

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records*



LIBRARY

JAN 20 1982

FIRST COMMITTEE

46th meeting

held on

Monday, 30 November 1981

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 46TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. YANGO (Philippines)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

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

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

- (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

* 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.46
8 January 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 57 AND 58 (continued)

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, L.60; 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

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The discussion of the question of strengthening international security provides the United Nations with an excellent opportunity, poised as it is on the threshold of the new year, for considering the international situation. It also makes it possible for us to take stock of the results of political events of the year, draw the necessary conclusions and outline the necessary practical measures. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union raised this particular question at a certain point in the General Assembly.

Since that time, the discussion of this matter has proved to be an important milestone in the work of each session of the General Assembly, and that is entirely understandable, because the task of preserving and strengthening international peace is the central function of the United Nations.

The situation in the world, as it has recently emerged, is alarming. The policy of aggressive imperialistic forces has already led to a considerable growth in international tension, with all the dangerous consequences flowing therefrom. Even as far back as the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s,

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

these forces had adopted a course of undermining détente and of escalating the arms race. Now they are trying to intensify this policy even further, and bring it to the very brink of insanity.

As a result, there has recently been a growth in the danger of war, an intensification of the policy of imperialist aggression and dangerous military adventures. Concrete manifestations of this policy have been the Israeli attack on the nuclear research centre near Baghdad, the barbarous bombing by Israel of the population of Beirut and the naked aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. There has also been armed provocation by the United States against Libya, their criminal designs aimed against Cuba, and also acts of blackmail and threats against Nicaragua and Grenada. There has been support for the bloody Pol Pot cutthroats, with a view to overthrowing the lawful Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea; and finally, there have been the attempts to rewrite the history of Afghanistan and erase the April revolution of 1978 in that country with the help of armed gangs infiltrated from outside.

As was stressed by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and President of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet, L. I. Brezhnev:

"Adventurism, willingness to gamble with the vital interests of mankind in the name of their own narrow selfish purposes, this has been a particularly obvious and flagrant manifestation of the policy of the most aggressive circles of imperialism."

The threat to international security and possibly, indeed, to the very existence of mankind, flowing from this adventuristic policy, has now assumed unprecedentedly dangerous proportions. Of particular danger to international peace and security are the plans which have been hatched with particular light-heartedness in Washington for the practical use of nuclear missiles. The Government of the United States of America is striving for a sharp increase in what is, in any case, a gigantic expenditure on new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, primarily nuclear weapons. Well justified alarm and a wave of protest throughout the world have been aroused by the decision to develop large-scale production of the inhuman neutron weapon.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Having declared that there are things which are more important than peace, the leaders of the United States have left no doubt that underlying the arms race which they have whipped up there is the intent to achieve a position of superior force. They are also gambling that by having recourse to nuclear blackmail or even actually unleashing a "limited" or full-scale nuclear war they can count on achieving victory or obtaining political advantages. Their calculations are entirely in vain, but nonetheless dangerous.

The Soviet Union openly and directly opposes this irresponsible and reckless policy with a clear-cut political alternative, namely, the Programme of Peace for the 1980s put forward nine months ago at the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The thrust of this programme is that the situation in the world today calls for new, further efforts to banish the threat of war and to strengthen international security.

What are the main provisions of this programme?

The land of the Soviets and its Communist Party proceed from the belief that at the present time the task of easing the threat of war and curbing the arms race has acquired particular significance and urgency. To these ends, the Soviet Union has proposed a number of concrete measures, primarily in the area of limiting and reversing the arms race.

First, the Soviet Union has urgently called for restraint in the area of strategic armaments. We have expressed our readiness to continue, without delay, talks on the subject with the United States, while preserving all the positive gains which have been made so far in this area.

Secondly, the USSR has proposed that agreement be reached on limiting the deployment of new American and Soviet nuclear submarines and on the prohibition of the modernization of existing, and the creation of new, ballistic missiles carried by these submarines.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Thirdly, we have proposed that a policy be adopted of concluding a permanent treaty on the limitation and, what is even better, the actual reduction in Europe of new medium-range nuclear missile systems of the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the USSR.

Fourthly, our country has proposed confidence-building measures in the military field, both in Europe and in the Far East.

Fifthly, we believe it to be important for the vital necessity to be demonstrated of the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe. The peoples of the world must know the truth about how destructive the consequences of a nuclear war would be for mankind. To this end, it would be useful to create an authoritative international committee which would include the most eminent scientists from various countries of the world.

We are satisfied that the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and its First Committee have measured up to the major problems facing mankind in connexion with the need to curb the arms race. This is demonstrated above all by the Declaration already adopted by the First Committee, on the initiative of our own country, on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, which would proclaim the first use of nuclear weapons to be the gravest crime against humanity. It is also demonstrated by the resolutions adopted by our Committee prohibiting the inhuman neutron weapon, the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the stationing in outer space of weapons of any kind and by other resolutions.

Apart from disarmament, another important field on which efforts should be focused is, in the view of the Soviet Union, the need to solve the most important still unresolved international problems.

First and foremost, we have in mind the Middle East problem. In that regard the Soviet Union has proposed a return to an honest collective search for a comprehensive settlement on a just and realistic basis. As for the separate Camp David deal, it is high time to consign it to the scrapheap.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

We must also ensure peace in the region of the Persian Gulf. A situation of stability and tranquility in this region can be created, again only by concerted efforts in the light of the legitimate interests of all parties. We must guarantee, first and foremost, the sovereign rights of the States of the region and, on the other hand, security for maritime and other forms of communications. We have no objection to questions connected with Afghanistan being discussed in a linkage with questions of Persian Gulf security.

Lastly, there is one more key element in the Soviet peace programme. As experience has shown, when hotbeds of military conflict arise, it is no easy matter to douse them. It would be far better to adopt preventive measures which would forestall the emergence of such hotbeds. To these ends, and also in order to cool off the international situation, the Soviet Union has proposed the convening of a special meeting of the Security Council at the highest level. The task of such a meeting would be to seek keys for restoring the international climate to health and preventing war. Of course, in order to ensure constructive results from such a meeting, it would have to be very carefully prepared.

Of course, the proposals I have enumerated, which were made at the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are by no means exhaustive. Other measures too, which had been proposed earlier by the Soviet Union, remain valid.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the belief that it is in the vital interests of the European peoples to continue the course begun in Helsinki to strengthen peace and security in Europe. Of great significance in this regard is the question of convening a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe, which is now being considered at Madrid.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

We would welcome the conversion of the Mediterranean region from a scene of military and political confrontation into a zone of stable peace and co-operation.

In the view of the Soviet Union, those goals would be served by the following measures: extending to the area of the Mediterranean Sea the confidence-building measures in the military field which have already proved themselves in international practice; an agreed reduction of armed forces in that region; withdrawal from the Mediterranean Sea of ships carrying nuclear weapons; the renunciation of the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear-weapon Mediterranean countries; and the acceptance by nuclear-weapon Powers of the obligation not to use nuclear weapons against a Mediterranean country which does not permit such weapons to be placed on its soil. The normalization of the situation in the Mediterranean area would also be promoted by the preservation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and strict respect for its policy of non-alignment.

We are ready to consider the proposals of other countries. For example, we consider very timely and useful the initiative of the Mongolian People's Republic proposing the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific Ocean.

The Soviet Union professes its solidarity with the struggle of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the peaceful, democratic reunification of its country, without any outside intervention, and for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea. The Korean problem can and should be settled by peaceful means, on the basis of the proposals put forward by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Political means could be effective also in settling other dangerous situations and controversial problems. We believe that in many of such cases the Security Council could play an extremely important part. It is

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

the United Nations organ upon which the Charter places primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council could also do a great deal of useful work in terms of the broad consideration of crisis situations as a whole and preventing potential conflicts. This could be done, in particular, by holding special meetings of the Council for those purposes at a special level, as provided for in last year's General Assembly resolution 35/158. One hundred and twenty Member States voted for that resolution and there was none against, so that all that remains now is for it to be implemented. We view our proposal for the holding of special Security Council meetings at the highest level as directly in keeping with that resolution. It is to be regretted only that the Security Council has so far failed to respond to those timely proposals.

The Soviet Union favours speedy cessation of the war between Iran and Iraq and a political settlement of the conflict; it supports the efforts of the United Nations and the Mission of Mediation of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in this regard.

On the basis of its policy of principle of struggling for the total and final elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid, the USSR believes that United Nations efforts must be stepped up in that area. The people of Namibia must, without any further procrastination, exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of its country.

The maintenance of the apartheid régime in southern Africa in general constitutes a constant threat to international peace. We must call a halt decisively to the aggressive banditlike actions of the racists against Angola and a number of other African States, and we must adopt the sanctions against South Africa provided for by the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Using artificial pretexts, the United States has developed a campaign of threats and pressure against the Republic of Cuba. These actions by the United States Administration constitute a flagrant attempt deliberately to heighten tension in that part of the world, exert pressure on independent States and prepare the ground for further aggressive actions. These criminal designs of the United States against Cuba must be halted. The organizers of this campaign must clearly realize what dangerous consequences are inherent in such a course of action.

The shameless policy of pressure on Libya is also inadmissible. An end must be put to the provocative actions of the United States of America against Libya, its open intervention in that country's internal affairs and attempts to blackmail it by force of arms.

What alternative to the clear-cut and constructive Programme of Peace for the 1980s proposed by the Soviet Union has been put forward by the Western States, particularly the United States?

It would be no exaggeration to say that, as a counter-weight to the programme of limiting the arms race, the United States in essence proposes an unbridled orgy of military expenditures - war-brinkmanship, in fact. Instead of settling conflicts,- something that the Soviet Union is proposing to do - the United States in actual practice is pursuing a course of freezing conflict situations and accumulating and stockpiling explosive material.

Particular concern is caused by Washington's plans to restore the military positions of imperialism in countries that have thrown off the yoke of colonial dependence. This is nothing less than a policy of establishing American military protectorates and of de facto re-colonization of liberated countries, on the artificial pretext of struggling against a non-existent Soviet military threat.

At the present time, all kinds of theoretical investigations are going on in the United States, and practical measures are being taken on the subject. At the same time, the slogan about the need to repel the "Soviet threat" often gives way to the open revelation of the narrow, selfish aims of the neo-colonialists. Noteworthy in this regard is a recent study which has been issued under the title, "Western security: what has changed; what should be done?", published by the American Council on International Relations, together with kindred organizations in the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany. That study, directed primarily at the re-colonization of the Persian Gulf, points out that the NATO countries could bring military force to bear in the following three cases having nothing whatsoever to do with the USSR: in the event of war among the countries of the region themselves; in the case of internal disorders in those countries; and, finally, in the case of other potential situations requiring rapid deployment in that area for the defense of sources of oil.

American rapid deployment forces, as we know, have only recently been carrying out intimidating military manoeuvres in the Middle East, and anyone who believes that the explosions of American bombs in the Middle East in the course of those manoeuvres are aimed at intimidating not the Arab and other countries of that region but somebody else is amazingly naive or extraordinarily short-sighted.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

We, for our part, believe it necessary to warn that all these actions on the part of the United States represent a direct danger precisely to developing countries. We want to inform the representatives of those countries of the fact that the United States is now actively considering, for example, the following scenarios for the use of force: in the Panama Canal Zone, to defend it against "hostile groups"; in the Straits of Hormuz and Molucca; for intervention against guerrillas in southern Africa; and even for military intervention in India, in the event of internal disorders in that country. We would advise anyone interested to read, in this regard, a book which has just come out in the United States, entitled, "U. S. Policy and Low Intensity Conflict: Potentials for Military Struggles in the 1980s".

If, however, official representatives of the United States would like to demonstrate that Washington does not, in fact, harbour such aggressive intentions against countries that have freed themselves from colonial dependence, there would seem to be a very simple way of doing that. Why, for example, should the United States not adopt the proposal put forward as long as seven months ago on 27 April this year, by the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State, L. I. Brezhnev? What he proposed was that the United States, the other permanent members of the Security Council and, of course, all other States should be guided by the following norms in relations with the young States of Asia, Africa, and Latin America:

First, recognition of the right of each people alone, without outside interference, to settle its own internal affairs; renunciation of attempts to establish any form of domination or hegemony over them, or to include them in the "sphere of interest" of any Power;

Secondly, strict respect for the territorial integrity of those countries; the inviolability of their frontiers; and the withholding of any outside support for any separatist movements aimed at dismembering those countries;

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Thirdly, unreserved recognition of the right of every State of Africa, Asia and Latin America to equal participation in international life and the development of relations with any countries in the world;

Fourthly, full and unreserved recognition of the sovereignty of those States over their natural resources and, also, recognition, in actual practice, of their total equality in international economic relations; support for their efforts to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and to eradicate racism and apartheid, in accordance with the United Nations decisions on these subjects; and,

Fifthly, respect for the non-aligned status chosen by the majority of the States of Africa, Asia and Latin America; renunciation of attempts to bring them into military-political blocs.

But one cannot but be put on one's guard by the United States failure to respond in any way to that proposal of the Soviet Union. In the circumstances, in our view, it has become even more urgent for our Committee and the General Assembly to adopt the draft Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

For quite a long time now this draft declaration has been under preparation by the non-aligned States, and very little work remains to be done before it is concluded.

The situation is extremely simple. All those who have no ignoble intentions with regard to the non-aligned and other developing countries must support the adoption of such an important document. Only those who harbour such intentions can possibly oppose its adoption.

This declaration is a very good test of the substance of the policy of any given Power with regard to the countries that have freed themselves from colonialism. The Soviet Union is ready to take that test.

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): My delegation too would like to make a few remarks in connexion with agenda items 57 and 58.

The furtherance of economic, social, cultural and other forms of co-operation at both the regional and the interregional levels is an important instrument for building and strengthening good-neighbourliness between States. My delegation therefore supports the efforts that are being made in the different regions and at the global level towards this end.

We cannot escape the interdependent character of nation-States. Bridges of friendship and co-operation, when built, will definitely reduce tension and contribute to the peaceful settlement of disputes and further create the required atmosphere conducive to disarmament and development. The international community should therefore provide all the required impetus in such cases.

It is also in this context that Bhutan is supporting and participating in the efforts that are being made by the seven South Asian countries to begin co-operation in various social and economic fields. The benefits to the peoples of those countries will be immense once that co-operation has taken concrete form. In this regard my delegation was gratified that there was some positive development in the field of social and economic

(Mr. Dorji, Bhutan)

co-operation during the second meeting of the Foreign Secretaries of the South Asian countries held in Kathmandu recently. It is our hope that the countries involved will maintain the positive momentum that has already been generated.

As we have been debating for the past month-and-a-half or so the disquieting trends in the international situation of today have become more complex and dangerous, threatening our very survival. It is therefore imperative for the international community to continue to strive relentlessly and with greater vigour to find ways and means of strengthening international peace and security. My delegation believes that strict adherence to the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States can greatly contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. More often than once we have witnessed and seen ample proof of how international peace and security is threatened when those principles are violated.

In this context my delegation is gratified that on 27 November, on behalf of 93 non-aligned countries, the representative of Guyana introduced document A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Fev.1, containing the draft declaration and draft resolutions on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. My delegation, a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, attaches considerable significance and importance to this document. If adopted, this important political declaration would provide guidance applicable to all nations, big or small, powerful or weak, in the conduct of their relations with one another. My delegation hopes that all countries will support this endeavour.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): At the outset I should like to emphasize that at the present critical time in the history of mankind, whose very survival is threatened, the implementation of the system of international security provided for in the Charter has become a compelling necessity. *This is so manifest that it should require no argument in its support.*

The system of international security provided for in the Charter is the central axis around which the whole structure of the United Nations

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

revolves in its responsibility for the maintenance of peace. Starting with the preamble, the system runs through the main body of the Charter and culminates in Chapter VII. Upon that system rests the validity and effectiveness of Security Council decisions and consequently the meaningfulness of the United Nations in its primary function and main purpose, the maintenance of international security and peace.

I must take just a little time to explain the situation, which seems not sufficiently to be taken care of in the United Nations. It relates to the implementation of the system of international security that would render the Organization meaningful and the Security Council effective. The following clearly emerges from the Charter:

After an introductory passage, the preamble to the Charter states:

"... and for these ends ... to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security".

This means effective collective security through the United Nations.

Turning to the purposes of the United Nations, Article 1 (1) states the following as a primary purpose:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

So here in Article 1 we have the whole purpose of the United Nations in maintaining peace - that is, collective security. And from such collective security in the maintenance of peace would flow the possibility of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

If there is no effective restraining of aggression, the strong side in any dispute will not be willing to come to agreement for a peaceful settlement but will insist on its own position of strength. Consequently, a necessary element for the peaceful settlement of disputes is that there shall first be effective maintenance of order and security through the prevention or suppression of acts of aggression.

The two other purposes of the United Nations in Article 1 of the Charter are equally of importance but flow from the maintenance of international security and peace, without which it would not be valid. They are the self-determination of peoples and international co-operation for economic, social, humanitarian and other forms of progress in the world. Those are of equal importance for the United Nations but they are not part of the system of international security; they flow from the application of that system.

I have referred to Article 1 under "Purposes" of the United Nations. With regard to the "Principles" in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter which prohibits the use or threat of force in international relations, it should be noted that this prohibition acquires its validity and effect from the paragraph immediately following - paragraph 5 - which calls upon all Members to give assistance to any enforcement action that may be taken by the United Nations in carrying out that prohibition.

Therefore, we have the preamble and the purposes and principles of the Charter calling for collective security with effective action through enforcement measures. Then we come to the establishment of the Security Council empowered to deal with those purposes and principles and prevent or suppress aggression. Chapter VII follows, providing for the means of effective implementation of the system, and particularly Article 43 which calls for the conclusion by the Security Council of special agreements by Member States for a United Nations force to be available to the Security Council, on call, for international security and peace. Article 47 refers to a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council regarding enforcement action to give effect to its decisions for the maintenance of international security and peace.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

That, briefly, is the system of international security that runs through the Charter. It is a sad reality that this system has been bypassed, ignored and laid aside, depriving the Security Council of the means of implementation of its decisions which are thus rendered without effect and devoid of enforcement action. It is a maxim that law without enforcement is no law at all. The decisions of the Security Council without enforcement are meaningless. We have lived in these circumstances of a truncated United Nations Charter for 35 years. The United Nations has been functioning under a grave handicap, which has deprived it of the basic elements it needs to carry out its primary purpose and its main responsibility with respect to the maintenance of international security, peace and order in the world.

As a consequence of that situation the world suddenly found itself without an effective United Nations and even without the restraints and control in the conduct of nations that were in existence before the United Nations. Following the Treaty of Westphalia, signed in the 17th century after long and destructive wars, and the emergence of the age of reason when Grotius asserted the elements of international law, there were established rules of conduct about a just and unjust war, as well as other ethical rules. For example, war was considered unjust if it was waged for conquest or plunder or to impose a government on another people. It was conceded that preventive wars were unjust. The sanctity of diplomatic envoys was respected. There could be no war unless formally declared.

In our times, under the United Nations, none of these restraints are at all respected or considered. Diplomatic envoys are not protected. Blatant aggressions and horrendous invasions take place without any notice or declaration of war and in some cases they are accompanied by massive genocidal acts and other crimes. This situation of anarchy and insecurity prevailing today, and particularly in a nuclear age, should not be tolerated by the international community. Consequently, action must be taken to ensure compliance with the Charter system for international security as the only possible means of bringing the peace and security so direly needed in our times. The peoples of the world, by their recent repeated and emphatic demonstrations, show their deep concern over the nuclear threat and hope for action by their leaders towards mutual understanding and co-operation on matters of peace and survival, irrespective of socio-political differences.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

It is therefore disappointing to see such lack of interest in international security which is basic to disarmament and peace. The recent situation of decline in order and security and the grave dangers it involves would never have arisen if the Charter were respected and effectively complied with in its main purpose, namely the implementation of the system for international security and peace. I should like all Members of the United Nations to note that unless the Charter is respected we shall have no order and security, no possibility of attaining disarmament, no matter how long they negotiate in the Committee on Disarmament. That Committee, I must say, has in one form or another devoted its efforts for 35 years towards reaching agreements for some kind of disarmament, but not a single weapon has been reduced. Meanwhile, the arms race has escalated by leaps and bounds and every effort towards disarmament has been submerged under an avalanche of new weapons in the arms race.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

However, the Committee on Disarmament continues to pursue its efforts without realizing the need for parallel international security measures. Nevertheless, the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament sets out in appropriate sequence the two essential elements of international security and disarmament, stating in paragraph 13 that:

"Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces ..." (A/S-10/2, para. 13)

A system of international security must be promoted in order to enable us to proceed to disarmament. The two efforts must run parallel.

In compliance with the Charter and the Final Document, therefore, the Committee on Disarmament should, in parallel with its devoted and praiseworthy efforts to reach agreement on disarmament, also proceed to work towards measures for a system of international security that would make agreement on disarmament possible and feasible. It must be borne in mind that when we speak of disarmament agreements, these must be preceded by a stoppage arms buildup. It is inconceivable that armaments can be eliminated when at the same time new, more destructive and more dangerous weapons are being created. Nations must be provided with an alternative security, one that does not rely upon competition in armaments and a precarious balance of power. That alternative security is fully provided for in the United Nations Charter. It is the system of international security I have already mentioned, a system based on positive co-operation rather than on negative antagonism in the arms race. If we are to halt the arms race and save the world from the impending holocaust, we must comply with the provisions for the system of international security laid down in the Charter, whether we like it or not. That is the problem facing us today. That is the problem that must be solved if we truly cherish the interests and future of mankind. We have to think of the future. We must not think only of today or tomorrow or of short-term interests, monetary or otherwise, when dealing with this grave problem, but of generations to come.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The system of international security set forth in the Charter provides for enforcement action to be carried out by the Security Council, acting with the advice and assistance of the Military Staff Committee. However, the United Nations force, provided for in Article 43 of the Charter to give effect to Security Council decisions, is non-existent. I take this opportunity to state the urgent need for compliance with Article 43, in order that an international force might be created to give effect to the decisions of the Security Council. Shortly after the establishment of the United Nations, the Military Staff Committee prepared agreements with regard to the contingents of forces and other military facilities to be provided by States Members of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter. However, when those proposals came before the Security Council at the height of the Cold War they were not carried out because of certain disagreements. They are vitally essential, none the less, and there is a great need for them. Further efforts should be made to give them effect but none have been made since that time. Yet the Military Staff Committee itself has been established and has continued to function for nearly 35 years, holding bi-monthly meetings at the United Nations. But it fulfils no function whatsoever. The expense and time taken up by the Military Staff Committee has been wasted because, contrary to the Charter, there are no United Nations contingents on which it can give advice and assistance to the Security Council. The very fact that the Military Staff Committee continues to exist is an indication that the permanent members of the Security Council realize that such United Nations contingents must be created, and that the Military Staff Committee will therefore actually function, as required by the Charter, on matters important to international peace and security.

These are problems that we have to face, and we must fully realize the importance and significance of international security within the Charter system. A special session of the General Assembly should be convened to discuss this subject and enlighten world public opinion of the importance of international security under the United Nations Charter. A most significant aspect of international security, beyond that of protecting nations from unrestrained aggression, is that it would make it possible to halt and reverse

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

the arms race. The Charter system of international security is the only means by which the arms race can be brought to an end and progress in disarmament made a reality. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, after a few introductory paragraphs, strongly recommends, in paragraph 9, that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter. That paragraph is central to the Declaration and is followed by further paragraphs dealing with implementation of Security Council decisions. The Declaration goes on to mention human rights, economic progress and a new economic order. Those aspects, though vitally important, are subsidiary to the international security system. For if there is no international system of security and the arms race continues, wasting more and more resources in its escalation, there can be no resources for development and therefore no new economic order. Consequently, in our efforts to achieve development, we must first bring a halt to the arms race.

The efforts being made to establish zones of peace are highly commendable. We appreciate the statements made by the representative of the Soviet Union regarding the establishment of a zone of peace in the Mediterranean and, particularly, his reference to the importance of safeguarding the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-alignment of Cyprus. Freedom from foreign intervention, unity and, above all, territorial integrity are what every country needs. These will be further ensured in a zone of peace, but even independently of such a zone in the Mediterranean the inalienable rights of Cyprus are indisputable. They must be fully restored and safeguarded by the international community of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter and its resolutions.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

With regard to the relationship of national security to disarmament, a further aspect I wish to point out is that disarmament, according to the Charter, is a process that arises from the Charter system of international security and is dependent on it. This is spelled out clearly in the Charter. Disarmament is not treated separately and can only flow from international security. Article 11 of the Charter states:

"The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments ... "

Thus, the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments come within the purview of the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, whatever is done to achieve disarmament must come within the system of international security under the Charter.

Another article of the Charter which emphasizes this link is Article 26 which states:

"In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments."

Thus, under this article plans for the regulation of armaments should be discussed and formulated by the Security Council with the assistance and advice of the Military Staff Committee as part of the maintenance of international peace and security. Furthermore, Article 47, in reference to the Military Staff Committee's advice to the Security Council on the maintenance of international security and peace, includes the regulation of armaments and possible disarmament as part of international security. Consequently any reference made to disarmament in the Charter is related to and dependent upon the maintenance of international peace and security, the subject of our discussion today. We have to comply with the provisions of the Charter and with the tenor of the

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Declaration on International Security and the resolution on its implementation by stressing the need for compliance with Article 43 of the Charter. In previous years the relevant resolution emphatically asserted this.

I have taken a great deal of time in discussing this subject because it is a vital one and because inadequate attention is paid to it by the General Assembly and in the various disarmament forums. In fact, the interest shown so far is in inverse proportion to the importance of the subject. I hope that measures will be taken at the coming special session on disarmament to promote action towards international security, if need be by a special session on international security.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.