

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records*



DEC 10 1984

FIRST COMMITTEE
57th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 4 December 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 67: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 68: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 69: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 143: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF STATE TERRORISM AND ANY ACTIONS BY STATES AIMED AT UNDERMINING THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM IN OTHER SOVEREIGN STATES (continued)

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.1/39/PV.57
5 December 1984

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 67 TO 69 AND 143 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. DORN (Suriname): Mr. Chairman, my delegation appreciates the effective way in which you are conducting the deliberations of our Committee. Under your able guidance this Committee will successfully complete its task within the time limit.

The deliberations on the security items take place against the background of a tense and deteriorating international situation that is of grave concern to the whole international community, a situation that does not show any promise of a relaxation of the prevailing tension.

When the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security by consensus at its twenty-fifth session, it had hoped that that document would serve as an instrument for the creation of favourable conditions for the attainment of a lasting peace, since the provisions of that Declaration can be considered as a supplement to the Charter of the United Nations. During each of the successive sessions, the General Assembly adopted resolutions reaffirming the principles and purposes of that important Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. In those resolutions the General Assembly noted with grave concern that many of the principles of the Declaration had been ignored or violated, in particular the principles of national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-intervention, non-interference in internal affairs of States, recourse to the threat or use of force and threats to international peace and security.

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

In paragraph 6 of resolution 38/190, the General Assembly once more urged:

"... all States to abide strictly, in their international relations, by their commitment to the Charter and, to this end:

"(a) To refrain from the use or threat of use of force, intervention, interference, aggression, foreign occupation and colonial domination or measures of political and economic coercion which violate the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and security of other States or their right freely to dispose of their natural resources;

"(b) To refrain from supporting or encouraging any such act for any reason whatsoever and to reject and refuse recognition of situations brought about by any such act."

My delegation regrets to observe that many Member States fail to comply with obligations solemnly assumed under the Charter because of their lack of the political will.

My delegation also regrets that owing to differing opinions the regional groups could not agree on the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of exploring ways and means of implementing the said provisions. Consequently, the decision of the General Assembly in its resolution 38/191 to establish the said Committee could not be realized.

My delegation welcomes the replies received from seven Member States and hopes that the report called for in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 38/191 will be submitted in due course.

If we look at the behaviour of some States - how easily they resort to the actual use of force - one might wonder if it is not time for the United Nations to redefine more precisely the principle of non-use of force. Having said that, we are aware that some States have a broad concept of the use of force, assuming that their acts are consistent with the right of self-defence while they are the aggressors.

Force is not known only as military might but also in other subtle forms which are experienced as interference in the internal affairs of other States. The interference is manifested in various forms and ways. Interventions are carried out in the political, economic and sometimes cultural fields.

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

One way of interfering politically in the internal affairs of States is through the use of mercenaries. These mercenaries are trained and financed by neo-colonialist countries; they are recruited locally or abroad to take part in hostile activities with the aim of violating the territorial integrity of sovereign States by armed violence, endangering the lives of innocent people while doing so. The ultimate goal is to destabilize the Governments of certain countries.

The maintenance of peace and security will not be facilitated without a restructuring of the unjust international economic order. Ten years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, the international economic situation is unchanged, with the majority of developing countries still in a state of underdevelopment and poverty.

In order to obtain the necessary funds for their economic development most developing countries have to apply for loans from financial institutions and industrialized countries. The conditions imposed by the financial institutions are of such a nature that, if accepted by the developing countries, they would result in labour unrest and violence - a situation which is not conducive to the promotion of peace. Furthermore, developing States are confronted with measures by industrialized countries and financial institutions which they view as economic sabotage.

As producers of raw materials, developing States do not always get a fair share of what they export. As a result of their lack of expertise and control of market channels, they are often forced to conclude contracts with multinationals which eventually turn out to be disadvantageous.

The principles of the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes, territorial integrity and the sovereignty of States are the pillars of the collective security system. As Member States it is our task to improve the international climate, and we are in total agreement with the Secretary-General when he says that we should ask ourselves what useful steps can be taken in a given situation rather than start to think of all the extraneous reasons why they cannot be taken.

We are of the opinion that abiding by the principles laid down in the Charter - such as non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, non-intervention, sovereign equality of all States and the peaceful settlement of disputes - will not only certainly lead to improvement in the present situation but will also enhance international understanding and co-operation.

Mr. MLLOJA (Albania): The agenda item on the strengthening of international security, which is now under discussion in this Committee, is of particular importance, because it is related directly to the highest aspirations of peoples for freedom, independence and national sovereignty. But, regrettably, we note that, despite the fact that this problem is being discussed for years in succession, there has not been any real positive progress in this respect. The course of events from the last session of the United Nations General Assembly testifies to this.

It is an undeniable fact that the international situation is fraught with numerous tensions and conflicts which pose a real threat to the peoples' freedom, independence and world peace. The two super-Powers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, bear the responsibility for this situation, which is the result of their policy of imperialist domination and exploitation.

In all regions of the world - Europe, the Balkans, Africa, Latin America and Asia - not a single step has been made towards the strengthening of international security. On the contrary, new elements have been added, further increasing tensions and the threat to international security.

(Mr. Mlloja, Albania)

There has been much talk of European "security" and "co-operation" since 1975, when the Act of Helsinki was signed. At that time its protagonists, the United States of America and the Soviet Union attributed to it almost magic values. Since that time meeting after meeting has been held on this subject, but what has come of all this? Nothing good for the genuine security desired by all peoples. As foreseen by our Government, this demagogic farce aims at consolidating the super-Powers' domination in their zones of interest, in keeping with their hegomonistic policy to the detriment of the European peoples. This European "security" could not prevent the new round of the military build-up in Europe, the deployment of new arsenals of conventional and nuclear weapons in the East and in the West of Europe. One may rightly ask: what has come of all those bilateral and multilateral treaties and agreements on the prevention or limitation of this or that weapon? Have they served international security? The reality leaves no room for any comment.

The same can be said about international security in other regions of the world. There is hardly any tension or conflict in any part of the world that is not manipulated overtly or covertly by the super-Powers. These tensions and conflicts constitute a real threat to world security.

The increase of the military presence of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean, Indian Ocean, Persian Gulf and elsewhere does not serve international security. The reinforced Soviet and American fleets which criss-cross the oceans and seas of the world do not bring security and peace. On the contrary, they bear aggression and war. Their continuous military manoeuvres cannot be taken as acts of peace and security. Today's manoeuvres can easily become tomorrow's acts of aggression. The super-Powers ask no one's permission for the implementation of their aggressive and warmongering policy.

No matter what is said about international security, a survey of the reality of today's world shows quite clearly to everybody to whom freedom and independence are dear that international security is not being strengthened, nor has the world become more secure. It is impossible to have genuine peace and security under the persistent threat of the American and Soviet military machines, under their diktat and warmongering blackmail. Sovereign peoples and countries cannot be reconciled to that kind of security and do not believe in it, because such security means nothing but a reinforcement of imperialist control. That is why the super-Powers

(Mr. Mlloja, Albania)

do their utmost to turn the theme of international security into a smoke-screen that disguises their interventions in the internal affairs of other countries. The fuss about "international security" has never prevented them from unleashing their armies against other countries to satisfy their imperialist ambitions. This is the irony: that they, who are champions of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, of the unbridled arms race and war preparations, speak even louder than their victims about peace and security.

The peoples of the world are struggling for genuine and lasting peace, for a security that is not threatened by aggressive wars, by the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers, by their fleets and military bases throughout the world.

The Albanian people and its Government understand and share the concern of peace-loving peoples and countries about the threat that the imperialist policy of the super-Powers poses to international security. That concern is legitimate because it stems from the highest aspirations of peoples for their sovereignty and free and independent development.

We are of the view that international security cannot be voluntarily granted by the super-Powers because their imperialist policy would not give peace a chance. Genuine international security can be achieved only through the united efforts of peace-loving peoples, through the strengthening of national independence and sovereignty, through waging an uncompromising struggle against the hegemonistic policy of the super-Powers.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has for years been an opportunity for the General Assembly to express its perception of the international situation, to assess the state of international affairs and to point to ways of solving the problems facing the world today.

The current debate is being conducted at an exceptionally important and difficult moment. Exacerbation and confrontation have spread to almost all fields of international relations. Tensions and mistrust between the great Powers have increased. The arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, has been accelerated, new systems of weapons have been developed and we are on the threshold of the militarization of outer space. Further aggravation of the international economic crisis directly affects the dramatic deterioration of the situation of the developing countries, particularly regarding external debts, and threatens peace and security in the world.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Bloc divisions are becoming deeper, coupled with attempts to maintain and expand the positions acquired by old and new forms of political, economic, military, financial, technological and cultural dependence.

There are ever more frequent cases of threats to the independence, territorial integrity and national unity of sovereign countries. By imposing pressure and force, the free social development of peoples and countries is being jeopardized. Interference in the internal affairs of others, military interventions and various other forms of pressure are becoming almost daily practice. The fundamental right of every people - the right to self-determination and free choice of one's own development - is being denied and violated ever more frequently.

Such a situation is accompanied by a stalemate in multilateral channels of communication and negotiation, particularly within the framework of the United Nations. The world Organization is not only being circumvented, but there are attempts to weaken and change its role and to undermine the positive results achieved so far. The system of collective security envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations is not applied in practice.

The policy of force and expansion of spheres of influence continues to foment existing crises and to create new regions of tension in the world. The list of the points of crisis is becoming longer, since the old ones are not being extinguished, while at the same time new ones are emerging, constantly increasing the danger for peace and security in the world.

The developments in the Middle East continue to cause the greatest concern. Foreign occupation, interference and an increased foreign presence continue to be the source of an imminent threat to peace and security in that part of the world. The political settlement of the question of Palestine, which is at the core of the Middle East crisis, is thus being prevented. It is evident that only the attainment of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), its sole and legitimate representative, to self-determination and establishment of their own State, and the withdrawal of Israel from all territories occupied since 1967, can enable peace to be established in the Middle East and the security of all States in the region ensured.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The conflict between Iraq and Iran, two neighbouring and non-aligned countries, has entered its fifth year. There are still no signs of a political solution, the only kind of solution that could, on the basis of respect for the legitimate interests of both parties, restore peace in that part of the world and prevent the enormous human losses and material destruction which these two countries now suffer.

The continuation of crises in South-East and South-West Asia is causing permanent tension in those regions, and is directly contributing to a more wide-spread exacerbation of tensions in international relations.

There has been none of the desired progress towards the realization of the aspirations of the Korean people for peaceful unification, for which the proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constitute a sound and constructive basis.

The Mediterranean continues to be fraught with foreign military presence and a build-up of newly developed weapons, which create a constant source of tension in that part of the world and impede the desires of the countries of the region to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation. The situation in the Mediterranean was considered at the ministerial meeting of the Mediterranean members of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Valletta, Malta, in mid-September, when the important document entitled "Valletta Declaration" was adopted.

The restoration of the unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of Cyprus, on the basis of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions offering the framework for a political settlement of the crisis, has still not been achieved.

The racist régime in Pretoria continues illegally to occupy Namibia and to deny the right to independence and self-determination of the people of Namibia and refuses to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia, thus endangering peace and security in the entire region of southern Africa.

The critical situation in Central America and the Caribbean, a region undergoing a process of emancipation of countries and deep political and social upheavals and controversies, continues, owing to permanent foreign interference, intervention and pressure.

In the situations I have mentioned, as indeed in all other critical situations afflicting contemporary international relations, obviously the only possible and

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

realistic ways out of crises are those which are based on the right of peoples to self-determination, independence, sovereignty and respect for territorial integrity, which are in accordance with the aspirations of those peoples and countries for free development and which proceed from the basic principles of the Charter and the policy of non-alignment.

In the present international circumstances, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970, has assumed even greater importance and urgency, and its full implementation has become more necessary than ever. This implies consistent respect for all its provisions and the fulfilment of obligations and duties accepted by States in international relations, on the basis of the Charter, as supplemented and brought up to date by the Declaration.

The non-aligned countries have always attached great importance to this issue. They were in fact the main moving force in the elaboration and adoption of the Declaration, which is greatly inspired by the policy and principles of non-alignment, as formulated at the first summit in Belgrade in 1961, and elaborated further at subsequent summits and other meetings of the non-aligned countries. The Declaration is an expression of the vision and the programme that the policy of non-alignment and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries offered the world in order to achieve the democratization of international political and economic relations and to establish an order which will be in the interests of all peoples and countries.

In this world, which is so interdependent, any dispute carries the danger of turning into a conflict of the widest dimensions. Therefore, the strengthening of international security and the maintenance of peace are tasks of the utmost priority for the world Organization.

Yugoslavia supports the initiatives to establish zones of peace and co-operation in some parts of the world. This is particularly true of the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean regions. The growing presence of great Powers and the build-up of arms and military forces can only lead to wider conflicts, with unforeseeable consequences for peace and security, not only in those regions, but in the world at large. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean adopted by consensus a decision on the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean in

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

1986. We hope that a constructive spirit will prevail and that this exceptionally important international Conference will not be postponed again.

As a European country, Yugoslavia attaches particular importance to the co-operation and security of the countries of that continent, where bloc divisions are most expressly reflected, the military presence of great Powers is most concentrated and the armaments deployed are most sophisticated.

Next year will mark 10 years since the adoption of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held in Helsinki. The adoption of the Act was the beginning of a new process of negotiations on a wide range of issues which are vital for the peoples and countries of the continent and in the interest of the peace and security of the world at large.

Yugoslavia fully and actively participates in the negotiations conducted in Stockholm within the framework of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. We believe that if the participants display the necessary political will, the negotiations may produce results which will be a genuine contribution to confidence building and to the creation of political conditions in which it will be possible to reach agreements on concrete measures for the halting of the arms race as well as for the launching of disarmament in Europe.

The non-aligned countries at their ministerial meeting held at the beginning of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly addressed an appeal to the great Powers:

"to undertake genuine negotiations in a constructive and accommodating spirit and taking into account the interests of the entire international community in order to halt the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, and achieve disarmament." (A/39/560, para. 136)

They pointed out that the resumption of dialogue between the two major Powers must be sustained and lead to a genuine relaxation of tension. They underlined again that détente, in order to be durable, should be universal, cover all regions, address all issues and be open to the participation of all States.

The recent agreement of the two leading Powers, which we welcome, to resume the negotiations at the ministerial level gives reason for a certain amount of optimism in that regard. We have constantly emphasized that it is necessary to

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

resume the dialogue as soon as possible, and that it is a way to genuine negotiations on disarmament whose conduct would contribute to improving the overall atmosphere and other spheres of international relations, primarily regarding crises and focal points of crisis.

Regardless of frequently diverse views on some concrete problems and different assessments of the situation and of some events, it is necessary to concert our efforts and direct them towards joint endeavours aimed at solving the important issues of today. Mistrust and tension should not prevent efforts to seek solutions or threaten world prosperity and peace.

The gravity of the situation facing us and the dangers arising from it demand that all members of the international community urgently unite their forces and efforts in order to preserve international peace and security.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The time in which we are living does not allow divisions and confrontation. It demands that concrete measures be urgently undertaken aimed at relaxing tensions in the world and solving the outstanding international problems in a peaceful and just way. The contemporary era proves that dialogue and negotiations, coupled with an equitable participation by all countries, are the only way to achieve peaceful and lasting solutions to the problems in the world. In so doing it is necessary to use multilateral negotiating mechanisms, since it is obvious that major international problems cannot be solved solely through bilateral efforts. This proves that the growing interdependence in the world is impelling all States to develop mutually beneficial co-operation on the basis of equality and in accordance with the need to provide such international conditions as would be favourable for the economic and social progress of all countries.

It is therefore of essential importance for peace and security in the world urgently to start substantive negotiations on the most important issues regarding the halting of the arms race and disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, as well as to invest renewed efforts in stabilizing the world economy, accelerating the economic development of developing countries and establishing new and just international economic relations.

There is no doubt that the United Nations should play the most prominent role in the pursuit of these goals.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): World developments in recent years have brought to the forefront of international affairs problems which, if not solved soon, may prove disastrous for the whole of mankind. What is involved here is to avert the threat of nuclear war, stop the arms race and create a situation in the world in which peoples would feel secure for their future. The solution of these problems calls for concerted actions by all peace-loving States irrespective of their size, socio-economic system or level of political and economic development. After all, we all live on the same planet or, as they say, in the same house.

Concern for the fate of the world has been clearly voiced at the current session of the General Assembly and has been reflected, for example, in a draft resolution adopted by the First Committee on the initiative of a broad range of States expressing:

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

"grave concern over the acceleration and intensification of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, as well as the continued, very serious deterioration of relations in the world, and the intensification of focal points of aggression and hotbeds of tension in different regions of the world, which threaten international peace and security and increase the danger of nuclear war" (A/C.1/39/L.58/Rev.1, op. para. 1).

The Soviet Union is doing everything it can to improve the international situation and eliminate the nuclear threat. The foreign policy of our State has since its inception been directed towards ensuring peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems.

In laying down the basic principles of Soviet Russia's foreign policy, Vladimir I. Lenin consistently advocated the idea that the principle of "peaceful cohabitation" should become the basis of its relations with States belonging to other systems. We do not impose our ideology and our values, which flow from the very nature of the socialist system, upon anyone, but we shall continue to reject resolutely any attempts to impose an order and views alien to our society on us and to carry over ideological differences into relations among States. We shall resolutely oppose such attempts.

The Soviet Union is open to mutually beneficial co-operation with States on all continents. We are in favour of settling all outstanding international problems peacefully through serious, equitable and constructive negotiations. Peaceful coexistence contains an immense constructive potential for the development of good relations. Surely this was borne out by the experience of the 1970s, when it became possible to sign the Helsinki Final Act and when détente took root and grew stronger.

We are well aware of the fact that the international situation depends to a large extent on the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The USSR would like to see good relations with the United States on an honest and equal basis. We would like to halt the arms race and eliminate the threat of nuclear war. That is why, as Konstantin U. Chernenko recently stated:

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

"the Soviet Union proposed to President Reagan the other day that the USSR and the United States begin negotiations on the entire range of interrelated issues of the non-militarization of outer space and the reduction of strategic nuclear arms and medium-range nuclear systems. The Soviet Union is prepared to search in all these areas for the most radical solutions that would make it possible to move towards the complete prohibition and, ultimately, the elimination of nuclear weapons. The future will show what position the United States Administration will take and whether it is really prepared for constructive talks."

It would in our view be crucial to observe certain norms which nuclear Powers must follow in the present circumstances. These norms are natural ones, if the goal is the preservation of peace. Would it not be natural if those countries that are primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace were to consider the prevention of nuclear war as the main goal of their foreign policy?

The Soviet Union backs up its appeal to all the nuclear Powers to adhere to such norms with practical steps. Thus, for example, it has assumed the unilateral obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Compliance with such norms would be a major step towards the restoration of normal relations among States and the strengthening of universal security. We have consistently advocated the reduction of international tension by practical deeds and by creating an atmosphere of trust in the world.

In achieving that goal States must abandon the idea of dictating the fate of other sovereign States and of imposing their will on everyone everywhere.

Every people and every country must be guaranteed the right to peaceful development in conditions of independence. The Soviet Union believes in the rule of law in the world and not in the rule of arbitrary diktat. No State has the right to intervene in the internal affairs of another.

All forms of interference in the internal affairs of States and peoples must be unconditionally excluded from international affairs. Unfortunately, the world has now witnessed many instances of such interference, which creates a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. What is particularly alarming is the fact that certain States are, with increasing frequency, undertaking actions aimed at subverting the social and political systems of other States, going so far as to use arms.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

For this purpose different forms of military, political, economic, moral and psychological pressure have been used systematically and various methods, including the dirtiest of blackmail and intimidation, with regard to other countries and peoples have been employed. In this way the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States are violated, harbours are mined, shows of military force are staged and a military presence in the immediate vicinity of the borders of other States is built up, compelling them to live under the threat of an imminent invasion. To create an atmosphere of fear and confusion in a given country, subversive actions are undertaken, attempts on the lives of state and political leaders are planned and carried out, acts of sabotage resulting in losses of human life and serious material destruction are committed, gangs of mercenaries are formed, trained and armed and officially incited to engage in criminal activities. Undeclared wars are in effect waged against other countries. The peoples fighting for their inalienable right to self-determination are falling victims to colonialist and racist policies. They are being deprived of their territory, annexed by the occupying forces, and they are being denied the right to political independence and a State of their own.

Actions of this kind are not just a policy of diktat and interference; they are aimed at destabilizing the Governments of other States, undermining and forcibly changing their socio-political systems. Terrorism is elevated to the level of State policy.

In the present tense international situation, in a modern world filled to overflowing with weapons, including nuclear weapons, the policy of State terrorism is extremely dangerous not only to countries which are the immediate targets of such a policy but also to other States and to the fate of the whole of mankind.

Guided by those considerations, the Soviet Union has brought before the current session of the General Assembly the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States. The Soviet Union has condemned and will continue to condemn any manifestations of terrorism. We flatly reject the policy of those States that have opted for terrorism as a method of dealing with other States and nations. Such a policy is basically an attempt to deny the peoples their inalienable rights to free self-determination, independent choice of their own political and economic system and independent, political, economic, social and cultural development.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Pursuance of the policy of State terrorism against other States and peoples leads to the negation of the very possibility of ensuring peaceful relations of mutual trust between countries and to a growing danger of war and is a violation of international norms of conduct. The inadmissibility of the policy and practice of State terrorism as a method of dealing with other countries and peoples flows directly from the United Nations Charter, from generally accepted norms of international law and from numerous United Nations decisions governing relations among States such as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Interference in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States.

The list of instruments establishing the inalienable right of peoples to a free choice of their socio-political system could be extended by adding to it, inter alia, the decisions of the Non-aligned Movement, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and other international forums. Concern over acts of interference in the internal affairs of other States and attempts to impose on the peoples those models of socio-political development they had rejected has been reflected in statements of a large number of States at the current session of the General Assembly. For example, in the general debate in a plenary meeting the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, Mr. Dizdarevic, pointed to the dangerous implications of:

"attempts to export and impose systems and ideologies, attempts to interfere with a view to influencing internal social and economic development ..."

(A/39/PV.9, p. 57)

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cameroon, Mr. Mboumoua, emphasized that

"the security and independence of many States have been threatened by interference in their internal affairs, military intervention and attempts to impose different social systems." (A/39/PV.24, p. 31)

The policy of State terrorism strikes at the very foundations of international peace and security and must be immediately counteracted by the United Nations in the strongest possible way. It is incumbent upon the United Nations to call unequivocally on all States to renounce any actions whatsoever aimed at a forcible change in or the undermining of the socio-political systems of sovereign States or

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

the destabilizing and overthrow of their legitimate Governments and to demand that no military action be initiated to that end under any pretext whatsoever and any such action already in progress be ceased forthwith.

All concepts and doctrines at times propounded with a view to justifying and encouraging actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political systems of other States should be categorically rejected. All attempts to justify the policy of State terrorism by pinning labels on States with an independent policy and on peoples fighting for their independence by mounting slanderous campaigns against any given State also deserves to be condemned.

In the present tense international situation it is incumbent upon the United Nations to raise its voice in favour of the international rule of law and against violations of the elementary norms of State conduct, which are particularly dangerous in a nuclear age when they may have disastrous consequences not only for the freedom of peoples but also for their very existence.

The General Assembly should call upon all States to respect and strictly observe the right of peoples to choose their socio-political system freely and without outside interference and to pursue their political, economic, social and cultural development independently. By upholding that sacred right, the United Nations would make a tangible contribution towards safeguarding the sovereignty and security of all States, irrespective of their socio-political system and their level of economic and political development. It would thus promote the unity of efforts of all States in favour of restoring trust, normalizing the international situation and erecting political and legal barriers against the threat of war.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet proposal was promoted by the desire to strengthen the foundations of universal peace and security, to remove tensions, to prevent and eliminate international conflicts and to reduce the danger of nuclear war. Its adoption would be instrumental in restoring an atmosphere of trust and strengthening international legal barriers against aggression, interference in internal affairs and the policy and practice of State terrorism.

The Soviet delegation takes satisfaction in the fact that the Soviet proposal on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political systems of other States has been supported at the current session of the General Assembly, inter alia, in the consultations held with a wide range of States. It is grateful for the views and comments on the Soviet draft resolution that have been put forward to develop the ideas contained therein. Having taken these views into consideration, the Soviet delegation submits to the First Committee for its consideration a revised draft resolution on this question (A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1).

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): I am looking at this morning's Journal. The item we are supposed to be discussing is entitled "General debate, consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on international security agenda items". I have been advised that a decision was indeed taken to group the items together, but I think that in future it would be helpful if the items could be separated, as in the past. For example, the Ambassador of the Soviet Union has just spoken on State terrorism, and I propose to speak on collective security. When the items are clustered together like this, I think it is not helpful; it does not facilitate the debate. So I hope that in future we shall endeavour to separate the items.

Having said that, Sir, I hope you will kindly convey to the Chairman of this Committee, the eminent and worthy representative of Brazil, who is presiding over the deliberations of this Committee, our gratification at his election to that post. His election is indeed a deserving tribute to his good self and to his efforts in the field of disarmament. We should also like to congratulate you, Sir, on your presiding over these particular deliberations; we are aware of the efforts you and your country have been making in the field of disarmament. We extend similar felicitations to the other officers of the Committee.

The maintenance of international peace and security, the primary purpose of this Organization, continues to be major preoccupation of the Government of Sierra Leone. Addressing the General Assembly at the beginning of this session,

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

the Foreign Minister of Sierra Leone observed that over the past few years, but particularly at the present time, the United Nations has been confronted with a number of complex and menacing challenges, many of which threaten the very survival of mankind. The most dangerous of these challenges, is, he noted, the accumulation and accretion of nuclear weapons, with the attendant danger of nuclear annihilation.

It is the considered view of the Sierra Leone delegation, guided by historical evidence, that an unbridled and perennial arms build-up, the perfecting of weapons of mass destruction and the acquisition of nuclear capability by many nations inexorably lead to war, either by design or through accident or miscalculation.

Like other members of this Assembly, my country has a vested interest in the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, in the maintenance of international peace and security, in the preservation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States, but especially the smaller ones - true collective security.

The collective security system of the Charter envisages the co-operation of all nations, big or small, in the common cause of guaranteeing security and justice for all rather than true military alliances. The persistence of many regional but potentially dangerous conflicts in some parts of the world also threatens international peace and stability. This situation is continually aggravated by the use of armed force to solve international disputes, contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

In his report to the General Assembly the Secretary-General has maintained that the system of collective security established under the Charter has not been utilized in the manner envisaged by those who drafted the Charter. It is the profound conviction of the Sierra Leone delegation that the key to disarmament and the cessation of the arms build-up is the effective utilization of the collective security provisions of the Charter.

It was for that reason that my Government supported the inscription on the agenda of the General Assembly of this item on the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter some two years ago. My delegation is encouraged by the great interest the item has aroused among Member States from the various geographical regions of the world. This has also found clear expression in the various replies and comments by Member States and in the general debate that has taken place in this forum. Most of those replies have common elements - namely, the call for the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter by the Security Council and the assumption by the Security Council of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

As may be recalled, the fundamental purpose of this Organization remains the maintenance of international peace and security, and in furtherance of that task the taking of effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and breaches of the peace, and the suppression of acts of aggression. Also, in furtherance of this objective, the Charter lays down the framework for prohibitive or remedial action with a view to maintaining or restoring international peace and security whenever it has broken down.

However, since the inception of this Organization, and notwithstanding the numerous occasions on which there has been an actual breach of the peace, let alone the threat thereof, no successful effort has been made in implementing the collective security provisions of the Charter - namely, concerted diplomatic, economic and military action to deter and terminate all armed attacks.

This inability to maintain the peace has come about as a result of the inability and failure on the part of some of the permanent members of the Security Council to agree among themselves, notwithstanding the high privilege of membership and the special veto granted them. As a result the perception has developed - and this has today been accentuated - that the collective security provisions of the Charter could never be implemented and those States which had believed and expected that at the end of the day the Security Council would defend and protect their independence and sovereignty have felt betrayed. As the Government of Portugal rightly puts it in its reply to the Secretary-General, for 38 years the application of the collective security provision has unfortunately been neither easy in itself nor facilitated by others, a fact which weakens the efficacy of the provisions themselves and causes frustration harmful to the easing of international tension.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

On the other hand, the failure to implement the collective security system has been regarded as a licence to resort to force in breach of the Charter and a repudiation of the collective machinery under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. As a consequence, this inability or failure on the part of the Security Council to maintain the peace has had more than a debilitating effect on the Organization. First, it has encouraged those who are so disposed to continue to use force in violation of Article 2 (4) of the Charter. Secondly, it has eroded the confidence of those who had entrusted their security to this Organization. Thirdly, it has demonstrated that the Organization was not to be trusted with its most important function as no good would come of it whenever it was challenged.

The Security Council itself, charged with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has been reduced to a mere forum where complaints are aired, uttered with eloquence, sometimes with folly, but always to no avail. Increasingly it has been bypassed, even on issues that are manifestly within its competence.

The role of the Secretary-General has been relegated to the issuance of statements of regret and calls for restraint.

In the face of all this, the authority and integrity of this Organization have been cast in doubt and its authority and efficacy impugned, and it is seen as unable to act effectively to implement its decisions or otherwise offer solutions to intractable crises.

It is against this background that the Government of Sierra Leone continues to request the urgent consideration of this item by the Committee. In doing so, my Government seeks to point out again and draw the attention of this Organization to the massive betrayal of the goals which had inspired the efforts culminating in the founding of the United Nations, a betrayal that has contributed to the increasing and heightening of global tensions and insecurity on an unprecedented scale.

The collective security system was intended to prevent war and maintain peace or, failing that, to defend States subjected to force and armed aggression in defiance of efforts to maintain the peace. It was in order to achieve that objective that the Charter laid down an institutional framework, namely, a system

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

of collective security to support the decisions of the Security Council, a system within which the Security Council is granted the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In other words, the Security Council, in cases where there have been breaches of the peace or acts of aggression, is to decide what action to take for the restoration of the peace and the implementation of its decisions.

Unfortunately, as we have noted, since the inception of this Organization this intrinsic belief in and these expectations of the collective security system have not materialized. Thus, since it became apparent that the Security Council would not institutionalize the collective security provisions of the Charter, that it would not deploy concerted diplomatic, economic and military action to deter or terminate all armed attacks, States started to seek refuge in armaments. Today almost all nations, large and small, rich and poor, are pursuing the elusive goal of national security through the strength of national arms. But one assured lesson of history is that there is no security in armaments, even less in their accumulation.

This may explain the fact that, notwithstanding two special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to the question of disarmament and the efforts of this Committee to come to grips with the issue, that goal has remained elusive.

The escalating arms race will continue to endanger our independence and existence unless and until collective security measures are taken to maintain the peace. The logic of this is that we cannot violate the primary principles of the Charter or ignore its axioms only to fall back on corollaries in seeking solutions to our problems. The non-use of force and the collective security system of the Charter are among the Charter's first principles, while disarmament is a corollary.

As a matter of historical record, it has been discovered that disarmament is impracticable without the assurance given by collective security. Therefore, in order to achieve disarmament, we submit, the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter has become even more urgent and imperative today.

The Sierra Leone delegation does not minimize the difficulties and obstacles ahead of us in any effort to implement and strengthen the collective security measures provided for in the Charter of our Organization. Nor do we intend to ignore the factors that have up to this time conspired against a convergence of views on this vital matter.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

It has been said that in an environment where both super-Powers have an effective second-strike capability, it would be inconceivable to envisage the Security Council undertaking effective collective security measures. While my delegation understands these arguments, it cannot accept them. It is in any case politically and morally unacceptable that our collective security should be predicated on the relations between the nuclear super-Powers.

In the mid-1950s, peace-keeping operations were seen as an adequate stop-gap to fill the void caused by the non-implementation of the collective security measures of our Organization. Despite the very creditable record of peace-keeping, we have recently seen that even this noble endeavour is beginning to lose its effectiveness. My delegation does not believe that the increasing tendency to establish multinational forces outside the present framework of the United Nations is an adequate answer. Nor should peace-keeping forces themselves become permanent. That is all the more reason for us to believe that a serious re-evaluation of the collective security measures under the Charter is urgently called for, and my delegation is of the fervent view that all Member States will rise to the occasion.

The implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter will serve both as an exercise in practical utility and as a reaffirmation of our faith in the United Nations. It will reaffirm that only in our collective security and its maintenance and pursuit do our individual salvation and safety lie. Furthermore, the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter will give assurances that in all cases of aggression, irrespective of the degree of conflict, sanctions will be applied by all, and that can be achieved only if sanctions are made obligatory. With the implementation of the collective security measures, my delegation believes that the authority of the Organization would be restored and never again would aggression go unchecked for want of collective action.

My delegation therefore regrets that agreement could not be reached on the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee to consider this all-important matter. It is therefore the hope of the Sierra Leone delegation that this time around immediate and effective consultations will be undertaken to constitute the Ad Hoc Committee and that the draft resolution on this item will be adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

To strengthen the United Nations is to abide by the principle of collective security, which is a practical measure towards the security of all States and the strengthening of the role of the Organization. In that way we shall begin to construct that new system which provides for the safeguarding of peace by the assertion of reason and collective security.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Together with the traditional consideration of disarmament issues, the regular consideration of items relating to international security is a very suitable opportunity for the First Committee to cast a lucid glance across the evolution of the international situation. The present features and tendencies of the international situation are a very apt and timely reminder of the primary mission of the United Nations - the promotion of peace for the benefit of all peoples, to establish and consolidate international security for the benefit of all States.

That is an objective which today more than ever is eminently timely and urgent, particularly for the non-aligned countries, which, with this aim in view, have constantly exerted their efforts and affirmed their faith in the international Organization, which they wish to see a universal, democratic organization concerned with the problems of the majority of the world. Our Organization is indeed the place where we should reaffirm that international peace and security are to be promoted in natural geographical indivisibility. International peace and security cannot countenance any disregard for conflicts that may rashly be considered as peripheral or minor in so far as they do not affect the great Powers.

To be satisfied with the statement that there have been no major conflicts between the great Powers since the end of the Second World War is to heighten further the North-South inequality as regards the right of peoples to peace and security. Because that is the problem - a discriminatory approach which prevails today at the expense of the third world in consideration of the legitimate security interests of States.

Thus, a ranking military officer of a nuclear Power recently stated: "... nuclear weapons have called into question the usefulness of war as a means to a political goal." That is a precept which, limited to relations between the two major military alliances, may be considered somewhat acceptable. But, by its very nature, such an axiom which refers to the respective military doctrines of deterrence of the nuclear Powers is only valid, as is rightly pointed out in the comprehensive study on nuclear Powers, so long as a conflict has not broken out between these two great Powers. Moreover, the principle of Von Clausewitz, which is referred to here and which this ranking military officer dismisses as an anachronism, is, unfortunately, tragically relevant and timely in that vast region of the world which is so extraordinarily diminished and rendered "anonymous" by the expression third world.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The accession of certain Powers to mastery of nuclear weaponry has not prevented them from resorting to war in the third world to achieve a political aim. Moreover, a lesson that may be drawn from a recent war is that a conflict between a nuclear Power and a non-nuclear-weapon country always involves the risk of resort to those weapons - by reason of the decisive advantage they imply - by the party to the conflict which possesses them. From this standpoint no one can say what the margin of wisdom or unreason may be that lies between men's temptation to use nuclear weapons and their actual use. Thus, once again, over and above guarantees not to use nuclear weapons against countries which do not possess them, there is the problem of the urgency of nuclear disarmament.

Moreover, to say that 150 conflicts have taken place in the third world since the end of the Second World War is deliberately to use only figures and neglect the evidence that derives from observation of the facts. If we were to establish a typology of the open conflicts that have broken out in the third world they could easily be placed in one of the following categories: conflicts resulting from the denial of the right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial or foreign domination; conflicts caused by direct or indirect intervention by a great Power in violation of the right of peoples freely to choose their economic and social system; and conflicts prompted, encouraged or maintained by great Powers in a quest for strategic advantages in keeping with the logic of East-West confrontation.

Of course one cannot deny the existence of local or regional causes for the outbreak of certain conflicts among third world countries. Those conflicts, which are often of alarming gravity and highly disturbing duration and intensity, have always been the focus of concern in certain regional organizations or the Non-Aligned Movement. The Non-Aligned Movement is a natural framework of solidarity where efforts have never been lacking to arrive at approaches that could promote reconciliation and peace between member countries which are parties to a conflict. But it must be established clearly that there is a responsibility falling to those who distort the localized nature of a conflict by injecting into it an artificial East-West dimension and delaying the advent of a definitive solution by creating obstacles heavily influenced by the interests of the great

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Powers but very little influenced by the legitimate aspirations of peoples. That, at least, is the lesson we can draw from the persistence of the conflicts in southern Africa, the Middle East and Central America.

Improvement in the international situation and, beyond that, the firm and permanent establishment of a reign of peace and security necessarily call for a deep change in the structure of international relations and significant evolution in the observance of the legitimate rights of peoples and the sovereign interests of States.

One of the necessary conditions for a world where peace and security could prevail is a renewed dedication to the unquestionable right of all peoples to pursue their economic and social development in the context of a freely chosen political system, without pressure, foreign interference or intervention. Of course, the realization of that right to development cannot come about until the unavoidable and necessary advent of a new international economic order.

Moreover, the lasting solution of existing conflicts and the strengthening of international peace and security call for satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of peoples and strict respect for the sovereign interests of States. There is also a need for a prompt rehabilitation of dialogue instead of confrontation, consultation instead of unilateralism and responsible commitment instead of policies of power, in particular for those among the Members of the United Nations which have the primary duty to ensure respect for the Charter.

The implementation of systematic efforts to establish, in an institutional framework, lasting rules for equally shared security has so far focused on Europe, as if the third world were only a vast geographical puzzle naturally suited to the venting of all disputes, as if its aspirations to peace were only vague dreams.

The problems specific to a given region of the world may require an approach that is geographically suited to a group of countries concerned directly with their problems and sharing their common concern to achieve given objectives.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

But the identification of the geographical region according to historical or political features that it may present should not lead to giving precedence to the security concerns of a set of countries which, in the case of the Conference on the Security and Co-operation in Europe, would be Europe, as compared with a periphery which, in this case, would be the Mediterranean. Very justly concerned by the extension of tensions to the Mediterranean, the countries of the southern shore of the Mediterranean are rightly devoting their efforts to establishing definitively their natural dedication to making their region a zone of co-operation in the framework of a zone of peace.

The ministerial meeting of the non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean, held in September in Valletta, as well as the final declaration emanating from that meeting, are based on that approach.

Thus, basing ourselves on the indivisibility of international security, it seems to us perfectly appropriate to use the method of concentric circles, the smallest one being the point of departure of a growing wave of universal peace. The search for appropriate solutions in their natural regional settings for localized conflicts may also be the most appropriate. Good examples of this are the action of the Organization of African Unity since its inception in Africa, or in Latin America such initiatives as that of the Contadora Group. This kind of action, initiatives of this sort, should have the unreserved support of the great Powers.

The beginning of a real process of disarmament and the promotion of genuine international security are two requirements which, taken together, constitute a necessary condition for the harmonious development of peace and co-operation among nations. These are not abstractions, depicting an ideal world, concocted merely as an escape from reality; rather, they are a real alternative that has matured in the hearts and minds of peoples and has become today the only option which, however tainted it may be with the angelic, can enable us not to dream of ideal worlds, but to prepare a future in the realm of the possible. Disarmament and international security are thus a broad field for action open to all initiatives, initiatives which must necessarily be bold, since they are aimed at achieving lasting peace in a spirit of universal concord, as a healthy substitute for continued precarious international equilibrium. A whole series of efforts should therefore be pursued

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

in a determined effort to achieve the only goal that can ennoble mankind and human civilization, that is, peace. The reality of the world today must be grasped by effective, consistent and orderly action. In this nuclear age, in a prevailing mood of end-of-century pessimism, we have no choice but to lay the groundwork for a breakthrough into the extraordinary, a breakthrough to secure mankind's survival.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): We are discussing the item of international security and the strengthening of international security, which is an aspect of it. I should like to point out that on this item, which has been dealt with as a matter mostly concerning the General Assembly, it is also particularly a matter concerning the Security Council, because the Security Council is the body which is effectively to deal with security matters. If we look at the Charter, we shall see that in Article 25 it says:

"The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

Whatever refers to matters of security is to be dealt with in the Security Council.

We have done a lot of things in the General Assembly about international security, but we have not involved the Security Council itself in the question of the strengthening of international security. That is why I am introducing a draft resolution which refers to the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That is a Declaration of the General Assembly, but at the same time this is a matter which concerns the Security Council and therefore I am proposing a very brief draft resolution, to this effect:

"The General Assembly,

"Profoundly concerned over today's situation of the international community in circumstances of undeclared, long-continuing wars between nations and noting a marked decline in respect for the basic elements of international law and order,

"Gravely concerned also with increasing manifestations of various forms of international terrorism,

"Considering that the main organ of the United Nations which, under the Charter, has the essential characteristic of rendering its decisions effective is the Security Council,

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"Taking due regard of the need that on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations specific endeavours should be devoted by the international community to restoring to the United Nations the effectiveness required by the Charter,

"1. Requests the Security Council to give priority consideration to the strengthening of the system of collective security provided for in the Charter of the United Nations;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to report thereon to the General Assembly at its fortieth session."

It is my humble submission that we must get the Security Council involved in matters which have been generally discussed and dealt with in the General Assembly. This is a subject that I believe must be brought out, particularly on the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, realizing that we have reached this point, after 40 years, of a United Nations which is ineffective in the maintenance of international peace and security and with the prospect of it becoming more effective declining, continually declining. It is my submission, therefore, that the Security Council, which has the means - or which should have the means - to be effective, is the body which should be involved with the maintenance of international peace and security.

If the Security Council is to be involved, it will have to consider how it is to be involved in the strengthening of the system of collective security. That system of collective security depends entirely on the functions of the Security Council. Therefore the Council will have to consider its own functions with regard to the collective security provided for in the Charter. It is not enough merely to adopt resolutions on the strengthening of international security in the General Assembly. The Security Council must be directly involved in this subject, and that is the purpose of the draft resolution I have presented today.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.