmament on the subregional, regional or global level.

Taking into account the basic requirements of an effective security system, the Polish proposal is not confined to the consideration of confidence and security-building measures alone. It does not evade such crucial issues as the limitation of armaments or lowering the ceilings of military confrontation in Europe.

The convening of a conference on confidence and security-building measures and on disarmament in Europe would mean that all States concerned would be able to contribute to the solution of security problems acceptable to all these States. It would, we hope, generate more propitious conditions for the establishment in Europe of a zone secure from the danger of war and, in the long run, a zone of limited armaments. My delegation strongly believes that such a development could not but have a positive effect on other regions as well.

Our interest in European issue should in no case be interpreted as indifference to larger world problems. Together with other socialist States, we have put forward a number of proposals aimed at effective regional and global disarmament. It is not now my intention to dwell at length on this subject, as it was exhaustively dealt with by the First Committee in the course of its disarmament debate.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

The importance of early and meaningful progress towards halting the arms race does not mean that the international community should confine itself to working for military détente alone. In our aspirations for a more effective security system we should bear in mind that there is an important corollary to military aspects of security. Indeed, to facilitate the achievement of the latter, it is necessary, inter alia, to undertake more determined efforts in search for ways of reducing the scope of conflicts, to institutionalize the various forms of governmental and non-governmental consultations and to increase their substance, to develop appropriate forms of co-operation based wherever possible on long-range agreements and to vigorously seek ways of improving the mechanism for such co-operation, and to strive to achieve vital national objectives through negotiation without attempting to impose any one State's will and solutions on others.

The resolve of my Government to work for the settlement of the socio-economic conflicts and other internal problems in Poland through negotiations reflects also a deliberate policy of the Polish Government - supported by the overwhelming majority of the Polish people - which is pursued with due regard for the broader security implications for Europe and beyond our continent. Our determination to maintain and consolidate Poland's alliance with the Soviet Union, our participation in the Warsaw Pact, and our good relations and equitable co-operation with all States, are much more than just important cornerstones of our foreign policy. They are, indeed, crucial factors of European and world security.

I should like to turn now to a question which is of special interest to Poland as the initiator of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace adopted by the General Assembly three years ago.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

Among the efforts aimed at the strengthening of international security, a proper perspective must be reserved for the question of the implementation of that document. As is well known, it is a problem to which Poland has attached special importance. In accordance with the request contained in General Assembly resolution 33/37, my Government has duly presented exhaustive information on the implementation of the Declaration by Poland. As is borne out by the report of the Secretary-General (A/36/386), consistent and long-range actions have been taken up by socialist countries. A closer examination of the report reveals that the ideals and principles of the Declaration also enjoy support in many countries of Latin America. The efforts of these and other members of the international community were echoed by the active stand of many non-governmental organizations, religious communities and leaders, including the committed voice of His Holiness Pope John Paul II.

I should like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to those Governments which, pursuant to the General Assembly's recommendation, have sent to the Secretary-General their replies on the implementation of the Declaration, which are contained in documents A/36/386 and Add.1 and Add.2. Their content has been carefully studied by us and we hope that they will be helpful in the search for new acceptable ways and means of increasing international co-operation in this important field. My delegation has also taken note with satisfaction of the positive and active attitude with regard to the Declaration demonstrated by many organs and agencies of the United Nations system, especially UNESCO.

An interesting and constructive response to the Declaration has also come from such organizations as the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the World Peace Council, the World Federation of United Nations Associations and many other governmental and non-governmental international organizations and associations. Encouraged by the generally favourable response from a number of States, Poland presented at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe follow-up meeting in Madrid a proposal envisaging various forms of international co-operation for the implementation of the Declaration. They

include the establishment of long-range programmes of bilateral efforts such as, for instance, measures encouraging the review of history textbooks in order to eliminate language or interpretation deemed prejudicial or at variance with history.

The spirit of co-operation and the unity of purpose demonstrated in the process of implementation of the Declaration testify to the readiness of many States to foster a system of education based upon the spirit of tolerance and compassion. In the words of a 19th century Polish poet, Cyprian Norwid, our "goal is not to enjoy peace, but to make peace". That means above all, that we have to build a solid structure of lasting peace. The spirit of that maxim -- to our gratification -- appears to be shared by many.

In the view of my delegation, the stronger the harmful factors affecting the process of détente the greater the urgency of shaping international relations on the basis of the principles set forth in the Declaration. As we see the most pressing tasks, it is necessary to deploy far more dedicated efforts if we are to put into effect the principal concepts and ideals of the Declaration. These efforts should provide, in particular, for: an increase in active co-operation among all States, including consultation and exchange of experience; good faith in dialogue and negotiations based on a desire to seek accommodation rather than confrontation; increased and more determined regional efforts on all continents; increased co-operation on the bilateral level, and promotion of good-neighbourliness, mutual respect, equal rights and mutual understanding and, finally, encouragement of specific activities of governmental and non-governmental organizations as well as of institutions and persons involved in education, culture and the mass media.

I should like to stress once again that my Government considers the United Nations system to be the most natural environment for the promotion of ideas aimed at the preparation of societies for life in peace. This objective, in our view, would certainly be better served if necessary improvements were made in the methods whereby the international community is made familiar with the text and the spirit of the Declaration. At stake is that all Governments and peoples should be convinced that education and preparation for peace are the sole alternative to education for war, whether "cold" or "hot".

The Government of Poland stands ready to continue its efforts towards that end and urges other Governments to take similar positions. Accordingly, my delegation, together with other interested delegations, has prepared a draft resolution which, we hope, will respond to the concerns of the international community. That draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/36/L.58.

I now, therefore, have the privilege of introducing that document on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Algeria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Madagascar, Peru, the Philippines, the United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia and Poland; those States are among the original sponsors of the Declaration of 15 December 1978.

The draft resolution is largely self-explanatory. In its operative part it solemnly invites all States to intensify their efforts towards the implementation of the Declaration, and reiterates the appeal for concerted action on the part

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

of Governments, the United Nations and other governmental and non-governmental organizations with a view to establishing, maintaining and strengthening a just and durable peace for present and future generations. In its final paragraph, the draft resolution, inter alia, requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly on the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration.

It is the hope of the sponsors of the draft resolution, on whose behalf it is my honour to address the First Committee, that its text will commend itself to the Committee for adoption by consensus.

Mr. Waliur RAHMAN (Bangladesh): The agenda items now being debated are more relevant to all of us than ever before. Since the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted by the General Assembly by virtual consensus 10 years ago, certain positive developments have taken place which need to be commended by the international community. Last year, my delegation had the privilege of introducing a draft resolution relating to that Declaration to the General Assembly. However, so far it has not been possible to ensure full compliance by all States with all the provisions of the Declaration. The worsening international situation, as recent evidence has shown, has proved conclusively that the lack of consensus and political will has been the main stumbling block in the way of the full implementation of the provisions of the Declaration.

The adoption of the Declaration was considered a landmark in the history of the United Nations. That important document provides guidelines and a broad programme for the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument for the easing of international tensions and the creation of conditions for the attainment of just and lasting peace. The General Assembly, at each of its last nine regular sessions, adopted resolutions solemnly reaffirming all the principles and purposes of the Declaration. The Assembly called upon all States to adhere fully to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Declaration, as well as to those of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as the basis of relations among all States, irrespective of their size, level of development, or political, economic and

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

social systems. In those resolutions, the General Assembly noted with deep concern that many of the principles and provisions of the Declaration have been ignored or violated, particularly with regard to the principles of national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-intervention, non-interference, recourse to the threat or use of force resulting in breaches of the peace, and threats to international peace and security. Attention was drawn also to the non-compliance by States with their obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to a disregard for the role of the United Nations and to a lessening of confidence in the effectiveness of the Security Council in ensuring international peace and security.

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

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

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

The Final Document adopted at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament contained certain fundamental principles for disarmament negotiations, strict adherence to which would ensure that disarmament measures would be compatible with improving and increasing security through disarmament. The success of disarmament efforts presupposes a balanced and strict observance of these mutual obligations. Further adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties in implementation of the Declaration on International Security are necessary.

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

In recognition of the urgency of the need for the restructuring of economic relations and the establishment of the New International Economic Order, the historical Cancun summit between the leaders of the developed and developing countries, at which my Government had the privilege of participating, took place. We are hopeful that, as a consequence of the Cancun Summit, meaningful

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

dialogue will commence between the developed and the developing countries with a view to achieving a more equitable international economic order.

While my delegation is deeply concerned over the deteriorating international security situation, we at the same time have striven to lend meaning and purport to the concept of good-neighbourliness between States. The concept of good neighbourliness is as old as the history of civilization itself. Even when the old precepts of international law and the ancient tablets governing the basic relations between and among States were being formulated, the overriding factor shaping those principles was the conviction of the need for good neighbourliness among States. This concept therefore will continue to remain an important acceptable force in governing relations between independent and sovereign States of the world. The supreme necessity of acceptance of and respect for the concept of good neighbourliness is felt today more than ever before, since historical experience in the evolution of international relations has shown beyond doubt that the security of every nation and the maintenance of international peace and security largely depend on the measures taken by neighbouring States with regard to their mutual relations.

The importance of the principle of good neighbourliness for maintaining international peace and security and promoting friendly relations between States has been emphasized in very clear terms in the United Nations Charter, which stipulates that one of the principal aims of the United Nations is to ensure that the peoples of the world can live in peace in a spirit of good neighbourliness. The importance of that Charter principle was further reaffirmed in the unanimously adopted Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The existence of neighbouring States having different and varied political, social, economic and cultural systems makes it incumbent upon all States to make conscious efforts at establishing good-neighbourly relations based on a spirit of understanding and accommodation, equity and justice and of not interfering - covertly or overtly in the internal affairs of other States. Any violation of this spirit in the past has led to tension and conflict, which has more often than not degenerated into open military conflict.

(Mr. Rahman, Bangladesh)

The cardinal principle of the foreign policy of Bangladesh is based on its constitutional obligations that stipulate that our relations are based on friendship towards all and malice towards none. Guided by this conviction, the Government of Bangladesh has always sought to foster with its neighbours solutions to all problems, potential or outstanding, in a spirit of co-operation and understanding based on the principle of equity and justice. As an extension of that policy outside the parameter of Bangladesh, the Government of Bangladesh has wholeheartedly supported the spirit of détente and general relaxation of international tension. While pursuing good-neighbourly relations with its neighbours, Bangladesh has at the same time encouraged the gradual evolution of the process of democratization of international relations facilitating the participation of all States, big or small, powerful or weak, militarily significant or not, in all international conferences on a basis of equality. As a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, Bangladesh since its very inception has made concerted efforts in such forums as the United Nations, the Islamic Conference, the Commonwealth and the Non-Aligned Movement in favour of the cause of peace and international security and the development and intensification of co-operation, economic and political, between all States in the world.

Since its independence, Bangladesh has taken sincere and persistent initiatives in promoting all-round relations with its neighbours. As part of that persistent objective of the Government of Bangladesh, the late President Ziaur Rahman conferred with the Heads of State of all the neighbouring States on matters of common interest. President Ziaur Rahman, through his bilateral talks at the highest level with the leaders of all neighbouring countries set in motion a spirit whose salubrious impact is obvious to all. The initiative of the late President on the South Asian Forum for Co-operation and Development among seven South Asian countries is historical. The first two meetings at the highest official level have been concluded, and several high-level committees have been set up to examine further the areas of co-operation in various fields, such as agriculture, hydroelectric power, trade, commerce, cultural exchanges and co-operation at various other levels. As a result of the active policy of peace and friendship pursued by Bangladesh in every field, Bangladesh has contributed to the cause of peace and détente, progress, prosperity, co-operation and national independence all over the world.

(Mr. Waliur Rahman, Bangladesh)

Bangladesh voted for General Assembly resolution 34/99, convinced of the importance of good-neighbourliness, which can bring about a climate of confidence and security among States. As General Assembly resolution 34/99 underlines, the basis for good-neighbourliness lies in respect for the principles of national independence and sovereignty, equality under law of all States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and non-use of force or the threat of use of force in resolving problems. This resolution specifically points out the supreme necessity of resolving problems through pacific means without affecting territorial integrity, the inviolability of frontiers and respect for the right of peoples to decide their own destiny and to fulfil their Charter obligations without any attempt to establish a sphere of influence or domination. It is a matter of record that each time this fundamental principle of international law has been violated or attempts have been made to act without regard to these principles, the foundation of the principle of good-neighbourliness has been compromised, giving rise to avoidable tension with the potential for conflict and a breach of international peace and security.

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the principle of good-neighbourliness should be further considered with a view to seeking agreement on specific modalities to enhance it and ensure universal and strict adherence to this principle as the basis for promoting peace, co-operation and mutual respect among all nations.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. Chairman, the President of your country, Mr. Sergei Kraigher, has just concluded a successful visit to Malta. It set the latest seal on the exceptionally friendly relations between our two countries, based on the principles of true non-alignment. It is against this background that I warmly compliment you on your election to preside over the work of our Committee and that I extend sincere congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

(Mr. Cauci, Malta)

I have tried to condense in one statement all of the major preoccupations of my delegation, and I therefore crave your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and that of the members, if I take up more of the Committee's valuable time than I myself would have preferred to do.

The search for security in the post-war period has relied very heavily on the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. We have had quite enough time to evaluate the outcome of this policy. In terms of cost, it has been ruinous; in terms of security acquired, it has proved barren; in terms of accumulated lethal weaponry, the results are disastrous, and in terms of future perspectives, a continuation of that policy is likely to be catastrophic.

Thirty-five years ago, on the threshold of the nuclear age, the very first resolution adopted in the General Assembly called for the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. Today, those weapons no longer form a distant backdrop of terror, a vague and remote threat of total destruction should relations between nuclear-weapon States lurch erratically out of control. On the contrary, those weapons - 50,000 of them at the latest count - seem to be all around us, each pulsating with a promise of terminal destruction within 30 minutes of launch.

The underlying politics, the accompanying rhetoric of East-West confrontation, have thwarted all efforts to keep the lid on the nuclear genie. Ten years ago, when there was still some room for optimism, we might have regarded SALT I as the initial step in a natural progression. At that time, a partial test-ban Treaty and a Non-Proliferation Treaty were in force. In Vienna, attempts were being made to reduce conventional forces in Europe. These earlier hopes, however, have been badly disappointed, if not finally crushed, during the past decade.

(Mr. Cauci, Malta)

The objective of general and complete disarmament had then already been relegated to arms control and even that has proved to be a very forlorn subject. It would appear -- to paraphrase Einstein's worst prophecy -- that the splitting of the atom has changed everything except mankind's way of thinking: thus, we seem to drift helplessly towards unparalleled catastrophe. Each year we pledge to alter course, each year we fail, and the situation deteriorates further.

The first special session devoted to disarmament underlined that the arms race itself has become a threat to the security of nations. Fine sentiments and very true observations. In practice, however, the objective of security, an indispensable element of peace, continues to be via outmoded and increasingly dangerous methods.

The super-Powers have added thousands of warheads to their arsenals since SALT I and they have carried out more tests since the signature of the partial test-ban Treaty than previously. Statistical disparity in weaponry is simplistically viewed as indicative of either strength on one side or weakness on the other, and security is equated with the maintenance of a precarious balance of deterrence, or doctrines ranging from the chimera of limited warfare to strategic superiority.

Apparently, the realization has not yet sunk in that a combination of fear and uncertainty can never be the foundation of logic and consequently, that endless acquisition of nuclear weapons offers no guarantee of protection whatsoever. On the contrary, it undermines the security of the protagonists just as much as it threatens the very existence of all nations and peoples.

Acquisition of nuclear weapons is seen by the defenders of the deterrence doctrine as indefinitely postponing war. They point out that deterrence has kept the peace for 36 years. It is of course a moot point whether the absence of world conflagration is really the product of deterrence; it could equally be due to a recognition by all of the futility, based on bitter experience, of any one nation trying to dominate the world.

But even this realization has not eliminated widespread conflict in different areas and on dozens of occasions since the last world war. Hotbeds of tension persist; what is worse, they are generously fed by arms supplies from the major Powers, while political initiatives are stifled.

One deficiency in our past approaches immediately becomes evident. The theory of deterrence focuses on tension, which in turn hinders the resolution of political differences between the super-Powers. Deterrence per se does little to promote the quest for peace. It proposes no resolution of differences and assumes that decision makers faced with highly complex situations will always behave in a rational manner.

Yet, as was obvious from a recent press conference, it is clear that leaders with direct access to or close to the nuclear button were confused or uninformed as to what exactly is contained in sensitive contingency plans. This casts doubt on the validity of at least one assumption of the deterrence thereof.

In addition, there have also been several reported instances of false nuclear alerts in just one year through errors in communications systems. We can safely assume that at least as many incidents have not even been reported. Improvements in communications systems provide no guarantee whatsoever against unpredictable technical faults.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

And yet we continue to hear more and more loose talk about the feasibility of limited and winnable nuclear wars; we even read recently reports that the neutron bomb might be used in case of emergency in Korea. This merely confirms our perception that we now stand on the very edge of the precipice.

Negotiations between the super-Powers have long been part of a "stop-go" approach; periods of silence are interspersed with an exchange of truisms about the need for better relations no sooner enunciated than acted on in direct contradiction of stated intentions. Each side is fixated by the myth of relative advantage and feverishly manoeuvring to retain maximum superiority. Neither side can possess a totally effective first-strike capability but each worries that the other might reach such a break-through. Negotiations of this type do not break old moulds; they have become part and parcel of the arms race and mirror its increasing paranoia.

All too often international conflicts, or a potential conflict, result in a polarization of positions by the super-Powers and their allies. It has become almost axiomatic that the East will espouse one side and the West the other. Trouble spots, as one distinguished European politician commented recently, are viewed through an East-West prism. This has led to a precarious armed confrontation in many trouble spots and, of course, to complete paralysis of the Security Council.

In the current arctic state of East-West relations, it is perhaps comforting that the two super-Powers have finally agreed to resume negotiations on theatre nuclear weapons in Europe. However, my delegation is not unduly optimistic. Past experience has amply demonstrated that agreement to talk does not mean that concrete results will emerge. Political gestures cannot be confused with genuine attempts to reduce the size of military arsenals. The negotiation process, with its inherent counter-balancing efforts, promises to be a tortuous one.

The past three decades have proved convincingly that developments in military technology continue inexorably regardless of the international negotiating climate. We now fear that some new weapons threaten to lower the nuclear threshold and may even trigger a nuclear exchange; the new generation

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

of chemical weapons also represents a further malign twist in the arms race spiral. And the search for new weapon systems is now probing outer space.

Military strategists speak blithely in terms of mega-deaths. We have been catapulted into a new plateau of destructiveness and redundancy. The latest recipient of the Albert Einstein Peace Prize rightly stated:

"To my mind the nuclear bomb is the most useless weapon ever invented. It can be employed to no rational purpose. It is not even an effective defence against itself. It is only something with which, in a moment of petulance or panic, you may commit such acts as no sane person would ever wish to have on his conscience."

It seems that we have now reached the stage where rearmament appears to be the natural state of being. Neither super-Power is willing to alter its military course or can coerce the other to do so. Yet the political and military realities of today call for an alternative scenario which would reduce the chances of involvement in a military confrontation and enhance a common concern about survival and economic and social progress.

I am conscious that these brief remarks on the disarmament aspects of security only echo detailed expositions made by previous speakers. We are pleased to note that our views coincide with those of neutral and other non-aligned countries members of the Committee on Disarmament, whose contributions in that Committee we highly value.

I must admit that Malta's hopes are not very sanguine either as to the practical outcome of many proposals which are merely declaratory in character; yet we have a natural tendency not to oppose any measure calculated to promote disarmament and not automatically to doubt the good intentions of its proponents. We shall therefore support most proposals, while pointing out that, since they do not provide the necessary reassurance, they should at least be limited in number so as not to detract attention from more specific measures. Our preference for action as opposed to rhetoric remains steadfast; and, if we have had nothing but vague declarations these past few years, we have at least had some valuable studies.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

I wish to commend in particular the report of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which shows in a very clear and concise manner that we have to face a choice. The arms race cannot be reconciled with the pursuit of a more sustainable international economic and political order.

It is therefore not surprising that, in countries where freedom of expression and of assembly is not curtailed, public and professional protest against the arms race is gaining momentum. Today's potential barometer of destruction has reached an all-time high.

Against this bleak universal outlook, my country feels very strongly that there is a better prospect of progress in regional initiatives which respect global guidelines and which aim to ease, rather than to accentuate, the dangerous stalemate of East-West confrontation.

Clearly, there are certain conditions and requirements of security which are specific to particular regions. Equally clearly, attempts to strengthen security in one region will have a stabilizing effect beyond that region and will therefore increase global security.

For some time now many countries have supported the idea of zones of peace in various regions of the world. This is a political and not a legal concept, and the absence of any precise definition should not inhibit regional initiatives.

A zone of peace may be seen as a region or subregion whose component States aim jointly to promote a better future through planned co-operation. These joint efforts take into account the specific characteristics of the region and the universal norms for reducing tension and for promoting stability, thus enhancing the prospects and spreading the contagion of peace.

Leaders of the majority of littoral States of the Mediterranean have publicly stated their desire to create a zone of peace and co-operation in this region. The initiative is theirs alone to take. While it is preferable that all States in the Mediterranean should eventually be involved, there is room for unilateral and subregional action. The complete elimination of military bases in Malta in 1979, and our subsequent ratification of a neutrality agreement with Italy, is a case in point. Malta has now unilaterally fulfilled its

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

political vocation and made its contribution to Mediterranean security in a most tangible way. Italy and other countries recognize and encourage this role.

The zone of peace concept is a regional and political response which goes far beyond the objectives of disarmament and arms control. The States involved would be able to tackle their own problems in a framework which represents the positive side of co-operation. They could offer their good offices in reducing regional tension, resolving existing conflicts and preventing new ones from arising.

The establishment of a zone of peace in the Mediterranean could eventually entail the creation of a political forum for periodic discussion. It would be necessary to review progress from time to time, to embark on new projects and to seek recognition of the zone of peace by outside Powers, especially nuclear ones. Above all, component States would be tackling their own problems, free from interference by the super-Powers, whose interests have proved to be so often diametrically opposed.

The Non-Aligned Movement has long recognized that the super-Powers bear a special responsibility towards the promotion of peace. Malta's position of neutrality is now formally recognized by parties in both major military alliances. The agreement with Italy was registered, in terms of Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, on 25 July 1981 and that with the Soviet Union on 24 November 1981. Recognition of the Mediterranean as a zone of peace would represent a flowering and logical extension of this policy.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The Non-Aligned Movement as a whole has expressed its respect for, and support of, Malta's new status, and has recognised it as a positive contribution to peace and stability in the region. Your own country, Mr. Chairman, as long ago as 22 June 1980, in a joint declaration with Malta, gave us its full support for which we express appreciation. It was reaffirmed in specific detail in the joint communiqué issued at the conclusion of your President's visit to Malta this week.

It is therefore all the more regrettable that Libya, an active and ambitious fellow-Mediterranean non-aligned country, should have embarked on an aggressive posture towards Malta's efforts at attaining economic self-sufficiency through exploration for, and exploitation of, our offshore resources. Despite years of patient negotiations, despite Libya's profession of friendship for the people of Malta, despite overtures from friendly countries, Libya's belligerent response to Malta's peaceful activities was the despatch of missile-bearing gunboat against an unarmed oil rig, forcing it to suspend activities.

Libya has maintained its threat again to use force against Malta's peaceful exploration should we resume activities at any time in the future, and it continues to make unacceptable unilateral conditions to prevent the matter being adjudicated by the International Court of Justice.

To the regret and concern of my Government, the Security Council, faced with this evidence, hesitates to urge Libya to pursue an equitable and peaceful code of conduct. We find this difficult to understand. Libya is flouting the Charter, the principles of non-alignment and of good neighbourly relations, and regrettably the Security Council looks on as a disinterested spectator, despite Malta's appeal for the protection of the Council. If small countries such as mine cannot rely on this Organization for protection of their legitimate interests, one is bound to question seriously the benefits of membership, and to consider other alternatives to protect one's rights. Malta is convinced that it is acting honourably and equitably in this dispute, and that it is from Libya that a change of attitude is required, if necessary through the enforcement action of the Security Council.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

To return to my main theme, despite such setbacks from unexpected quarters and despite the fact that we are situated right in the centre of a turbulent region, my country, whose military expenditure during the past financial year came to only 1.3 per cent of our budget, remains dedicated to the creation of an environment of collective security in which we can grow in peace as good neighbours with a common destiny, seeking a common identity. The world is now dangerously advanced on the path towards a nuclear holocaust, and far more needs to be done to prevent the chances of conflict. The zone of peace concept would establish a regimen geared towards reducing tension and promoting co-operation for peace and stability. It would curb super-Power rivalry for spheres of influence, of which the definition is becoming increasingly more elastic, provocative and dangerous.

The alternative to the rigorous pursuit of the zone of peace approach is to put our faith in a disarmament dialogue between the super-Powers, in the declining hope that a positive effort to overcome political inertia will emerge. This would in essence represent a preference for a process characterized by shrinking expectations. The objective of general and complete disarmament has already been whittled down even further and replaced by suggestions for confidence-building measures and crisis management. To talk of peaceful co-operation has become almost heretically idealistic.

But the idealists of yesterday have become the realists of today; they demand practical alternatives to the failed strategies of the past. They ask for guarantees that peaceful initiatives will be respected by all, so that tension will really decrease and danger will be averted. There can be no doubt that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. The prevention of conflict through regional co-operation will meet with difficulties, of course, but these can be overcome. We have seen that other initiatives that go in the same direction have proved successful. We commend the Latin American nuclear-free-zone, and the co-operative progress made by the Andean, Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and European Economic Council (EEC) countries. We commend and support the timely

(Mr. Ganci, Malta)

initiative of Guyana in proposing a comprehensive declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and the dedication of Romania in promoting the concept of good-neighbourly relations. We welcome and support efforts to strengthen the Security Council and to make more efficient the economic and social arms of the United Nations. A combination of these efforts is surely a more realistic approach than attempting to pick up the pieces after conflicts have escalated into war. Otherwise, there may not even be any pieces to pick up.

Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The deterioration in the international situation means that day by day consideration of the agenda item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" gains importance. The time that has passed since the Declaration was adopted has demonstrated its significance and the important role that it plays in the consolidation of the fundamental objective of the United Nations - the maintenance of international peace and security. As President Herrera Campins of Venezuela said in the general debate in this thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly:

"Many peace-keeping efforts have been made in this forum, and we must overcome great difficulties for this institution to contribute effectively to the achievement of a true peace. The evils threatening mankind are not invincible, and hope in the United Nations is far from vanquished."

(A/36/PV.5, p. 21)

There is no doubt that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is one of the most important efforts that have been made in the search for peace. Yet there are still situations in which certain fundamental principles of the Declaration have been ignored or violated. The joint efforts of all States are needed to achieve a safer, more stable and equitable world in which peace and security prevail, as the Declaration says. As part of these efforts, respect for, and compliance in good faith with, international agreements concluded by States constitute one of the foundations of peaceful, harmonious coexistence among States. In international relations there must be strict compliance with obligations entered into under the Charter.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

The Co-operative Republic of Guyana has circulated document A/C.1/36/9 in connexion with agenda item 50. I wish to read some paragraphs of the memorandum that my country prepared in connexion with that document. We circulated it in a letter to the Secretary-General dated 23 November, and it appears in document A/C.1/36/12 of 24 November. It says:

"The Government of Venezuela was surprised and greatly disturbed to receive the memorandum, distributed as document A/C.1/36/9, prepared by the Government of Guyana, on the pretext that it related to item 58 of the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Utilizing an indefensible propaganda manoeuvre whose fantastic aim is to present Venezuela as a country that is threatening to attack another, that Government is trying to conceal an intention that is becoming increasingly clear, namely, to evade compliance with its international commitments.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

Venezuela regrets that once again the Government of Guyana is showing its determination to raise in a multilateral context a problem for the handling of which between the parties an instrument already exists, the Geneva Agreement, freely entered into by both countries and the United Kingdom. However, this eagerness to divert attention, including the propaganda manoeuvre, would cause us no great concern were it not for the fact that they are grounded on false accounts and on slanted and slanderous interpretations and because, more importantly, they reveal once more Guyana's intention not to comply with its international commitments and duties.

It is not the first time that allegations and improper statements by Guyanese representatives to the Organization have compelled the Government of Venezuela to distribute informative material in order adequately to illustrate the territorial spoliation to which we were subjected through the acts of imperial and colonial Powers. The Minister for Foreign Relations, Dr. José Alberto Zambrano Velasco, had to exercise the right of reply in the General Assembly on 24 September 1981 in response to the tendentious statement of the Prime Minister of Guyana. Venezuela does not wish to become embroiled in a sterile and repetitious debate but the Guyana document before it demands a brief commentary that will reveal its false premises and its dangerous intent.

I. Guyana's distortion of the truth

1. Venezuela is a democratic State that has amply demonstrated to its nationals and to the world that it respects its Constitution and laws, human rights and its international commitments. Since the War of Independence, over a century and a half ago, Venezuela has never been involved in armed conflict with its sister countries in the American continent. Venezuela has never been a belligerent nation and has no military forces abroad to serve imperialist Powers. It is therefore shocking and unpardonable that our claim should be described as expressing a hankering for territorial conquest by countries that are far from observing the respectful attachment to law and justice that Venezuela has demonstrated. What our people is calling for is reparation for the monstrous spoliation to which it was subjected by the colonial imperialism of the last century, and this aspiration must be

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

understood by all countries of the world, especially by those -- many of them represented in the United Nations -- which have endured similar outrages, in times fortunately a thing of the past for mankind. We accordingly declare categorically that we are not prepared to yield to moral pressure in the form of an attempted false presentation of this matter which seeks to present us as a strong country about to destroy or enslave a weaker one. This manoeuvre ignores our history and our own position as a free and democratic developing country and its aim is to consolidate an injustice and frustrate a just claim for the benefit of Guyana, as the heir to colonial spoliation ...

"2. Guyana, falsely, affirms that Venezuela has never impugned the non-existent award of 1899 and that its argumentation derives from a posthumous memorandum of Severo Mallet-Prevost, of whom Guyana dares to insinuate that he was bought over by means of a decoration ...

"The Government of Guyana deliberately omits any reference to a letter written by Mallet-Prevost 20 days after the so-called award of 1899, of the same tenor as his posthumous memorandum ...

"Internal repression may well keep the people of Guyana ignorant of the facts, but other countries can and must get to know the historical and legal background that makes the Venezuelan position so strong ...

"Only a few of the reasons for Venezuela's demonstrating the nullity of the award of 1899 have been mentioned. Others could be adduced, such as the alteration of original maps submitted to the Arbitral Tribunal, the official notes giving instructions to be transmitted to the English arbitrator, thus interfering with their function as judges of law, or the maps which prove that the 'line of the award' had been substantially arranged in the Colonial Office three months prior to the award. These facts are expounded in the documentary pamphlet circulated by Venezuela at the current session of the Assembly.

"3. The memorandum of the Guyana Government claims that Venezuela has never advanced her rights or titles in the present claim and has not submitted evidence in support of her arguments. This is to ignore the declaration of the Foreign Minister of Venezuela of 9 December 1965, which gives an account of all the legal aspects of the matter, none of which was refuted or answered by the British Government.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

"4. An attempt is made to accuse Venezuela of failing to comply with the Geneva Agreement and using the dispute in an endeavour to explain the revolt of sectors of the population against a Government known to be tyrannical, when it is an obvious fact that Venezuela keeps out and always has kept out of all political processes connected with the Government of Guyana; it is obvious, moreover, that Venezuela has pursued no methods other than legal methods in seeking reparation for the injustice committed against it...

"5. In patent disregard of the truth, it has been asserted that Venezuela opposed the independence of Guyana, thereby ignoring the declaration of the Chamber of Deputies of 1962, which proclaimed 'that, by vocation and principles, Venezuela has been a State which pioneered full independence for British Guiana and for all the colonial possessions still existing in the Americas'.

'Likewise ignored is the statement of Minister Iribarren Borges, more than a year before Guyana's independence, that 'that my country is maintaining its claim even if a change of status occurs in the present colony of British Guiana by no means signifies that we are obstructing the independence of that colony'.

"6. An effort is made to present Venezuela as a country that has outstanding territorial disputes with all its neighbours. This overlooks the fact that in recent years Venezuela has concluded maritime delimitation treaties with the Netherlands Antilles, the United States and the Dominican Republic. That Venezuela has signed a similar treaty with France, which is in the process of approval and ratification. That Venezuela is engaged in fruitful negotiations with Trinidad and Tobago with a view to adjusting its maritime frontier to the law of the sea as it now stands. That Venezuela has been engaged in negotiations on maritime delimitation with Colombia, in which, notwithstanding the difficulties of the issue in this particular case, Venezuela's unquestionable readiness to negotiate in good faith has been patent. And, above all, that the only case in which Venezuela has been unable even to start real negotiations is precisely with Guyana, in consequence of the stubborn refusal of the only government which that country has had in its 15 years of independence to comply with the obligations imposed on it by the Geneva Agreement...

"II. The memorandum of the Government of Guyana causes serious concern.

"It is a matter of record that, as a consequence of British territorial spoliation, Venezuela made a strong claim against England for reparation of the grave injustice committed against our country. These claims led, in 1966, to the signing of the Geneva Agreement, the parties to which are Venezuela, Guyana and Great Britain and whose objective, stated in the preamble and article 1, is to seek by peaceful means a satisfactory solution for the practical settlement of the controversy. The text of the Geneva Agreement has been made available to delegations in order to help them to form a clearer idea of the real scope of the issues involved...

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

"It was in this way that we came to a formal agreement by which the three parties involved committed themselves to a political search for peaceful solutions to a dispute inherited from colonialism ...

"The Venezuelan Government ... does not believe that there is any point in raising in a multilateral context a matter that already has a legal statute accepted by Venezuela and Guyana which, if applied in good faith and with the firm intention of overcoming outstanding problems, will undoubtedly serve to bring about a final settlement of this dispute in all harmony. Venezuela reiterates that it is prepared to comply with its international commitments, as has been its tradition and as is proper for it as a legally organized democratic State.

"However, the fact that Guyana insists on raising the matter within a multilateral context may reveal, apart from a desire to make propaganda, an intention to disavow the bilateral instrument which, by our joint will, was to be the means for the settlement of the dispute.

"On this occasion the Government of Guyana raised this matter under item 58 of the Assembly's agenda, i.e., in connexion with the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. One may well ask how international security can be affected if a treaty, article 4 of which refers expressly to the means of peaceful settlement of disputes provided for in article 33 of the United Nations Charter, is complied with in good faith. Venezuela fears that the unusual behaviour of Guyana reflects its decision to evade compliance with that undertaking and means of peaceful settlement for the present territorial dispute. As that, if it were the case, would indeed endanger international security, just as would any outside intervention in the matter, the Government of Venezuela earnestly urges the Government of Guyana to comply with the provisions and the intent of the Geneva Agreement and to keep this matter between the parties themselves.

"A further cause for concern is that, in its publicity manoeuvre, Guyana is trying to present Venezuela as a belligerent country, to the point of daring to assert that the Caribbean region has faced a constant threat to its peace and security as a result of the Venezuelan claim. This entirely false assertion is no more than a vain attempt to create friction and tension

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

in a region which is already disturbed, for the sole purpose of gaining political advantage. This is not a serious and responsible way to conduct international relations, and the Government of Venezuela accordingly urges the Government of Guyana to put an end to these intrigues and prepare itself for a joint effort to find a satisfactory solution to the dispute.

The Venezuelan Government wishes to reiterate that it is well aware that Guyana is not the British Empire and is not the direct perpetrator of the injustice that was committed against us. We have affirmed and still affirm that all these circumstances must be borne in mind when, in pursuance of the Geneva Agreement, we propose to seek, by peaceful means, a satisfactory solution for the practical settlement of the dispute.

"For this reason, and because we again reiterate our willingness to find a practical solution to the present problem within the framework of the Geneva Agreement and through frank and, ideally, fraternal dialogue, we again regret that the attention of this important meeting has been diverted to a problem which is governed, diplomatically and legally, by a treaty statute. It is therefore not in order for the Assembly to consider it."

In conclusion, let me say that the Government of my country once again demonstrates its good faith when it again invites the Co-operative Republic of Guyana

"to observe its international commitments and to prepare itself to comply in good faith with the agreed obligations of the Geneva Agreement, in the assurance that if both countries are equally willing to take the road towards overcoming the pending dispute the matter will be satisfactorily resolved, and the world will be given an example of how developing countries can tackle and solve the most difficult problems."

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to refer to the statement of the representative of Malta. I wish to put forward the viewpoint of my country on that subject and to state the measures adopted by Libya.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concluded a special treaty with Malta in 1976 in order to solve the question of the continental shelf, which is before the International Court of Justice. It had entered into negotiations with the Government of Malta in order to clarify certain points, including the necessity for both parties not to drill in the controversial area until the International Court of Justice solves the matter. That had been accepted verbally by the Government of Malta, as mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General on the subject. Later, Malta changed its mind and maintained in negotiations continuing until 1980 that it should be able to carry on drilling operations, while Libya insisted that it should not. Finally, the Libyan legislative authority ratified the agreement at the end of January 1981.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya prepared the document of ratification for exchange with Malta in accordance with the usual practice adopted by Libya, as required by our laws, which are in harmony with international laws and conventions.

In order to respond to the efforts of the Security Council, the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, we twice sent a delegation to Valletta in order to conclude the matter. However, the Government of Malta made certain conditions which did not make it possible to exchange instruments of ratification. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General then put forward a number of questions to both sides, and we have replied to those questions. Our documents are ready, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is ready to exchange instruments of ratification. We are ready to appear before the Court any time the Government of Malta requires that we do so, and we are ready to send a delegation to Malta at any time, or to receive a Maltese delegation in Tripoli, in order to resolve the matter.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has always called for the declaration of the Mediterranean as a sea of peace. We are ready to render all co-operation so as to fulfil that objective. Libya respects the Charter of the United Nations, which stipulates in Article 36, paragraph 3,

"legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court".

We should like to emphasize that we are ready to appear before the International Court of Justice, and that we have undertaken all necessary measures in that respect.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Our only fear is that the Government of Malta wishes to use the United Nations as an instrument for the promotion of certain internal considerations that have nothing to do with the dispute. Once again we express our full readiness to co-operate with Malta and with the United Nations. However, our consistent position has been not to accept any drilling activities in the disputed area until the matter is settled by the International Court of Justice.

In conclusion, we believe that the matter is a simple procedural dispute and that no danger whatsoever is posed to the security of Malta or the whole area. In point of fact, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is very interested in maintaining good relations with Malta. We have respect for the Government and people of Malta, and wish them all success and prosperity. Indeed, more than 20 enterprises and companies have been set up as a sign of the co-operation between our two countries.

We hope that Malta will maintain its neutral, non-aligned position. We emphasize that we have not threatened to use force against Malta.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): I must say, it was with great surprise that I listened to the statement made by Mr. Martini Urdaneta of Venezuela, concerning a matter which exists between our two countries, a claim which Venezuela is pursuing against more than two thirds of Guyana's territory. When I say I am surprised, I mean that I really am genuinely surprised. As an indication of this, I shall not even address myself to the substance of what the Venezuelan representative had to say, even though, as is well known, my delegation has very strong views on this matter, which we have made known already in the General Assembly and in our document.

Among other charges, the Venezuelan Ambassador made three to which I shall address myself. First, he accuses Guyana of trying to raise, in this multilateral forum, the United Nations, the question of a dispute which his country maintains against my country. In this he bases himself on a document which we have circulated as a document of the General Assembly. When my Prime Minister spoke in the General Assembly on 24 September, he described briefly the facts relating to the dispute. He said at that time that we had prepared a memorandum which we were going to

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

have circulated as a document of the General Assembly. My Prime Minister left New York and, following his instructions, I requested that that memorandum be circulated as a document of the Assembly under agenda item 58.

All members of this Committee are aware that whenever a delegation wishes to have information circulated for the benefit of the Assembly it must do so in relation to a particular agenda item. In this case, it was most logical that that item be "Strengthening of international security". And Guyana was not unique in this: since the beginning of the year similar action has been taken by dozens of delegations - Afghanistan, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Laos, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, the Philippines, Poland, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, to name only a few. Those delegations desired to make information available to the Assembly, so they wrote, requesting that the information be made available and, following the requirements, related their documentation to a particular agenda item.

This does not mean that when an agenda item comes up before the First Committee all the cases related to it are considered by the Committee: it is purely in satisfaction of the requirement that the documentation is related to a particular item. That is what Guyana did. We had no intention whatsoever of raising the matter in the Committee, we did not even inscribe our name on the list of speakers on this item. And yet the representative of Venezuela, going into so much detail about Venezuela's side of the dispute, accuses Guyana of diverting the attention of the Committee, which is the second accusation he makes against us.

With regard to the third charge, that it is the intention of Guyana to shirk its international responsibility, I shall merely recall the words of my Prime Minister in his statement of 24 September and my own statement made in exercise of the right of reply to the Foreign Minister of Venezuela. I should like to reaffirm the oft-stated position of the Government of Guyana: that we stand by the Geneva agreement, and that, so long as Venezuela is willing to comply strictly and faithfully with the terms of that agreement signed in 1966, we are ready to talk, to engage in dialogue. As we have said on many occasions, we respect fully the Geneva agreement.

The representative of Venezuela said that he had had a document circulated. I have not yet seen it, and my Government will decide after it has seen the document what action it would like to take, whether in this Committee or elsewhere.

But I repeat that we came into this Committee with no intention whatsoever of raising the issue. We did not feel that the Committee was prepared for this, nor did we consider it appropriate to do so. It is Venezuela that raised the matter of the dispute that it maintains against my country, and then accused me of diverting the attention of the Committee.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): The reply made by the representative of Libya, would have been very encouraging were it not for the fact that his country has been saying the same thing, more or less, in different words, since 1976. But they have not done anything about it. Their policy is that, as long as they can prevent Malta from drilling by dilatory tactics, such tactics will suffice, but that, if we get fed up with those tactics and try to do something about it, they then will use force.

As an illustration, I need only mention that we ratified the agreement five days after it was signed; they took five years to do so, and when they did, they imposed a unilateral condition which they knew in advance Malta would never be able to accept. We have agreed, unlike Libya, to go before the Court at any time. Libya has not said that. We have even gone so far as to tell the Security Council in advance that we will abide by the finding of the Court and that if we have carried out any activities in an area that the Court finds should legally belong to Libya - a tremendously unlikely possibility - we would give Libya the benefit of all our activities. Libya has not even responded to that gesture.

I think that gestures speak much louder than words. Unless we get a real response to Malta's friendly overtures to Libya, we cannot be satisfied with mere words, which is what we heard in the reply of the representative of Libya.

Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, I should like to say that I am pleased to have heard Ambassador Sinclair, with whom, as he said, we have personal ties, state that his country was prepared to abide by the provisions agreed to in the Geneva Agreement. That is, in fact, what in all our statements we have been saying to Guyana, namely, that the 1966 Geneva Agreement must be abided by and a peaceful and friendly solution to the pending territorial dispute found. So it has been a source of satisfaction to hear his words to that effect.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that Venezuela spoke today merely to refer to the general topic contained in agenda item 58, but since, in connexion with that agenda item, a memorandum or letter by the Government of Guyana has been circulated, we commented on it. But let me repeat that Venezuela is not raising in this Committee the possibility of debating the problem with Guyana in this gathering. Only Venezuela and Guyana are the parties concerned in this problem, and they should reach a friendly settlement.

I do not want there to be any doubts remaining in this connexion. It seems to me that I heard the representative of Guyana say that we had raised the matter here. No, let me repeat that we have not raised any issues here; we have only referred to a document published by the Government of Guyana.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Guyana, and I have to say that this is his second exercise of the right of reply and it is to be limited to five minutes and will be the last right of reply that I am going to grant to him at this meeting.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): I shall say just two things. First, when I insist that we adhere to the terms of the Geneva Agreement, it is only a reflection of Guyana's attitude towards international agreements freely arrived at and solemnly entered into. It is a matter of principle with us.

Secondly, we were not the first to raise in the United Nations the question of Venezuela's claim to Guyanan territory. It was raised in 1962. We were not even independent then.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.