United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

LIBRARY

FIRST COMMITTEE
49th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 2 December 1981
at 3 p.m.

New York

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records*

UN/SA COLLECTION

.14N 1 4 1982

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 49TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

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

Distr. GENERAL A/C.1/36/PV.49 11 January 1982

ENGLISH

^{*} 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.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, L.61; A/C.1/36/3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15; 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. RAKOTONIAIN. (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The Malagasy delegation continues to believe that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is an important document and one that could induce States to act in strict compliance with the principles of the Charter. For reasons of their own, some States unfortunately do not feel that they are bound by the terms of the Declaration. The constant deterioration of the international situation does not seem to have brought about any notable change in their thinking in this regard. For our part, we continue to be convinced that the document provides valuable guidelines for promoting world stability.

Speaking in the Committee last year, my delegation stated its views on the three international problems that we regard as potential sources of latent danger

to peace, in the sense that if no rapid solutions were found acceptable to the members of the international community as a whole, those problems would eventually give rise to frustration and mistrust, which, in turn, would jeopardize the chances of co-operation among States.

At the time, we cited the inability to produce genuine disarmament, the injustice prevailing in international economic relations and the persistence of colonialism in certain regions, as well as the policy of <u>apartheid</u> in South Africa.

We shall not go into detail with regard to the arguments we put forward at that time. We would, for the sake of clarity, simply recall their substance. At that time, we stated that in a situation of domination and exploitation the violence and confrontation that would result from constant friction between oppressor and oppressed would not fail to have an impact on international security. While we urged the rich countries to accept in good faith the democratization of international economic relations, we also drew attention to the dilemma of coexistence or mutual destruction with which States find themselves confronted, given their inability to arrive at disarmament measures at a time when nuclear armaments have increased to such a point that they are capable of destroying the world several times over.

That sad state of contemporary affairs seems even more topical today. Some evolution, of course, has taken place in the emancipation of peoples and in the degree of co-operation among States, but both the nature and the structure of the situation remain fundamentally the same where international security is concerned.

No State can feel secure in view of the worsening of the current international situation and the saturation of military arsenals capable of blowing up and destroying mankind, if only through human error or some purely mechanical malfunction. We are entitled to wonder whether we are not more secure than we might be tomorrow, given the rate at which the arms race is increasing. As a practical conclusion, the arms race must stop and genuine

disarmament must commence, for disarmament is one of the prime factors for the promotion and improvement of international security. The peoples of the world have quite rightly risen up and expressed their anxiety and concern at the constantly increasing international political and military tension.

In order to prevent the tragedy of a nuclear conflagration, it is imperative and urgent that we act together to preserve peace and consolidate international security. Disarmament is a complex task that requires considerable time, and no one can predict when it will come to pass. Efforts, therefore, must be devoted to measures to improve the international climate and to stimulate the quest for broad-based agreement and co-operation. Strict compliance with the principles of the Charter, in our opinion, is a necessary prerequisite for a reversal of this highly dangerous trend in present-day international relations. It would be naive to expect an improvement in international security when such cardinal principles of the Charter as the non-use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of States are disregarded. When we look closely at events on the international scene, we must acknowledge that no region of the world has been spared upheavals capable of degenerating into even more complicated situations. We also realize that the interference of third parties in the internal affairs of others is both the cause and the effect of such developments.

Unrest, friction, hotteds of tension and conflict throughout the world cannot, after all, be spontaneous manifestations. Behind them, one always finds ill-concealed motivations arising out of political and military considerations.

In the Middle East, haggling is taking place over the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, and the territorial integrity of Cyprus has been virtually forgotten. In Asia, scarcely had the wounds of war begun to be tended when other armed conflicts broke out, and the tension there is increasing daily because no account is really being taken of the genuine aspirations of the people. A number of proposals have been made in an attempt to relieve the tension in that region. Among them are those put forward by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and intended, on the one hand, to replace the Armistice Agreement

with a peace treaty and, on the other, to make a beginning towards the peaceful reunification of Korea within a confederated framework. So far, there does not seem to have been any positive reaction to such initiatives, although it seems to us that they could well eliminate the danger of war in that region.

The campaign of slander being waged against Governments whose political choices are not to the liking of certain circles is continuing, to the detriment of good-neighbourliness in Latin America.

On the African continent, South Africa is clinging to Namibia, repressing the black population there by means of its odious system of <u>apartheid</u>, committing aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and occupying a part of its territory. Yet it does so with impunity because certain interests would be threatened were anyone to take it into his head to strike back at the Pretoria régime. Only recently, our brothers in the Seychelles had to repel from their territory the barbarous attacks of mercenaries whose aims, while never acknowledge, could easily be guessed at. Such interventions are inadmissible and call for vigorous measures on the part of the United Nations.

We are profoundly convinced that as long as the short-term interests of States prevail in their decisions on international affairs, it would be illusory to hope for peace, and any arrangement for the strengthening of international security would be precarious. All States, and particularly those bearing special responsibilities because of their material and military power, should immediately and unswervingly start eliminating the factors of division and distrust and, on the other hand, promote trust and co-operation among States. In this belief, my delegation decided to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59, submitted by the Socialist Republic of Romania, on the "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States".

Madagascar, which is an island country, has the advantage and also the disadvantage of not having land boundaries with any other country. Scientific and technological progress in this century has considerably shortened distances and placed our territory in a privileged position, one in which people of virtually every nationality pass through every day. In fact we have as many neighbours as mainland countries have, if not more. For us the concept of good-neighbourliness is no longer limited to the sense customarily attributed to it. Good-neighbourliness, in this context, could promote mutual understanding and the drawing together of peoples, thus facilitating co-operation in the higher interests of all parties.

Under the Charter the concept of international security demands the existence of certain conditions in day-to-day international life. This means that actions contrary to the principles of the Charter cannot fail to erode and undermine world stability, which is sorely needed today at a time of mounting political tension. It also means that individual and collective initiatives should be taken to strengthen and restore stability with a view to achieving global and lasting peace.

Man has demonstrated great intelligence and admirable creativity in taming the atom; but we now have sufficient reason to fear that the control of man's own creation might slip from his hands as if it were a monster invented by a scientist that turned against its own inventor. We firmly hope that man

will show the same intellectual powers to create the conditions necessary for his well-being and security and indeed the survival of his own species.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to convey to you the sincere condolences of the delegation of Mali with regard to the aircraft crash that afflicted your country yesterday.

Being founding members of the Non-Aligned Movement, Yugoslavia and Mali have forged solid bonds of friendship and fraternal co-operation. I am pleased to extend to you the warmest congratulations and the heartiest greetings from the delegation of Mali on your very competent conduct of our debates. In the same spirit, my delegation extends its congratulations to your associates.

If it is true that every people, every nation, every State, approaches problems according to its own sensitivity, its own values, its historical identity and its own concerns of the moment, it is impossible to define the foundations of good-neighbouliness outside the context of the aspirations, the culture and the values of civilization of the nations. It is not only a concept that can be defined in the positive terms of our common humanity whereby we seek our identification with others but it is also the concrete and indivisible expression of mankind's more human development. This is a fundamental issue which we need to resolve together.

Everywhere and always, relations of good-neighbourliness have been perceived as a stabilizing element in human relations, one which covers various fields and functions in a universal or a specific framework, broad or narrow, regional or local, with obvious implications. Without good-neighbourliness there can be no peace; without peace, there can be no security or development.

That truism has made and continues to make an impact on all aspects of human history. However, especially today, almost everywhere peoples, nations, and States are concerned for their security and preoccupied by conflicts, armed or otherwise, and international tension. So there is a growing need to maintain peace and to restore international stability so that attention will not be diverted from the economic and social development of mankind as a whole and so that the international community will be prevented from racing towards its

annihilation. In today's international life, in view of these very threats to the balance and even the survival of the world, relations of good-neighbourliness must be treated as a matter of serious reflection. In this regard, it is a considerable advantage to be able to consider them as a privileged framework, one in which nations, great or small, powerful or weak, take the opportunity to engage in dialogue to settle all questions, in keeping with all other relevant principles of our Organization.

Having the political impact of a fundamental objective, the practice of good-neighbourliness is a basic virtue to which Mali ascribes special importance. Mali has made it an essential element of its foreign policy. It is therefore natural that my country is engaging in this collective consideration of the question of "good-neighbourliness as well as ways and modalities to enhance it, with a view to preventing conflicts and to increasing confidence among States".

Mali's historical identity, forged over the ages, and the need to reconcile traditional African humanism with the efficiency of the modern world continue to derive strength from ethical standards based on dialogue and social consensus, good faith, respect for one's word and other age-old standards which determine the conduct of individuals and communities, including the State.

My country, which has seven borders, has since its independence worked for the introduction, maintenance and strengthening of the principle of good-neighbourliness. It is a fundamental axiom of Mali's conduct in the concert of nations, in a world confronting major difficulties, including the question of survival, at the international, the regional and the subregional level.

The institutionalization of good-neighbourly relations on the political, economic and cultural levels gives proof of our profound determination to work for a just peace for the benefit of neighbouring countries, on a consistent socio-political and juridical basis.

The instruments for implementing good-neighbourly relations are many and varied, and I shall not try to enumerate them here. I shall simply mention

the following. First, there are the regional economic arrangements, such as the Economic Community of West Africa consisting of six neighbouring States: the Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta; and the Community of West African States consisting of 16 countries: Benin, Cape Verde, Ivory Coast, Gambia, Ghana, Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Upper Volta.

Next, there is the Organization of Saharan States, including the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Chad.

There is also the Organization for the Development of the Senegal River, including Mali, Mauritania and Senegal, and the Liptako-Gourma Group, including Upper Volta, Mali and Niger.

The Niger Basin Authority includes the United Republic of Cameroon, the Ivory Coast, the People's Republic of Guinea, Upper Volta, Mali, Niger, Nigeria and Chad.

There are agreements covering administrative assistance between border authorities which bind Mali to all its neighbours. There are joint commissions which every year provide an opportunity bilaterally to assess Mali's co-operation with its neighbours and its other partners.

Regular consultations take place, featuring friendship visits and working visits at the highest level, as well as goodwill missions.

Although set in a historical context, the concept of good neighbourliness is abstract language. It is the language of the features of the human condition. It is the language of universal rationality or man's intelligence.

Without neglecting the philosophical implications of this concept, the delegation of Mali is convinced, at a time when the future of mankind is threatened everywhere by political and economic imbalance which we are all familiar with, the practice of good neighbourliness is and will remain a powerful tool to create, restore and build confidence among States, in particular among neighbouring countries. It is by committing oneself to respect the rules of good neighbourliness that one can hope to maintain security and international stability.

It is by respecting the rules of good neighbourliness that one will surely put an end to conflicts, the disastrous consequences of which are a clear denial of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter to which we have all subscribed.

We have a duty to redouble our efforts to seek together ways and means of reducing and removing the tensions which, directly or indirectly, threaten the life of each of our States. Aside from these moral connotations, and considering today's realities, this vision calls for a clear political will in keeping with the principle of the primacy of the rule of law over force and violence.

Therefore the delegation of Mali is of the view that, as a matter of urgency, we draft an international legal instrument governing good neighbourliness.

The CHAIRMAN: I deeply appreciate the representative of Mali's touching words of condolence on the occasion of the air disaster involving a Yugoslav airliner.

At the same time, I should like to thank him for the kind terms in which he referred to the officers of the Committee and to myself.

Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would like to convey to you and, through you, to the people of Yugoslavia our profound condolences in connexion with the very grave crash of a Yugoslav aircraft at the cost of so many lives.

The consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is taking place this year against a background of sharply heightened tension and a significant growth in the threat of nuclear war. Having made a sharp turn in its policies at the beginning of the 1980s, the United States has undertaken actions which are undermining the foundations of the structure of international security. It has thereby hurled a challenge at the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and other basic decisions of this Organization.

What constitutes the mounting threat to international security at the present time? First of all, it is the result of the United States policy of attaining military supremacy over the Soviet Union and the socialist community, relying on a Position of strength and blackmail in international relations.

This reckless policy takes the practical form of a significant increase in the already excessively inflated military budget of that country and an uncontrolled increase in the new programmes of armaments, particularly nuclear missiles, the intensification of military preparations in various parts of the world and gross interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

At the same time, one hears being bandied about in the United States variants of the idea of preventive use of nuclear weapons, taking advantage of the surprise effect, and other aggressive doctrines.

The United States military strategy at the present time, which allows for the possibility and the acceptability of nuclear war, is in every aspect capable of causing a nuclear disaster. Such an irresponsible approach to the fate of mankind cannot fail to arouse alarm among all sober minded people.

In this respect, we wish to refer to the major significance of the Declaration on the Prevention of a Nuclear Catastrophe recently adopted in the First Committee on the initiative of the Soviet Union. Given the evidence of destabilization in the international situation and the undermining of international security, what strengthening of international security can we possibly talk about when, for example, large scale efforts are being made to deploy new military bases outside the frontiers of the United States? And that is being done at a time when more than 150 large naval and air bases are already deployed around the Soviet Union and the other socialist States. In addition to the American troops who number about 500,000, deployed in 16 countries, new standing armed units are being stationed in the Near and Middle East.

Another blow to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is the aggressive United States policy of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and their subversive actions against national liberation movements. In fact, it is not defence against the mythical Soviet military threat, but rather the aims of neo-colonization of the newly emancipated countries that are promoted by the present and proposed United States military bases throughout the world.

An important area for hegemonistic aims of the United States is Africa. The White House has openly taken under its protection the racists of Pretoria, who have stepped up their aggression against the independent countries of Africa. With the help of South Africa, groups of mercenaries and terrorists have been formed whose aim is the destabilization of the situation in Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States, and the suppression of the national liberation movement in Namibia.

Nor is the United States neglecting Latin America. Direct interference is occurring in the internal affairs of El Salvador, and subversive actions are being undertaken against Nicaragua and the campaign of threats and provocation against the Republic of Cuba is being stepped up.

Together with China, the United States is in effect waging an undeclared war against Afghanistan, interfering in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and pursuing its aggressive policies towards Viet Nam.

Asia, Latin America, Africa - such is the range of the hegemonistic ambitions of Washington.

In the light of the foregoing, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR attaches great significance to the preparation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States. The vital interests of the world community urgently require prompt measures to strengthen peace and international security, and a shift to a sound, realistic course of negotiations on the basis of equity, with renunciation of attempts to disrupt the existing military balance and to dictate one's will to others. It is precisely this that is the aim

of the peace programme for the 1980s adopted by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at its twenty-sixth Congress. As L. I. Brezhnev said at the Congress:

"The measures proposed by us cover a wide range of problems. They concern nuclear missiles and conventional weapons, ground troops and naval and air forces. They relate to the situation in Europe, in the Middle and Near East and the Far East, and they also involve measures of a political and military nature. These measures have one aim and desire in common: to do our utmost to rid the peoples of the world of the threat of nuclear war and to preserve peace on earth."

At the centre of the Soviet initiatives put forward at the Congress is the question of further measures to strengthen peace in Europe. In considering the question of the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the majority of delegations in the First Committee have steadfastly indicated that the situation in Europe is an important element for stability throughout the world. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and its system of confidence-building measures have become a significant stage towards the solution of the tasks indicated in the Declaration. The new Soviet proposals are also an important contribution to the implementation of the aims of the Declaration.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR welcomes the start in Geneva of Soviet-American negotiations on the reduction of medium-range nuclear systems in Europe. Of course, one can hope for the successful outcome of those negotiations only if the questions are resolved after all relevant factors have been taken into account and on the basis of equality and of equal security for both sides. As was emphasized recently by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, V. V. Shcherbitsky:

"Our people wants peace in conditions of equality and equal security. That is why we advocate negotiations with the United States and strive for the reduction of armaments."

One of the most important tasks of our day is the elimination of existing hotbeds of international conflict and their prevention in the future. The socialist countries advocate the strengthening of international security not only in Europe but throughout the world, both in the Near East, where it is high time for a return to honest collective efforts for a comprehensive and just settlement, and in the Middle East, in the region of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, and in southern Africa. Furthermore, it was concern for the preservation of peace in such an important area as the Far East that motivated the Soviet proposal for the application there of confidence-building measures in the military sphere. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR entirely supports the initiative of the Mongolian People's Republic for the conclusion of a convention on non-aggression and the non-use of force among the States of Asia and

the Pacific. We have consistently advocated the normalization of the situation on the Korean peninsula and the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, and we express our solidarity with the struggle of the Korean Democratic People's Republic to unify Korea on a peaceful democratic basis without interference from outside. The relevant proposals of the Korean Democratic People's Republic are a sound basis for the solution of these problems.

The constructive and concrete peace initiatives of socialism contrast with the policies of unrestrained heightening of tension and of brinkmanship pursued by the ruling circles of the United States.

In the recent past the Western Powers have sought to justify these adventuristic policies by attempting, as it were, to "link" the consideration of international problems such as disarmament and détente measures with various events occurring in the international arena. We can also discern a tendency to blame the socialist countries for any development in the world which is not to the liking of the Western Powers.

For instance, the efforts of the Western Powers to describe the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia or Palestine as "international terrorism" and to present matters as though, in extending support to them, the Soviet Union was supposedly acting on the side of terrorists will not withstand critical analysis. That struggle, as is well known, is recognized as a lawful one in United Nations decisions and is the legitimate reaction of peoples to the policies of aggression and the preservation of colonialism, neocolonialism and apartheid pursued by the imperialist Powers and the racists.

In conclusion, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers it necessary that the United Nations should do its utmost to perform its central task - the strengthening of international peace and security - and that the General Assembly should, in adopting this year a resolution on the matter, resolutely call for a positive solution of pressing international problems and draw attention to the need for an active and thorough dialogue and negotiations in all forms and at all levels, including the highest, for the development of urgent joint action to reduce the threat of war, to curb the arms race and to ensure world peace.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for the touching words of condolence he addressed to the people of Yugoslavia on the occasion of the tragedy of the air disaster.

Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, before I speak on the item in question, allow me on behalf of the Chinese delegation to express our profound sympathy and condolences with regard to the air disaster that has befallen Yugoslavia.

There are two items - Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States, and Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security - on today's agenda, and I should like to state the views of the Chinese delegation.

To oppose and put an end to wars of aggression, to safeguard international peace and security, to establish good-neighbourly relations between States is the urgent desire of the people of the entire world. The thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly this year has had a positive debate on the question of safeguarding international peace and security. By forcefully condemning the acts of aggression and interference committed directly or indirectly by the super-Powers, by standing up for what is just and what is right, this debate has served to uphold the solemnity of the United Nations Charter.

The draft resolution which is before the First Committee on the question of development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States in document $\Lambda/C.1/36/L.59$ reaffirms the rejection of any acts seeking to establish zones of influence or domination.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60 on the question of strengthening international security points out that it is recourse to the threat or use of force, intervention, interference, aggression and foreign occupation and tendencies to divide the world into spheres of influence and domination by big Powers and blocs, as well as colonialism and racism, that endanger and undermine international peace and security. It reaffirms again the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist régimes and urges Member States to increase their support for and solidarity with their national liberation movements.

The draft resolution on non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the annexed draft declaration in document A/C.1/36/L.61 call on all foreign forces engaged in military occupation, intervention or interference to withdraw completely to their own territories. They declare that it is the duty of States to refrain from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing internationally recognized boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government. They further declare that it is the right and duty of States not to recognize situations brought about by the threat or use of force or acts undertaken in contravention of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference. All these are positive provisions in the context of safeguarding international peace and security.

In spite of the annual debate at the United Nations in recent years on the question of strengthening international security, regrettably international security has not only not been strengthened, but the international situation has become even more tense and turbulent. Old problems have not been solved while new ones continue to crop up. Now why is that?

It is because the two super-Powers are intensifying their rivalry for hegemony throughout the world. The arms race continues unabated because both of them are trying to build up their military strength. They are also stepping up their acts of aggression, interference and subversion in various parts of the world. All of these have undermined international security and good-neighbourliness between States, and the third-world countries are the ones which directly suffer the most.

One super-Power is trying stubbornly to maintain the old order and jealously guarding its vested interests. It aids and abets the Israeli expansionists and the South African racists, thereby setting itself against the Arab and African peoples. Israel has flagrantly attacked the nuclear reactor of Iraq, repeatedly invaded Lebanon and continues to occupy the territories of Arab countries. The South African racist régime defies the resolutions of the United Nations, continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and repeatedly launches attacks against the front-line States. That they have been so arrogant and truculent in trampling upon the norms of international relations is inseparable from the support and connivance of the super-Power. This super-Power also refuses to withdraw its military forces from South Korea, thereby obstructing the peaceful reunification of Korea and producing an adverse impact on peace and security in North-East Asia.

The other super-Power, riding on the momentum of its expansion, is extremely adventurous and constitutes the most serious threat to international security. Its all-out programme of arms expansion is aimed at obtaining an over-all military superiority over the West. It is stepping up its preparations for fighting different types of war and developing its nuclear and conventional weapons. Backed by its nuclear blackmail, it carries out aggression and unbridled expansion by means of its conventional forces. Not satisfied with the large tracts of territories of neighbouring countries that it already occupies, it is still trying by every possible means to expand its own sphere of influence. It even went as far as dispatching a large army to invade and occupy a weak, small, neighbouring country. It is now deploying for aggression

throughout the world, but the focus of its strategy is in Europe. It is creating tension by deploying large numbers of troops and new weapons on the eastern and western fronts and by carrying out frequent military manoeuvres in a show of force.

In its southward drive for the purpose of grabbing places of strategic importance and of controlling the sea lanes in the Gulf region in order to outflank Europe from the Middle East and Africa, it always avoids where the strength is and goes for the soft underbelly of those regions. It is also stepping up its infiltration and expansion in Latin America.

This super-Power is extremely sophisticated and cunning in its tactics for pursuing the hegemonic policy of aggression and expansion. It is very adept at carrying out armed aggression under the smokescreen of peace. It has created the theory of "limited sovereignty" and invaded a member of the socialist community in the name of "preventing counterrevolutionary restoration and of protecting the fruits of socialism". It is at this moment threatening another European ally for similar reasons. Resorting to the pretext of responding to the so-called invitation of puppet régimes and of fulfilling obligations under so-called treaties of friendship and co-operation, it murders the leaders of lawful Governments and invades and occupies independent and sovereign countries. Sometimes it hides behind the scenes and instigates and supports others to fight a surrogate war. It describes its aggression against other countries as the "internal affairs" of those countries, while vilifying the righteous acts of others in opposing aggression and supporting each other as "outside interference". It is customary for this super-Power to resort to such hegemonist logic, which is a complete reversal of what is right and what is wrong.

Hegemonism is the mair culprit for undermining international security and good-neighbourliness among States and the source of international tension, Be it global or regional hegemonism, they are both wildly ambitious and bent on expansion everywhere. With the building up of its military strength, hegemonism is becoming more and more ambitious in its expansion. As a result there has been an uninterrupted series of incidents of aggression of varying scale.

More and more people have come to realize that, in order to safeguard international security, its is necessary to oppose hegemonism. On the eve of the Second World War some countries did not discern in time where the threat of war was coming from and, therefore, failed to unite effectively to cope with such a threat. In the end the peoples of the world paid a heavy price.

That bitter lesson of history teaches us that appeasement will only breed trouble, that aggressors will never lay down their arms of their own accord and that peace can be attained not by begging but by the united struggle of the people of the world.

The correct way to strengthen international peace and security and good-neighbourliness among States is for the people of the world to unite and wage a resolute struggle against the hegemonists, who are undermining international peace and security.

The present session of the United Nations General Assembly has adopted by the overwhelming majority of more than 100 votes two resolutions, calling, respectively, for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan, and for the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea. Those resolutions once again reflect the just position and determination of the international community to safeguard international security.

It is ludicrous for the hegemonists to clamour about a so-called China threat in an attempt to escape condemnation and to distract attention. China does not seek hegemony; China does not have a single soldier or any military base on foreign soil. The guiding principle of China's foreign policy is to oppose hegemonism and to sameguard world peace. The people of China has long suffered from wars of aggression and, therefore, deeply appreciates the value of peace. The people of China requires an environment of lasting international peace for its socialist modernization. China has always advocated that relations among States and among neighbours should be based on the five principles of: mutual respect of sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

China is prepared to do its share for the strengthening of international security and for good-neighbourliness among States.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to express my deep appreciation to the representative of China for his touching words of condolence on the occasion of the air disaster and the ensuing human loss suffered by the people of Yugoslavia.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, may I convey to you the condolences of the delegation of Bulgaria on the disaster involving a Yugoslav aircraft. We join in the expressions of sympathy for the Yugoslav people and the families of those who were killed.

The present session's debate on the strengthening of international security takes place at a time when the international situation has been complicated by some very disturbing trends. The policies of the imperialist and hegemonist forces have seriously aggravated international tension by heightening the risk of military adventures. In the policies of certain imperialist Powers, once again the techniques resorted to have been taken from the arsenal of the cold war and the policy based on a position of strength.

In this connexion, there is a real danger that the realistic political approach that characterized the 1970s will be replaced by an inappropriate, unbalanced approach to problems of international relations. The thinlydisguised intent of the United States to obtain military superiority is a clear expression of these trends. Allegations that this is a matter of restoring a supposed breakdown in the military balance have no foundation whatsoever. Attempts to pollute the political environment by hysterical campaigns about alleged "Soviet military superiority" have proven many times in the past to be totally groundless. The United States scarcely conceals its plans to obtain the military superiority that would allow it unilaterally to impose its solutions to international problems from a position of strength. That policy is a threat to international peace and security and, in particular, to the security of the countries of the third world. The temptation to settle disputes by force could set off an uncontrollable chain reaction which, in turn, might ultimately lead to the destruction of human civilization. The psychosis thus fanned has created a climate of distrust and forced States to divert ever-growing funds to military purposes, to the detriment of their socio-economic development.

Haturally, as has frequently been stressed in this Committee, the thesis that an arms build—up could contribute to the strengthening of international security is unacceptable. Every action in this field produces a counter—reaction. Moreover, threats to security inevitably lead to respective defensive counter—measures. A new spiral in the arms race would ultimately raise the level of existing insecurity. Qualitative technological improvements in this area would only increase uncertainties over concepts of defence and create growing difficulties in the limitation of the absurd arms race. That is why there remains only one way to strengthen security in the world. And that is arms limitation and their substantial reduction until the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

The establishment of appropriate co-operation in this field requires systematic efforts to overcome the danger of anti-communism, with its primitive paranoia, winning the day. This kind of co-operation presupposes respect for the principle of equal security and of the legitimate interests of the opposing side. The specific path towards such co-operation involves contacts and the beginning of a dialogue to achieve mutually acceptable understandings on outstanding issues and the key questions of the strengthening of peace and security.

At the international meeting on détente, held in Sofia last May, the Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, reflecting the profoundest aspirations of the Bulgarian people to contribute to the success of the struggle for peace, stressed that peace can only be ensured by joint efforts and the goodwill of all countries. He stated, in particular, the following:

"Everyone must make a contribution; everyone must follow the path leading to this most noble goal. That is why dialogue - broad and constructive dialogue, dialogue conducted with goodwill and on the basis of equal rights and mutual advantage - today represents the best means of achieving a solution to the problems of every State and of all mankind."

31

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

In this connexion the Bulgarian delegation notes with satisfaction the opening of the Soviet-American dialogue in Geneva. We are thoroughly convinced of the need for this first step to be followed by others, which would unquestionably contribute to the strengthening of confidence, to the stability of the international situation and to security throughout the world. We note with satisfaction also the adoption by our Committee of important draft resolutions which once again bear witness to the interest of the overwhelming majority of States in working in a constructive and co-operative spirit to resolve the urgent problems that confront mankind today. Among these documents the Declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and the draft resolution on the conclusion of an international treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, which was adopted on the proposal of the Soviet Union, have a special place. Agreement on practical measures set forth in other resolutions on disarmament could also contribute to the strengthening of international security. In this regard we attach particular importance to the forthcoming special session devoted to disarmament.

It is well known that the strengthening of international security is closely linked with the elimination of tension in several of the world's sensitive areas. Here mention should be made of the gravity of the problem of the Middle East. Political developments in that area have shown that separate bargaining of the Camp David type, far from being effective, ultimately only complicates a situation. The United States-Israeli Agreement on strategic co-operation, which has just been signed, will in practice only encourage the aggressor. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is firmly convinced that a comprehensive solution of this problem on an equitable and realistic basis can only be achieved with the combined efforts of all the parties concerned in the context of an appropriate international conference with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

We support the just struggle of the People's Republic of Korea and the Korean people for the peaceful reunification of their country, free of foreign interference.

As the recent aggressive acts of the racists in Pretoria against the People's Republic of Angola have shown, the conflict in southern Africa is spreading. That situation makes it incumbent upon the United Nations to take action and impose comprehensive sanctions on Pretoria, thus compelling South African racists to bow to the frequently expressed will of the international community.

The escalation in the campaign of threats and pressure unleashed recently by the United States against the Republic of Cuba is also deeply disturbing. That dangerous game playing with fire and the policy of blackmailing other States in the area must be stopped.

Ten years ago the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security began to play a useful role in United Nations efforts to consolidate a system of international and political legal norms governing relations among States.

The draft declaration prepared by the non-aligned countries on non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States and other important documents now being prepared are most timely.

The question of strengthening the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in international relations continues to be particularly relevant. My country is working actively within the framework of the Special Committee on the preparation of a world-wide agreement on the non-use of force.

The above-mentioned documents unambiguously reaffirm the role of the United Nations, and in particular its principal organs, in the search for effective means to solve the problems confronting mankind. According to the United Nations Charter, the Security Council has a special responsibility in this regard since it is responsible for the preservation of international peace and security. In the opinion of my delegation - and we are quite convinced of this - a special meeting of the Security Council at the highest level would give the desired momentum to the Council's efforts to bring about a lasting, mutually acceptable solution to critical situations and potential conflicts.

As part of the effort to strengthen international security at the global level, stress should be laid on measures to strengthen security in the various regions of the world. It goes without saying that the sense of initiative of concerned regions is of primary importance if such measures are to be effective. We are convinced that progress in efforts to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and in the search for political solutions to situations in the region of the Persian Gulf, in South East Asia, in the Middle East and elsewhere can be achieved only if there is respect for the legitimate interests of the countries concerned. We believe that progress of that kind would be a notable contribution to the strengthening of peace and security throughout the world.

As a part of Europe, my country is keenly interested in the strengthening of security on the old continent. Within the framework of the Madrid Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, we are making every effort to ensure the adoption of practical action to implement the Final Act of Helsinki, while we attach primary importance to the convening of a European conference on military détente and disarmament.

The proposals of the countries of the socialist community at the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe in our opinion constitute a constructive basis to get the current negotiations out of the impasse that has come about because of the attitude of the Western side.

As a Balkan country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches particular importance to the situation in the Balkans and to the development of its relations with the other countries of the area. My country's consistent policy of principle in support of peace, mutual understanding and co-operation fully accords with the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. At the twelfth congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, guided by the principles of the Final Act of Helsinki, expressed its will to sign with neighbouring countries bilateral agreements concerning a code of relations of good-neighbourliness, mutual renunciation of territorial

claims and a ban on the use of the territories of contracting parties for mutually hostile acts and purposes. A number of other ideas were given concrete form by the twelfth congress as regards the extension of bilateral co-operation and the pursuit of multilateral Balkan co-operation in matters of common interest, in those concrete areas on which an understanding already exists.

In his statement to the solemn meeting devoted to the 1,300th anniversary of the founding of the Bulgarian State, the President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, gave new expression to our constructive policy regarding the Balkans. He stated:

We warmly support the idea of making the Balkans a nuclear-free zone. We propose to organize next year in Sofia a meeting of Balkan Heads of State devoted to this problem. The transformation of the Balkans into a denuclearized zone would meet the interests of our peoples. It would be an essential contribution to a healthier international climate, to making Europe a continent free of nuclear weapons, and it would be a further victory for peace."

Those are the positions of principle that have guided and will continue to guide the foreign policy of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in collective efforts within the United Nations fully to implement the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to express my deep appreciation to the representative of Bulgaria for the touching words of condolences to the people of Yugoslavia and to the families of those who were victims of the air disaster.

Mr. HELLER (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like first, on behalf of the delegation of Mexico, to convey my sympathy to and solidarity with the Yugoslav people in connexion with the recent crash of a Yugoslav mircraft.

The purpose of my statement is to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42, a revised draft in document A/C.1/36/L.42/Rev.1. The revised draft is the result of intensive consultations on a subject of particular significance to the international community. As delegations will note, some changes have been made in the preamble and in the operative part of the text. The second paragraph of the preamble now contains a reference to the SALT I agreement,, and more substantive changes have been made in the operative part. Operative paragraph 1: "Notes that the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT III) has not yet been ratified".

Operative paragraph 2:"Urges that the process begun by the SALT I Treaty and signature of the SALT II Treaty should continue and be built upon", that is, used as a basis for further progress.

Operative paragraph 3:"Trusts that the signatory States will continue to refrain from any act which would defeat the object and purpose of that process".

Operative paragraph 4: "Urges the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with reference to resolutions 34/87 F of 11 December 1979 and 35/156 of 12 December 1980, to pursue negotiations, in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, looking toward the achievement of an agreement which will provide for substantial reductions and significant qualitative limitations of strategic arms".

Operative paragraph 5: "Welcomes the commencement of negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland on 30 November 1981 between representatives of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on nuclear arms control in accordance with the joint communiqué issued by Secretary of State Haig and Foreign Minister Gromyko on 23 September 1981 ...". The two

(Mr. Heller, Mexico)

representatives had exchanged views on arms control embracing weapons which had previously been discussed by representatives of the two countries. The communique at that time stated that both countries attached great significance to the importance of the negotiations and would do their utmost to achieve an appropriate agreement.

Operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 essentially involve renumbering more than anything else. Operative paragraph 6: "Stresses the need that both parties bear constantly in mind that not only their national interests but also the vital interests of all the peoples of the world are at stake".

Operative paragraph 7: "Invites the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to keep the General Assembly appropriately informed of the results of their negotiations, in conformity with the provision of paragraphs 27 and 114 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

Operative paragraph 8, the last paragraph: "Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled 'Strategic arms limitation talks'."

The sponsors of the revised draft resolution hope that it can be adopted without vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to express my deep appreciation to the representative of Mexico for his expression of condolences to and solidarity with the people of Yugoslavia.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): A careful examination of international society as it is developing shows that, like national societies, it is engaged in a continuing search for peace, security, cohesion and development.

The subjects involved in this long-term venture - States, organizations and individuals - have as their prime task the strengthening and improvement of the framework of the good relations they have established among themselves. They also must devise other contributions of adequate number and quality to serve the legal and other structures set up for the same purpose.

It would not be superfluous to add that a deliberate political will to promote peaceful coexistence, non-aggression and the negotiated settlement of disputes, designed to minimize as far as possible anything that could be a threat to international peace and security, is a condition that would be conducive to the establishment of a world of harmony and a world determined to turn its back on war and other war-like manifestations, such as political or economic imperialism and policies of colonial or racial domination.

However, the disregard on the part of some of the major actors in the international political game, and sometimes even their scorn, for the machinery referred to in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security or for the principle of good-neighbourliness provides us today with the sad picture of a world which has lost its bearings and which no longer believes in dialogue and concerted agreement, because of generalized distrust of partners and of options resting exclusively on violence and comparative strength.

We are not referring only to the presumed chronic crises such as those of the Middle East, southern Africa, Central Europe, certain parts of Asia, such as Korea, and Latin America, for example. Also implied are other latent crises which could break out at any time, resulting from a deterioration of political theory and practice, which the founders of the United Nations thought they could rescue from the deadly alternative of war or peace. The situation is characterized by the high level of distrust resulting from policies wedded in advance to the language of force and very sparing in measures likely to create confidence.

That would seem to apply to the great Powers more than others not only because they are legally bound by special obligations or possess special responsibilities for peace and security, but also because of their power of setting the example and, if you like, their freedom of manoeuvre.

While giving due credit for the meritorious efforts made here and there to circumscribe certain so-called localized crises and promote, if not actions, at least a clear awareness of the stakes and dangers involved, we have to wonder about the role of a dynamic and responsible Security Council in the present circumstances, a role broadly described in the Sixth Committee in connexion with the proposals put forward by the non-aligned countries for strengthening the role of the Organization in the world.

The virtually incurable disease of political, economic and military power is domination. It is that which leads it to take upon itself the right to carve out zones of influence and divide the world into friends and enemies. With domination, the sphere of international law shrinks before our very eyes as the interests of imperial power merge with those of the international community, and the cardinal principles of the equality and sovereignty of States are nonchalantly trampled underfoot.

Democracy suffers a severe setback in dominated countries and regions, where, to the expression of the popular will and the free exercise of the attributes of sovereignty must be added an imponderable, namely, the pressure of transnational corporations and of strategies of "strategic consensus", representing an outright challenge to the principle of non-alignment.

According to certain theories that have really nothing to do with the coming of an international society based on tolerance and on co-operation guided by mutual interest and by principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of others, we are given to understand that even human rights should not be defended as such, but only in the light of the precise interests to be promoted.

In this order of things, there would supposedly be "totalitarian" régimes to be overthrown at all costs and mere "authoritarian" régimes that could be supported and abetted by every possible means.

A particular illustration of such a world view was given this summer in the Security Council when South Africa, a fascist country if ever there was one, found itself accorded attenuating circumstances after having perpetrated a deliberate act of aggression against a sovereign State, the People's Republic of Angola.

Such cases are not only regrettable because those responsible are permanent members of the Security Council; they also give rise to disquiet with regard to the future fate of the rules of law in international relations.

So soon after the United Nations adopted what is after all an operational definition of aggression, capable of settling certain clear problems in keeping with the spirit of the Charter, it is unfortunately still possible not only for an act of aggression to be perpetrated - which is not surprising in itself - but also for it to be denied, even when its author has claimed credit for it and it has been proved by its manifestations.

We could continue our enumeration of like aberrations, the intended victim of which is international peace and security. Thus, we could stigmatize the notion of vital national interests, the main characteristic of which is that they be outside the limits of the national territory of the imperial Power; just as we could stigmatize its corollary, the right to intervene in defence of those interests, with an interpretation of a self-defence that is wholly alien to the terms of Article 51 of the Charter.

Ideological prejudices should neither mask nor defer the need to make certain choices in order to spare a large part of mankind from needless suffering. The elimination of all forms of colonial or racial domination is one such need.

As to the objective of decolonization, it requires the participation of all peoples in formulating and guiding their own destiny. A contrario, every colonial situation is one in which violence is either latent or evert, as is the case in southern Africa.

South Africa is a permanent source of danger to international peace and security, not only because of its manoeuvres to perpetuate its illegal and harmful presence in Namibia, a territory under United Nations authority, but also because of the fascist nature of the <u>apartheid</u> régime, which, as everyone knows, the United Nations has branded as a crime against humanity.

Regardless of ideological or geo-strategic considerations, there can be no excuse for the perpetuation of such a régime, based as it is on colonial or racial oppression, nor for deferring the need to struggle by every means towards the eradication of this gangrene.

We must stress the respect and support we accord to all those men and women who are fighting under such conditions, weapons in hand, as the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations are doing, for the recovery of their dignity and the restoration of peace and justice to their country, in short, for the defence of the ideals and basic rights of man.

In such circumstances, a policy of peaceful coexistence with South Africa cannot in any way signify for us paying tribute to the policy of <u>apartheid</u>. On the contrary, South Africa must first demonstrate its real desire to return to the comity of free nations by abolishing its iniquitous system of <u>apartheid</u> before it aspires to any understanding whatever.

The maintenance of the system of <u>apartheid</u> coupled with a policy of indiscriminate aggression, of which certain neighbouring African States are the principal victims, must be regarded by the international community as a permanent threat to universal peace and security. The increasing militarization of South Africa with the benevolent support, if not the complicity, of certain countries that are deriving strategic and economic benefits therefrom, is an aberration with harmful consequences that the world will sooner or later discover.

In any event, South Africa, constantly seeking occasions for aggression against independent African States, furnished evidence of its basically war-mongering attitude only a few days ago when, on 25 November, a horde of mercenaries was dispatched against the Seychelles, a country member of the Organization of African Unity and of the United Nations.

My Government has vigorously condemned that barbarous act of aggression, which shows yet again that international imperialism will stoop to any vileness, including violation of the norms of international law, in order to achieve its ends. The phenomenon of mercenaries is an essentially imperialistic act, marked by the recruitment, financing and organization of networks of mercenaries designed to obtain by illegal and criminal means what cannot be obtained normally, namely, the subjugation of States and peoples that jealously defend their sovereignty and independence.

The Organization of African Unity has already adopted a convention branding as outlaws the mercenaries who have in recent years been particularly active in the African continent. It is high time the United Nations took the same position. We know that in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Sixth Committee, which is seized of this problem, many delegations have attempted to make this hope a reality.

To return to the situation in the Seychelles, we must express our thanks to those States that have unequivocally condemned the barbarous act committed against that small country and have offered to the Government of the Seychelles material aid to enable it to meet any new aggression.

The situation in the Seychelles is a cause for concern because that country remains subject to the constant violation of its territorial integrity and to threats that clearly indicate that the enemies of its independence, far from disarming, remain ready to strike again.

If South Africa truly wishes to avoid the condemnation of the international community it is incurring, it must undertake to extradite those mercenaries, as the Government of the Seychelles has requested, in order that they can be judged, as they should be, for what they are, namely, war criminals.

One of the basic elements of international relations today is the great multiplicity of situations and problems which in one way or another are capable of jeopardizing the ability of society to live in peace. The regional approach to problems has always been favoured by the Congolese Government, which, as everyone knows, has committed itself to international harmony. For the People's Republic of the Congo, the true peace experienced by its people is particularly applicable to the African continent and to central Africa.

President Sassou-Nguesso attaches particular value to the continual strengthening of relations of good neighbourliness, which for at least a decade have led the Congo to play a primary role in the solution of disputes between sister States.

Good neighbourliness, which implies peaceful coexistence among countries with different or similar economic, political and social systems, is a notion essentially fertile in its implementation. It includes the cultural dimension of relations between peoples, thereby constituting a reliable guarantee for peace and progress through consultation and exchanges of views.

For the weak countries that are slow to develop, good neighbourliness is a symbol of union and thus of strength, and it can have an important deterrent effect, just as it can, through complementarity, establish an objective or functional network of alliances.

In that context, let us state our concern with regard to Chad, a sister State of central Africa, which we had always hoped to see safe from covetousness by others. An excessive desire on the part of certain neighbours to interfere in the internal affairs of Chad still provides an opportunity for outside Powers to bring in their Trojan horses which could only prolong the distress of a people which aspires to unity and to peace, for which it has paid a high price.

It is not that we suspect every interest shown in Chad to be suspect, but suspicion cannot be absent unless those involved deal directly with the legal Government of the country and not with a splinter group that has broken away from it. We hope that the Organization of African Unity will prove equal to this important mission, which calls for action its part to consolidate peace and security in that sensitive area of the African continent.

With regard to relations with other sister States, my country is honoured to have special economic relations that have been formed over the years with fellow members of the Economic and Customs Union of Central Africa and aslo such special relations with all others for whom it provides transit for moods and in other cases where personal exchanges considerably improve the climate of trust which prevails in spite of certain inevitable misunderstandings.

External trouble-makers, particularly those who blame the socialist States for anything that might go wrong in other States, have been able to realize, through the opening of the borders of the Congo to allow the flow of persons to and from neighbouring countries, that not only was it practically impossible for the Congo to support hordes of trouble-makers but such a policy was not even among the peaceful options of our people, our party and our Government.

In fact, the Congolese have always felt and still feel that their country cannot make progress unless there is progress and development in other neighbouring countries and that everything should be done to give substance to such a good-neighbourly approach.

The Congo has always expressed the idea and nurtured the conviction that its revolution was not an exportable commodity. It is for itself alone primarily that the Congolese people has undertaken to transform the structures of its society and to adapt them to the evolution it intends to impart to its own history. My country has not spared time, effort or resources in effecting a reconciliation with sister States as required by the state of bilateral relations, thus systematically and permanently contributing to peace in the region.

Clearly, the troubles that have occurred in the region have always been the results of the actions of imperialism, which, desirous above all of exploiting the wealth of the soil and subsoil of central Africa, loses no opportunity to good divisive elements and indeed to create them itself.

Whether or not they be institutional, whether in the Joint Co-operation Committee or on an informal basis, the relations of the People's Republic of the Congo with Zaire, Cameroon, Gabon, Angola, Sao Tome and Principe, Equatorial Guinea, Central Africa, Chad, Rwanda and Burundi, for example, come within the same spirit of non-interference and natural complementarity.

More than ever, the fact that our countries belong to the United Nations should be seen not in defensive terms, as regards supposed mortal enemies existing in the imaginations of those who lust for power, but in the constructive terms of those struggling for the ideals and principles of the Charter, strengthened by the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

This year, as we are celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the Non-Aligned Movement, that movement is proposing once again that the whole world, which is divided into antagonistic camps and in the grip of the demon of distrust, should adopt a declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other States. We hope that this initiative, which my country firmly supports, will help to contribute to heightened vigilance on the part of individuals and States with regard to their mission whose purpose it is to build the world and not to destroy it.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.