

United Nations

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records *

UN LIBRARY

OCT 24 1979

UN/CA COLLECTION



FIRST COMMITTEE

7th meeting

held on

Wednesday, 17 October 1979

at 3 p.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

later: Mr. KOBUCHEY (Ukrainian SSR)
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 126: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Yankov (Bulgaria)
Mr. Vejvoda (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Singh (India)
Mr. Jaroszek (Poland)
Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia)
Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia)
Mr. Kamanda (Zaire)
Mr. Lechuga (Cuba)
Mr. Sourinho (Lao People's Democratic Republic)
Mr. Bafi (Iraq)
Mr. Kamil (Indonesia)
Mr. Gauci (Malta)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.1/34/PV.7

23 October 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

:
AGENDA ITEM 126 (continued)

INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
(A/34/243, A/C.1/34/L.1)

Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's pledge to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your colleagues of the Bureau, of its full support in the discharge of your very important functions. On a personal note, I should like to say that I am sure, knowing you very closely as I do, that under your wise guidance this Committee will successfully complete its duties.

This session's general debate has just ended. Judging from previous experience and common sense, time is needed for the most important trends to unfold in the further course of the session before it can be thoroughly evaluated. However, even a very preliminary and incomplete assessment provides fresh evidence of the fundamental preoccupations and concerns of today's world and reflects in particular the trends of the development of contemporary international relations.

In this respect it must be acknowledged and emphasized that the course of international life gives us enough reason to be optimistic. In spite of the persistence of serious global or regional problems of different dimensions affecting the prospects of international peace, security and co-operation, in spite, especially, of the attempts of certain forces to reverse the process of relaxation of tensions, this process is gathering further momentum and is gaining in scope and strength.

More and more peoples and countries today are identifying their future and the distant and peaceful prospects of the international community with the future of détente. Our hopes and expectations for a better world of tomorrow, including the establishment of a New International Economic Order, are closely linked today to the progress of détente and the broadening of international co-operation. This was made clear in the brilliant statement by the President of Cuba, Mr. Fidel Castro, speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries.

Our Organization has actively contributed during the past years to the deepening and consolidation of international détente. The most urgent and important task in this respect - that of complementing détente in the political field with

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

détente in the military field - has acquired the highest priority at the United Nations by becoming the subject of last year's special session devoted to disarmament. There can be no doubt that the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly will further contribute to the strengthening of international détente.

The political climate has been significantly improved with the signing of the SALT II treaty and will be affected in a most positive way indeed by its early ratification.

The process of relaxation of tension in international relations has also been favourably influenced by the decisions of the recent Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana.

The European Conference on Security and Co-operation follow-up meeting to be held next year in Madrid, to which we attach particular importance, is bound to give a new impetus to international détente.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

At the same time we have witnessed and are witnessing attempts to slow down or even reverse the process of international détente in various regions and in the world as a whole. Suffice it to mention recent events in South-East Asia, where the dangers not only to regional stability and peace but also to world peace and stability are still among the gravest.

That is why it is highly appropriate and timely that, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, our Organization has been seized of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. This new initiative of the Soviet Union is in full compliance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the efforts of our Organization to ostracize the policy of hegemonism as reflected in many of the most important and recent resolutions of its General Assembly.

At its thirty-second session the General Assembly recognized, in resolution 32/155, "that the continuation of the policies of confrontation and rivalry among States or groups of States is incompatible with the relaxation of international tension".

The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States contains among its principles the principle of the inadmissibility of hegemonism in international political, economic and other relations. There are also a number of other resolutions to that effect, which I shall abstain from mentioning explicitly now.

At the same time, the principle of the sovereign equality of States has been reconfirmed and all forms of foreign domination condemned in a number of other resolutions of the General Assembly - the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, to mention only a few. Thus in fact the United Nations has in a direct and also in an indirect manner already declared itself against the policy of hegemonism in international relations. For the first time, however, the General Assembly is called upon to embark on a comprehensive and constructive discussion of the roots and consequences of such a policy, whatever its manifestations or geographical location, and the measures required to oust it from contemporary international life.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

As is well known, hegemonism is not a new or unknown phenomenon in the political history of the world. One need not go back too deeply into history to find examples of this policy aimed at dominating other peoples and countries. The very idea of setting up the United Nations - as already pointed out - was conceived during the struggle against Fascist domination, with the aim of preventing similar attempts in the future.

The policy of hegemonism has invariably led to wars or the creation of dangerous hotbeds of tension. Aggression and the use of force in international relations have always served as instruments of the policy of hegemonism.

Therefore, the policy of hegemonism not only is incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations - in particular, the principle of sovereign equality - but is the very opposite, the negation of peaceful coexistence and international détente. It is hardly necessary to point out the dangers of such a policy when its proponents are in possession of destructive nuclear weapons that were previously unknown. It also goes without saying that the policy of hegemonism is of the gravest concern to the smaller nations, which always fall first victims to foreign domination or aggression.

I wish to add that hegemonism is a multifaceted phenomenon. It is manifested in various forms of domination by one State over others in different spheres of international relations: political, economic, cultural and other. The point is not that we lack a political vocabulary or a political philosophy today for the parameters or the contents of hegemonism, for it is well known what the implications and the manifestations of this phenomenon are.

Hegemonism has manifestations sometimes on a global scale and sometimes on a more limited regional scale. In some regions the attempts by certain States to impose their will or policies upon neighbours and to dominate them acquire less overt manifestations but have no less serious consequences and a negative effect on both bilateral relations and international détente. The policy of hegemonism on a regional scale is often concealed by attempts to project to the outside world, and especially to remote parts of it, an image of good-neighbourliness and respect for equality in international

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

relations. However, it is inadmissible for anyone to aspire to equality or independence without showing respect for the right of others to equality. That is a very simple, common-sense rule of international behaviour.

We are deeply convinced, as stated recently by the President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mr. Zhivkov, that hegemonism has never had and has no prospects in international relations.

Having condemned aggression and all forms of foreign domination, the General Assembly should now take yet another step in the same direction and condemn the policy of hegemonism as a root cause of domination, undermining détente and giving rise to international conflicts, including acts of aggression and war.

In the opinion of my delegation, by declaring the policy of hegemonism inadmissible the General Assembly would undoubtedly contribute to making this one of the inviolable laws of international behaviour; for it is well known that the General Assembly, as the main deliberative organ of the United Nations, has, as its main tool, the capacity to formulate decisions and declarations calling upon the Members of the United Nations to take certain actions, and this applies to the case of this phenomenon which we call the policy of hegemonism. Therefore, my delegation does not share the view of some delegations that either this is a self-evident phenomenon and there is no need for any action, or it is futile for the General Assembly to add yet another resolution on this issue. We have no such doubts. We think that the United Nations General Assembly will properly discharge its duties if, at this point, when this phenomenon has acquired a certain importance, it takes positive action.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

The draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Delegation envisages a decision of principle on the part of the General Assembly with the sole aim of overcoming resistance to détente and of improving the prospects for it. It is our conviction that such a decision would be in the interests of all States, and it is our hope that there will be unanimous support for it.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): Our Committee has begun consideration of the important proposal on the "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations", submitted to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Andrei Gromyko.

As has already been stated by the Czechoslovak Foreign Minister in the general debate, there can be no doubt that hegemonism means a completely obvious negation of peaceful, constructive relations among States, and of all the noble principles proclaimed in the Charter of this world Organization. That is why the Czechoslovak delegation welcomes the inclusion of this item in the agenda of our Committee.

We believe that the importance of this proposal will be even more evident if we recall certain phenomena from recent history which, up until the present time, have had a concrete impact on the situations in many countries and, it can be said, even in entire regions. I refer to the efforts by colonial Powers which in the past strove for world domination by seizing large territories in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Polynesia and subjugating the indigenous peoples. One glance across the General Assembly hall is sufficient to make one aware of all the far-reaching changes that have occurred since those times. Nevertheless, the remnants of colonialism, the manifestations of neo-colonialism and other such efforts that are a direct or indirect reflection of hegemonistic designs still persist and threaten world

(Mr. Vejvoda Czechoslovakia)

peace. The statements by a great majority of representatives in the general debate have shown what a serious hotbed of tension southern Africa continues to be, where the racists and neo-colonialists persist in their efforts to maintain their domination over the peoples of that region.

The horrible face of hegemonism was revealed in Hitler's fascism in Europe and throughout the world in the 1930s and 1940s. I should like to recall the particularly sad experience of the peoples of my country, which at the time of the Munich diktat in 1938 were among the first victims of the fascist schemes to dominate the world. Today, after a lapse of more than 40 years since Munich, it has become more than obvious that it would have been possible to thwart the hegemonistic aspirations of Hitler's fascists at their very inception. It would have been possible had the ruling circles of a number of European countries been able to rise above their narrow and very limited interests. It would have been possible if the League of Nations had listened to the proposals submitted at the time by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which were so clearly described here by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Troyanovsky, in his introductory statement. But the class-oriented benightedness of the majority of the European countries prevailed over the broad interests of the European peoples, which were thus drawn into the bloodiest conflict in the entire history of mankind, the Second World War. We believe that this reflection on our bitter experience in a not very distant past is very timely in this context, and this not only because the policy of Munich, which became a symbol denoting a policy of concessions in the face of openly declared aggressive aims of hegemonism, is still finding its protagonists and admirers in some countries. This bitter experience must be recalled for the additional reason, that in our times there is the threat that even the horrifying weapons of mass destruction could be misused for current hegemonistic designs.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

If we turn our full attention to the current developments in the situation throughout the world, we again clearly see the timeliness of our deliberations on the inadmissibility of hegemonism in international relations. Many events in Africa, Asia and Latin America demonstrate that hegemonistic endeavours must be faced and resisted by the international community even under present conditions.

That is why both the Fifth and the Sixth Summit Conferences of the non-Aligned Countries in Colombo and Havana were fully justified in reaffirming the necessity for international co-operation on the basis of equality, as well as the need for a systematic struggle against all forms and manifestations of foreign domination and hegemony.

Following the successful completion of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and after several years of positive experience with the implementation of its Final Act, favourable prerequisites exist for the strengthening of the process of détente not only in Europe but also in other continents and throughout the world. It is symptomatic of this that, in this year's general debate, a great majority of the heads of delegations spoke of their interest in the furtherance of détente. However, among the obstacles and pitfalls placed by the enemies of détente in the way of the fulfilment of these salutary aspirations of the peoples of the world, the policy of hegemonism represents one of the gravest dangers.

For all these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation supports the very timely and useful proposal submitted by the delegation of the USSR to the current session of the General Assembly for the adoption of a political resolution denouncing the policy of hegemonism in all its forms. It would be a great contribution to peace and the security of nations if the States Members of the United Nations have an undertaking never, in any circumstances or under any pretext whatsoever, to strive to achieve hegemony in international relations.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

The adoption of such an undertaking would simultaneously represent another significant step towards intensifying and strengthening détente, because there can be no doubt that hegemonism, whatever its form, can only result in destabilization of the international situation, in the creation of hotbeds of tension and in the deterioration of the over-all climate throughout the world. It is completely obvious that this kind of development would sharply conflict with the interests of all nations of the world, both small and large, developing and industrially advanced. As was borne out by the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly, the interest in promoting détente is a universal one. That is why the international community generally must be interested in the adoption of effective measures that would place the policy of hegemonism outside the law. For the policy of hegemonism is sharply at variance with the equality of States; it denies one of the fundamental and generally recognized principles of international law - the principle of the sovereign equality of States - and thus it also negates the Charter of this Organization which is founded on this vital principle.

The Czechoslovak delegation is of the view that with the drafting of the resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, we already have a basis from which we can proceed and on which we can build. We already have the now generally recognized and valid principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, reaffirmed in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and in other United Nations documents. We are of the opinion that it would considerably strengthen the healthy development of the foundations of international relations if all the principles already formulated were to be complemented by another universally valid principle, that of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism.

The Czechoslovak delegation wishes for its part to exert active efforts in order to contribute to the achievement of that objective.

Mr. SINGH (India): Mr Chairman, since this is the first time that I am taking the floor, allow me to convey to you the most sincere congratulations of the Indian delegation on your unanimous election as Chairman of this very important Committee. We can assure you of our fullest co-operation. We would also like to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election.

We have chosen to make a statement on the agenda item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations", since we believe that it is related to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as to the principles and objectives of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We have no reason to doubt the motives of the authors of this initiative, as the draft resolution proposed by them would be equally applicable to them, as to all other Member States, including the other States that possess nuclear weapons.

Whatever the origins of the word "hegemony" or its connotations in current political vocabulary, we interpret the word as meaning domination in the political, ideological, cultural or economic fields by one State or group of States over others. It is clear that a policy of domination or hegemonism in international relations is contrary to the United Nations Charter, to the principles of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to the relevant General Assembly declarations and resolutions and to the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Inherent in such a policy is the application of coercive measures to achieve domination over other States. Such methods include the threat or the use of force; interference or intervention in the internal affairs of other States, political or economic blackmail, the seizure of foreign territory for occupation or for political bargaining, and attempts to establish spheres of influence. Colonialism or neocolonialism are only manifestations in an extreme form of this policy of hegemonism. There could therefore be no doubt that a policy of hegemonism is inadmissible in international relations and is a threat to international peace and security.

A policy of seeking domination over other countries presupposes a rejection of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, especially of the principle of the sovereign equality of all States. It demonstrates a colonial mentality in a post-colonial period which has seen the triumph of nationalism and the emergence of scores of newly independent States.

(Mr. Singh, India)

As a country which won its freedom from colonialism after a long and arduous struggle, India has resolutely rejected the division of the world into power blocs and has consistently followed the policy of non-alignment in order to safeguard its independence of judgement and action. Ever since its inception at the Belgrade Summit in 1961, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has sought to establish a new world order, based on national independence and sovereign equality free from great Power of bloc rivalry and influence, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, the freedom of all States to determine their own political and economic systems, the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism, and the establishment of the New International Economic Order. The validity of these principles, which are aimed at countering foreign domination or hegemonism, has been vindicated by events over the past three decades and by the growth of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The spread of non-alignment and the increasing acceptance of the principles of non-alignment is the most important barrier to the pursuance of a policy of hegemonism or domination.

One of the most dangerous characteristics of the current international situation is the escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. As is stated in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament:

"The arms race impedes the realization of the purposes, and is incompatible with the principles, of the Charter of the United Nations, especially respect for sovereignty, refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, the peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States". (A/S-10/4, para 12)

The Final Document goes on to state that:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence of doctrines of strategic superiority". (A/S-10/4, para 13)

We are convinced that an international order which guarantees peace and security and the equal sovereignty of States cannot be realized without genuine disarmament measures and the elimination of nuclear weapons. Pending the elimination of nuclear weapon stockpiles, those States possessing nuclear weapons must renounce the use of them in order to guarantee human survival and to protect States against nuclear blackmail.

(Mr. Singh, India)

Over the years the General Assembly has elaborated the purposes and principles contained in the United Nations Charter. Among such endeavours were the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and various other resolutions such as the one on the Definition of Aggression adopted in 1974. We see the present initiative for the adoption of a resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations as part of the endeavour to strengthen the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): As a former Chairman of the First Committee, I am very well aware of the firm nature of rule 110 of the rules of procedure. I trust, however, that you, Mr. Chairman, will agree to bear with me in bending it slightly and accept my personal and my delegation's warmest felicitations on your well-deserved election to preside over this important body. We wish you every success in discharging your responsible functions.

I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee - the two Vice-Chairmen, Comrade Yuri Kochubey of the Ukrainian SSR and Mr. Awad Burwin of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Ernest Sucharipa of Austria - on their election to the important posts in this Committee.

For years now this Committee has had a reputation of its own in taking up important aspects of international security and disarmament. In many instances it has succeeded in working out instruments on international relations that represent milestones in the history of our Organization. The subject that we are now discussing under agenda item 126, so ably and convincingly introduced yesterday in his lucid statement by Ambassador Oleg Troyanovsky, represents yet another example of the First Committee's good tradition of timely reaction to topical phenomena of international relations. Indeed,

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR put it in his letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations dated 25 September 1979 in document A/34/243:

"... the elimination from the conduct of international relations of any manifestation of the policy of hegemonism, that is, the desire of some States to dominate other States and peoples, is becoming one of the most important aspects of the struggle for détente and peace."

Poland's approach to the issue at hand has been clearly defined in our statement in the general debate of the current session by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Emil Wojtaszek, as follows:

"Poland fully shares the concern at the international level over manifestations of the policy of domination and hegemonism. We therefore support the proposal submitted the day before yesterday by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Andrei Gromyko, to include on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly an item entitled 'Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations'. The Polish delegation believes that a debate on this pressing issue and the adoption of an appropriate resolution will represent an important contribution to the struggle for the elimination of obstacles to the process of détente and the strengthening of peace on the basis of the equal sovereignty of all States." (A/34/PV.11, pp. 56 and 57)

That position of ours remains valid. In fact, particularly at this time, one does not have to search far in retrospect to understand Poland's preoccupations and concerns with the policies of hegemony. This session of the General Assembly is taking place exactly 40 years after the outbreak of the Second World War, which started on 1 September 1939, by Nazi Germany's invasion of Poland. Mine was the nation which, by taking up armed opposition against the most degenerate form of hegemonism preached and pursued by the theory and practice of fascism, had to pay the highest price. The aggression

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

against Poland in 1939 was the most odious and flagrant manifestation of the hegemonistic policies of German imperialism pursued under the slogan "Drang nach Osten" - drive to the East - coupled with the Nazi doctrine of "lebensraum" - the living space - and of domination over the entire world. We all know the untold miseries and sufferings those policies brought to so many nations of the world, including the German people itself.

Mindful of our past, including also the sad historical experiences of Poland's three partitions, we strongly oppose any policy of hegemonism, in all its forms and manifestations, be it as a drive towards the East, South-East or in any other direction.

The notion of hegemonism still has world-wide dimensions. The founding of the United Nations has in fact been an extension of the struggle of nations against that phenomenon. This Organization was established both as a product and a direct result of the historic victory of the anti-Nazi coalition over fascist and militarist hegemonism. But, alas, hegemonism has not disappeared with the adoption of the United Nations Charter. It has manifested itself in different forms until this very day. One can even say that we observe a certain escalation of its dangerous policies in some parts of our globe.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

At the time of classical colonialism, prior to the momentous Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, hegemonism had been an instrument of total economic and political dependence. Despite the rapid strides of the decolonization process, hegemonism is still practiced today by the forces of neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid, which, in collusion with world imperialism, resort to acts of aggression and destabilization in various parts of the world, notably in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Contemporary hegemonism also bases itself on the use or threat of force vis-à-vis smaller or weaker neighbours; on attempts at subordinating other States and forcing them to renounce their independent policies; at creating conflict situations on their borders or exploiting border disputes to intensify pressures upon them. A particularly blatant form of hegemonism is exemplified by some States claiming the right to teach other States military or political lessons.

Wars of aggression continue to be the most visible manifestation of modern hegemonism; and that is why the Charter of the United Nations, especially in its Preamble and Articles 1 and 2, makes extremely strong points of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, preventing threats to the peace, respecting the equal rights and sovereign equality of States and refraining from the threat or use of force in international relations.

Particularly in the last two decades, which witnessed a growing conviction among the world community of the indispensability of independence of nations and peaceful co-existence, those sacrosanct principles of the Charter have been translated and indeed developed into a language of new world realities. One of the first documents that, next to the Charter, marked an important phase in the struggle against hegemonism was the historic Declaration on decolonization of 1960, contained in resolution 1514 (XV), which declared, inter alia, that:

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation".

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

A very comprehensive approach to combating individual components of the phenomenon of hegemonism has been included in the United Nations Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. In addition to its preamble, mention should be made in this context of the Declaration's principle concerning the duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State and, especially, the important provision that

"No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind". (resolution 2625 (XXV), Annex) Similarly, the principle of sovereign equality of States stresses that States are juridically equal and that each State has the duty to respect the personality of other States.

Only two months later, at the same twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, as a result of this Committee's efforts, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security solemnly reaffirmed that

"States must fully respect the sovereignty of other States and the right of peoples to determine their own destinies, free of external intervention, coercion or constraint, especially involving the threat or use of force, overt or covert, and refrain from any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of any other State or country." (resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 4) Similarly, relevant provisions of the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, also brought to fruition by the First Committee, point out numerous forms of positive international action to counter manifestations of hegemonism.

In the economic field, hegemonism is the vile antithesis of the New International Economic Order. Hence, it is not without reason that the United Nations Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States of 1974 has it that economic as well as political and other relations

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

among States shall be governed by principles which, among other things, include, "No attempt to seek hegemony and spheres of influence".

(resolution 3281 (XXIX), Chapter I (1)) It further stipulates that

"Every State has the sovereign and inalienable right to choose its economic system as well as its political, social and cultural systems in accordance with the will of its people, without outside interference, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever."

(ibid., Chapter II, Article I)

One might cite a series of other important documents of the United Nations, including its Definition of Aggression, in support of this Organization's continued concern over the recurring attempts at hegemony in world relations. In recent years such attempts have also given rise to serious apprehension on the part of political, social and religious movements. The phenomenon of hegemonism has, for instance, been strongly deplored by the last two summit meetings of the Non-Aligned Movement. It was listed among the world's evils in the inspiring address of Pope John Paul II before our General Assembly earlier this month.

May I also be allowed to recall my country's direct contribution at the United Nations to creating an atmosphere in relations among States which would discourage them from resorting to dangerous practices of hegemonism. I have in mind last year's Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, adopted by the General Assembly without a dissenting vote, again upon the recommendation of the First Committee. By having incorporated in its provisions a most comprehensive programme of positive international action, the Declaration offers an effective antidote against hegemony in world relations. Its uniquely all-embracing nature flows from the fact that it covers all aspects of international endeavour without exception, thereby indicating specific measures to eliminate manifestations of military, political, economic, racial and cultural hegemonism or even domination in the field of education and public information. The Declaration's eight principles of activities of States, and the subsequent measures provided for their implementation, offer the

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

best possible platform for the common existence of nations and their peaceful co-operation in conditions of mutual understanding of and respect for the identity and diversity of all people, free from hatred, prejudice and interference or intervention in their internal affairs.

Why is it now, at this stage in the development of international relations, that the question of hegemonism is taking on a special relevance?

The last several years have been characterized by a prevailing tendency in the world towards eliminating tensions and creating favourable conditions for all nations to co-exist peacefully. The evolution now taking place on our globe confirms unambiguously that the overwhelming majority of States reject pressure, domination and hegemony as instruments of international intercourse.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

Despite the difficulties that still exist, the overriding trend of that evolution is ever firmer conviction of the need for the total elimination of wars from international relations. Hegemonism contradicts these aspirations, as it thrives on the use of force, on conflicts local and global, on denial of the sovereign equality of States. It is therefore innately incompatible with the processes of détente, which it hampers considerably, as well as with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

In view of the over-all implications of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, the Soviet initiative and the draft resolution (A/C.1/34/L.1) before us have special meaning on at least three counts. First, they are indeed very timely and, as such, meet the vital concerns of the international community. Secondly, this initiative has been taken by a world Power, one of the permanent members of the Security Council, which bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Thirdly, it testifies to the unwavering consistency of Soviet foreign policy, based, as it is, on Leninist principles contained inter alia in the historic Decree on Peace of 1917, which until this day represents the most distinct manifestation of the anti-hegemonistic nature of the theory and practice of true socialism.

In our opinion, the adoption of the proposed draft resolution would be an important step forward towards codifying the notion of hegemonism; it would bring to light its practices and it would help ease tensions. Even so, it will only be the beginning of a longer process that we may face before the dangerous phenomenon is eradicated. But, once we embark upon such an effort and start seeking the most effective anti-hegemony political and juridical instruments, it will in itself be an enormous victory for the progressive trends in international relations. The Polish delegation is ready and willing to lend its full support to a course such as this. Our position stems both from the historical experiences of the Polish nation, to which I referred at the beginning of my statement, and from the socialist principles of present-day Poland, a peace-loving State and a firm link in the socialist community of nations.

We hope that in the spirit of the draft resolution other delegations will join us in firmly declaring that neither States nor groups of States should ever, under any circumstances, or for any reasons whatsoever, claim hegemony in international affairs or seek a position of domination, be it in the world as a whole or in any of its regions.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): As my delegation is speaking for the first time, Mr. Chairman, allow me to express my pleasure at seeing you presiding over the deliberations of the First Committee and to assure you and your colleagues in the Bureau of my delegation's full co-operation in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities.

My delegation has already indicated its support for the proposal on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations during the general debate, when the Foreign Minister of socialist Ethiopia stated that the proposal of the Soviet Union was not only timely but also of crucial importance for the maintenance of international peace and security.

No less important is the fact that it is submitted by a major nuclear-weapon State whose positive and constructive role has been and continues to be indispensable for the maintenance of global peace.

Throughout recorded history we find that the policy of hegemonism has invariably been the policy of war and destruction. Aspirations to control and subjugation, and especially the impulse towards political ascendancy of one people over other peoples and countries, whether in different periods of ancient history or in modern times, have left behind immense pains the lessons of which cannot be lost to the contemporary world.

Only the limited destructive capability of the spear, the arrow and weapons of that kind made possible the continuity of human civilization. The enormous loss of life and the incalculable destruction brought about by two world wars also resulted from the pursuit of hegemonistic policies.

In this regard let me refer to one of the statements made yesterday afternoon on agenda item 126. The danger of the policy of hegemonism was duly emphasized by reference to the failure of collective security and the onset of the Second World War. In that respect, the Ethiopian delegation wishes only to add that, contrary to the conclusions of that speaker, it was international peace and security and the League of Nations itself that went down the drain, and not Ethiopia. True, my country suffered severely, but it also made very heavy sacrifices to crush the hegemony of fascist Mussolini, so that today Ethiopia is independent, very much alive and as good and solid as gold.

In the present nuclear age, when the development of weapons and technology is threatening the very survival of mankind as a whole, the policy of hegemonism in the conduct of international relations can succeed only in self-annihilation,

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

with cataclysmic consequences for the entire world. We view the new proposal on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism as a broad-ranging programme for peace. That is because, whichever way we look at it, we find that hegemonism or the ambition to dominate others is at once a violation of all the principles, purposes and ideals enunciated in the Charter of our Organization, on which the conduct of international relations must be based.

The Ethiopian delegation is particularly delighted to note that the peoples of the United Nations whose determination, as proclaimed by the Charter, is to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to this end to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours and to unite their strength to maintain international peace and security - are now provided with a timely opportunity to further unite their strength for the maintenance of peace by resolutely condemning the policy of hegemonism in any form and manifestation and by declaring that under no circumstances, for whatever motive, should States or groups of States pursue hegemony in the conduct of international relations. Failure to do so would be tantamount to the failure of mankind to build a lawful and equitable world order and peaceful development of international co-operation on the basis of equality.

Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on item 126 of the agenda on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, proposed by the Soviet Union, was set forth in the statement of the head of our delegation, the Foreign Minister of the Mongolian People's Republic, in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly. In connexion with the discussion of this item in the First Committee, the Mongolian delegation would like to go into further detail about the reasons for its support of that important proposal.

Yesterday and today we have had an opportunity to listen to thoroughgoing and well argued statements by a number of delegations which have convincingly revealed the timeliness and relevance of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. Today, at a time when the peoples of the world are intensifying their struggle for national and social liberation, for détente and for the prevention of a new world war, their efforts are being thwarted by ever-growing resistance on the part of the forces of imperialism and reaction, which want to reverse the positive development of events and turn the clock back to the time of the cold war. This is shown by the emerging outline which can now be discerned of an alliance among the forces of imperialism and great-Power chauvinism and expansionism, which are to blame for the continuation of the escalation of the arms race, the exacerbation of existing hotbeds of tension and the creation of new ones in various parts of the world.

Behind all of this, of course, as we know, there is the reckless ambition to win a position of military supremacy which, in present day conditions, is something that is extremely dangerous and highly adventurous. This ambition is nothing but an attempt to impose upon other countries and peoples the will of a given country to intervene in their internal affairs, to dominate and to lord it over others by means of armed force. There lies, in our view, precisely the hub of the policy of hegemonism, which would deny and constitute an attack on the inalienable right of others to live in freedom and independence.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

The far-reaching and pernicious consequences of this policy are shown by the experience of the whole of human history and particularly by the horrifying lessons of the Second World War, which 40 years ago took more than 50 million human lives.

In the present age of scientific and technological revolution and in circumstances in which the arsenals of States contain vast stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, the destructive capacity of which is spiralling ever upwards, the new proposal of the Soviet Union has a particularly relevant and timely ring. The policy of hegemonism is contrary to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and, in particular, to the principle of the sovereign equality of all States, both great and small, developed and developing.

There is no need to prove that the first to suffer from the policy of hegemonism are the small countries and peoples which, as a rule, are the first victims of aggression in the global plan of hegemonism for world domination. The nature of the policy of hegemonism is the same today as it was 40 years ago and even earlier. The serious concern of the peoples over the policy of hegemonism and domination is shown particularly by the Final Declaration of the Havana Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, a document in which those countries once again confirmed their devotion, inter alia, to the principles of national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and sovereign equality and to the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism, and all forms of expansionism, foreign occupation, domination and hegemonism. They called upon all peoples to participate in all efforts to put these principles into effect, and, accordingly, confirmed that the struggle for universal peace and the peaceful coexistence of all States is indissolubly linked with the struggle against, inter alia, hegemonism.

These important principles to govern the conduct of States have been confirmed both in bilateral regional treaties and agreements and at the world level, beginning with the United Nations Charter and including a number of extremely important United Nations decisions, such as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and others.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly points out that economic as well as political and other kinds of relations among States will be governed, inter alia, by the principle of "No attempt to seek hegemony and spheres of influence" (resolution 3281 (XXIX), Chapter I (1)).

The present course of events in the world, and particularly the experience of the extremely recent past, have once again confirmed that the hegemonistic-expansionist actions of those forces, in particular of those who have proclaimed world war to be a normal phenomenon and have even accorded themselves the right by means of armed force to teach lessons to other countries and peoples, represent today the most serious threat to international peace and security and have been leading to the creation of hotbeds of tension and to naked aggression, with all the tragic consequences flowing therefrom.

The most reactionary and militaristic circles of imperialism, constituting the military-industrial complex and gigantic monopolies and companies, for the sake of their political, economic and other interests have by no means abandoned their plans for maintaining their grip on strategically important regions for purposes of strengthening their domination throughout the world. This is demonstrated by plans for expanding and improving the nuclear weapon potential of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the establishment of highly mobile corps for intervention in the internal affairs of other States and in order to exercise the functions of a world policeman. This question is of particular importance for the Mongolian People's Republic because our country, and not our country alone, has been the target of encroachment of its sovereignty and independence.

The ruling circles of a State - people who, verbally at least, pose as defenders of small and medium-sized countries - at the beginning of this year committed an act of armed aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and have constantly been intervening in the internal affairs of neighbouring States and others. The aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the genocide committed in Kampuchea by the Pol Pot régime have confirmed with renewed force that the expansionistic and hegemonistic policy is based on Fascist theories and inhuman principles.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

On the basis of what I have said, the Mongolian delegation believes it to be important for the General Assembly to take a clear-cut stand on this matter, and to condemn the policy of hegemonism in all its forms and manifestations as incompatible with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and with the goal of preserving peace and strengthening international security as the first step towards halting that policy.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

We would express the hope that a constructive discussion of this question and the adoption of a resolution on the subject on the basis of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, which our delegation supports whole-heartedly, would be a first important step towards the further consolidation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and would help to improve the international situation as a whole.

Mr. KAMANDA (Zaire)(interpretation from French): Taking into account your appeal, Mr. Chairman, but speaking for the first time in this debate in the First Committee, I have the pleasant duty of conveying to you and to the other members of the Bureau my most sincere congratulations on your election. Our confidence in you is as great as the importance and delicacy of the questions submitted to this Committee for consideration, and we are convinced that you will guide our work with the far-sightedness, lucidity, sensitivity and mastery that you possess.

A few years ago - nay, a few months ago - it was hardly possible to visualize the possibility of an immediate unanimous agreement, not only on the inscription on our agenda of the question of the "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations", but less still on the need for such a debate. Since that agreement has been reached, I should like today, on behalf of my delegation, to pay a tribute to the authors of the proposal as well as to all the other Member States of the United Nations which, aware of the dangers inherent in that phenomenon, are determined to find, through our debates, appropriate and, I hope, definitive solutions to it.

That unanimous agreement, which should be counted as an asset in the records of our common struggle against all forms of aspiration to power and domination, is undoubtedly the fruit of the awakening and the new awareness of all the peoples of the world - and in particular of the most underprivileged and dispossessed, who, since the end of the first half of the present century, have wondered about the main reasons for the contradictions, the disruptions and traumas which shake our world.

Contradictions as a result of which some live in security and others in insecurity, uncertainty and the fear of the morrow. Contradictions as a result of which some live in arrogant opulence, and others share the fate of utter misery and poverty; where some see constant improvement in the quality of life of their people to the detriment of the life of others; where some take pride in being free and

(Mr. Kamanda, Zaire)

powerful and in their cultural identity, while others languish under the yoke of these proud people, deprived of their cultural identity, their freedom, their right to self-determination, with no choice but to accept the ways of thinking and acting - even of praying and speaking - of others.

Today, that new awareness and awakening of the oppressed peoples who have lived through the bitter experience of the whole gamut of possible humiliations has taken root as an undeniable fact in the history of this second half of the twentieth century that is now coming to an end. In my view, it is this that explains the fact that this debate - the need for which has become obvious - is accepted today by all, even by those who did not accept it yesterday.

In the search for the safeguarding of the interests of all, account will henceforward have to be taken of this new awareness of the developing countries, countries which are determined to complete their political independence by achieving their economic independence. By this I mean true development and progress for their peoples, and the developing countries, to achieve that aim, seek peace and security, advocate the democratization of international relations, claim an effective participation in the decision-making process with respect to world affairs, advocate the establishment of a more just and equitable New International Economic Order; in short, they clamour for a world where there will be more confident co-operation, a world which will be more reassuring because it will be more just and more serene.

It is precisely to the powerful of the world that this man to man appeal is addressed. It is unquestionably a reason for rejoicing and hope that the great and the powerful of this world should heed this appeal and that they should show themselves ready, together with us in a collective effort, to forge and create the basis for a new world order free from fear, insecurity, war and the desire for domination.

The word "hegemony" comes from the Greek "hegemonia" and both Littré and Larousse tell us that it means "supremacy of one State, nation or group of States over others".

The fact of hegemony was known from the very dawn of the organization of men into societies, from the beginnings of the first structured States, well before the word was invented. Hegemony is synonymous with supremacy, primacy and domination. What we must remember above all is that it is the act of a State or

group of States and is motivated by the desire for power and domination by a State. It is in this that it is different from despotism, tyranny and absolute power, which are the preserve of individuals. Experience has often shown that the life of individuals in societies is like that of the institutions they create, and these failings of man were communicated to the societies they ruled. It is thus that hegemony was part of the imperialistic desire to rule and dominate. It is an imperial, international State totalitarianism.

In intercommunal, intersociety and inter-State relations, hegemony - the desire to rule and dominate - was used for political, economic and cultural purposes. When used for political domination, it engendered colonialism and later neo-colonialism. When used for economic domination, it gave birth to the economic exploitation of weaker States which had resources to offer. When used for cultural domination, it engendered the adventure of iconoclasts, cultural supremacy, attempts at the cultural alienation of subjugated peoples, the myth of the supremacy or superiority of one people or race over others. For this latter we find the theoretical or philosophical basis in the work of Levy-Bruhl, Blondel, and all the cohorts of Hitler - the ancestors of the southern African racists and other contemporary racists. Those writings state, for example, that certain peoples and races have a primitive and imitative mentality, that they are incapable of creating anything themselves, that they are unable to learn and cannot be reached by spiritual things, by abstractions or by logic. And since I come from the third world, I am part of these peoples and races so judged by history in the recent past.

I say that it is hegemony which is at the root of all imperialistic ventures and aspirations, of "diktats and pronunciamentos" in relations between States, and of arbitrary divisions and distributions for various purposes of domination, which have been a particular mark of the last century and of the present one.

The Powers which gathered at the Berlin Conference in 1885 were at the service of hegemonistic interests. The Powers which later defined the principle of an international balance founded on the division of the world into spheres of influence were at the service of hegemonistic interests.

(Mr. Kamanda, Zaire)

Like the subjected peoples of the world which in a general assault against absolutism achieved democratic victories and broke the power of tyrants, despots and sanguinary henchmen to bring about the advent of State power, constitutional democratic power, delimiting or tempering individual excesses of power, many States in the world today say no to hegemonism, that is, to the will for power and domination of the powerful and great in the world, claiming the establishment of a universal democratic order and the replacement of the rule of force, the rule of war, which was the basis of hegemony, by the rule of law.

We should recall here that the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations proclaims that the use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity constitutes a violation of their inalienable rights and of the principle of non-intervention; that subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a violation of the principle of the equality of rights of peoples and their right to self-determination, as well as a denial of fundamental human rights and is contrary to the Charter; and that armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are in violation of international law. Each State, therefore, has the duty to refrain from organizing or encouraging the organization of irregular forces or armed bands, especially mercenaries, for purposes of incursion into the territory of another State in pursuance of political, economic and cultural designs.

We should perhaps think today that things have changed, that the provisions of the draft resolution will be better respected than those in the Charter and in the Declaration on the Principles of International Law. True, we belong to the generation of men who, with barely concealed emotion and with great relief, witnessed the ending of the colonial era. However, the disappearance of the colonial empires did not uproot the evil. The myth of the archetype, anchored in the heart and spirit of the powerful, is still very much alive.

(Mr. Kamanda, Zaire)

Opposition and obstructions to the right of peoples to self-determination, neo-colonialism, the hardly veiled will of some to continue to govern our affairs, the refusal to break with the inequitable practices and habits of the past to allow for the advent of the New International Economic Order, the fact that most States of the world are left outside the decision-making process in world affairs, the imposition of ideologies, repeated attempts to destabilize régimes and Governments that are judged to be rebellious by those arbitrary interests, frequent interference in the internal and external affairs of States, recourse to force and armed intervention by the powerful against the weaker for the settlement of disputes, the refusal to pay just, equitable and remunerative prices for the primary commodities from the developing countries, the use of the force of arms and especially of nuclear weapons for the purpose of intimidation, reprisal and subjection, and the primacy of political, military and strategic interests of the great concerning the fundamental needs, aspirations and vital concerns of the less privileged peoples - these give proof of the fact that the myth has not yet disappeared. Throughout the history of the struggle of peoples to safeguard their interests and their identity, hegemony has always resorted to a policy of force and violence to achieve its ends, which, as I have said, are at the same time political, economic and cultural. We the peoples of the third world, we the people of Zaire, have been the victims of and have paid the price for this trilogy of hegemonistic aspirations.

It is hegemony that is essentially at the root of all the evils besetting mankind today. It is at the root of the accumulation of frustrations, rancour and suffering which have prompted the peoples to oppose with violent armed resistance and rebellion, have impelled them to mistrust and all the retinue of things going hand in hand with it. It is hegemony that is the cause of the cries of pain of the children of southern Africa, Palestine, South-East Asia and elsewhere.

As I say, our peoples and States have conquered no one, have colonized no one, do not wish to rule anyone, have no weapons to threaten anyone and do not compete with anyone in the outer-space race or the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Kamanda, Zaire)

We suffer the law of hegemony. We do not practise it. Therefore, it is not to us that the appeal of the international community is addressed for the eradication of this evil. It is to the great and the powerful in this world, the ones with the means to practise the policy of hegemony and the desire to do so, that this appeal is addressed.

I think we should not dilute the responsibility of the great and powerful in this world in the face of this crucial problem by giving the impression that we are all responsible to the same degree for the present disruptions of the world which threaten the future of peoples, peace and international security and harmonious co-operation.

Therefore, if in adhering to the spirit and the letter of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union - itself one of the great Powers of the world - all the other Powers intend effectively to give us the formal and solemn assurance that henceforth an end will be put to that phenomenon in relations between peoples and nations, to open up an era of peace and harmonious co-operation based on confidence, justice, equality and freedom, then this thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations will write in letters of gold an illustrious page in the history of mankind, one of which future generations will be justly proud. Believe me, we shall give those who deserve it, and especially the great Powers, the credit for writing that unforgettable page in the history of mankind.

It is a happy coincidence that this thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly should have decided precisely to devote a noble and generous thought to the children of the world by commemorating the International Year of the Child. Therefore it is the solemn and irrefutable commitment to eliminate the inadmissible policy of hegemonism in international relations that is expected by the children of the world from the powerful of the world. We express the hope that they will not be disappointed.

Mr. LECHUGA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Cuban delegation wishes to express its support for the principles contained in the draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations.

If we advocate international détente and the elimination of situations which endanger international peace and security and defend the principle of the equality of States and respect for their sovereignty, it is only a logical consequence that we should condemn hegemonism, which is no more than one of the expressions of the desires, intentions and practices of certain Powers to impose their policies on other peoples.

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

As we are all aware hegemonism is not a new phenomenon in the international **arenas**. History shows us countless examples of States having régimes with ambitions extending beyond their frontiers that **implemented** policies of domination of other States by force, using various pretexts to justify their aggressive actions. What makes hegemonism topical and urgent today, clouded over as it is by deceitful pronouncements, is its proliferation in various parts of the world and the fact that it is practised by States with different régimes which are at present joined in a strategic alliance to promote the arms race and hamper the process of détente. At the present international juncture, hegemonism is a serious threat which could lead to armed conflicts of incalculable consequences. For this reason, it is highly important that the international community take a political decision condemning hegemonism in all its forms.

It is obvious that hegemonism, which is a policy of force, contradicts the principles of the United Nations Charter and all those declarations of the General Assembly that speak in favour of the peaceful settlement of disputes and promote international security. It is a typical policy of the great imperialist Powers, colonialist States and their allies large and small that serve as spearheads for them while pursuing their own expansionist intents at the expense of their weaker neighbours. Because hegemonism has been equated with imperialism and racism, expansionism and colonialism, aggression and foreign occupation, the recent Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries held in Havana more than once condemned it strongly in its deliberations.

We feel that the initiative we are considering today in this Committee reflects the interests of all peoples and is a valuable, necessary and timely contribution that will help to strengthen the struggle for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, and in particular of those that have powerful neighbours with great aspirations to domination. The policy of hegemonism

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

seeks in some States to perpetuate obsolete colonialist or neo-colonialist relations and in others to impose new relations of dependency and subjugation. In both cases, of course, it represents a disrupting factor for world peace while fomenting hotbeds of tension and aggressive manifestations against the independence, sovereignty and free development of those peoples against which the policy is directed. Hegemonism runs counter to international co-operation, human rights and the fundamental freedoms of the States that are victims of such a policy or are threatened by it.

There is no doubt that the international community still has a long, arduous way to go before it can eliminate the danger of war, bring about a healthy climate in international relations while enhancing détente, and achieve a just and equitable economic development. Something has been achieved of late thanks to the heroic struggle of many peoples, to international solidarity in the face of foreign aggression and to the undeniable fact that the interrelation of forces in the world today has made it necessary to conclude partial agreements in certain areas. And it is precisely these advances that the most reactionary, counterrevolutionary forces are seeking to halt - forces which are intent on bringing the world to the brink of war.

Today, hegemonism is one of the most dangerous manifestations of that war-mongering policy, which is highlighted in the varied attitudes we see in South-East Asia and the Caribbean, perhaps manifesting its most crude, its most threatening and provocative and its most slanderous and hypocritical expressions in the attempts by its perpetrators to justify it. We would be doing a good piece of work if we included a condemnation and rejection of hegemonism amongst the principles governing the United Nations.

For all of these reasons, my delegation supports the initiative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French). As a small country which for almost a century has suffered from the effects of the policy of domination, hegemonism and the use of force and which is now subject to severe political and military pressure from international reactionaries who, for the sake of their hegemonistic and expansionistic ambitions in Indo-China and throughout South-East Asia, have massed several divisions of troops on its frontiers, sent in spies and pirates to carry out subversive activities and cause trouble on its territory and rallied all the Laotian reactionaries in exile around the so-called Lao Socialist Party, which they themselves have fabricated, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, because of the circumstances in which it finds itself, welcomes the inclusion on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of item 126, entitled, "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations," proposed by the Soviet Union. And we also welcome the fact that priority was given to the examination of this item by the First Committee.

Hegemonism is not a new phenomenon, as several previous speakers have already quite rightly stressed, citing in support several distressing examples from the past, particularly that of the Second World War, which caused so much destruction and indescribable suffering for mankind. It was in order to put an end to the policy of hegemonism, which leads to war and suffering in all their forms and manifestations for the peoples of the world, that the United Nations, which was forged in the holocaust of the Second World War, engraved in gold letters in its Charter certain fundamental principles, among which were the principle of sovereign equality of all States, the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes among States, the principle of non-recourse to the threat or the use of force against the integrity or the political independence of States, and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's Democratic Republic)

Today 34 years have gone by since the Charter came into force, and in spite of the combined and sustained efforts of the forces which cherish peace, justice and progress to promote understanding and co-operation among peoples - in short, to promote universal peace - scores of regional or localized conflicts, provoked by imperialist and reactionary forces which have not abandoned hegemony, have broken out entailing suffering and the death of millions of human beings.

The hotbeds of tension persisting in southern Africa, the Middle East and other parts of the world and which continue to cause suffering to peoples are the reflection of the scant regard some among us have paid to scrupulous respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and of international law.

Furthermore, although the time of gunboat policy is now over, it is regrettable that there should still be one great Power which, relying on its superior force, claims with unbounded cynicism the right to teach lessons - mild or severe, as it deems necessary - to sovereign States, while another great Power also openly threatens to send troops to intervene in certain parts of the world, wherever its so-called vital interests are threatened.

What are all those phenomena but arrogant manifestations of hegemony? And it is those manifestations which continue to poison the climate of international relations and to constitute a serious obstacle to the deepening of détente and speed up the arms race.

Let all those who oppose the policy of hegemony, whether in muted tones or stridently, here or elsewhere, join in the effort of the United Nations to combat this scourge. In this connexion draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.1, submitted by the Soviet delegation, which we support and which is at present under consideration by the First Committee, represents in our view a good point of departure towards banning hegemonism in international relations that will lead to the advent of a better international order ensuring peace and progress for all.

Before concluding I wish to take this opportunity to convey to the Chairman, on behalf of my delegation, my warm congratulations on his unanimous election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. The fact that it should be him, such a distinguished representative of a small country, from the geographic and demographic point of view, who has been entrusted with the conduct of our Committee

(Mr. Souvarinho, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

at the time when, thanks to fortunate circumstances, it is actually considering this question of vital interest for the security if not the very survival of small States, - the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemony in international relations - this represents for us, in the Lao People's Democratic Republic, real comfort in our desperate and unflagging search for peace based on justice, on respect for the principle of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, equality, mutual advantage and peaceful co-existence. We are convinced that under his enlightened leadership the debate on the item we are concerned with at present, as well as on the other points on the agenda of our Committee, will lead to positive results, which will thus mark an important turning point in our common struggle for détente, disarmament, peace and progress for all peoples.

Mr. BAFI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The policy of hegemonism in all its forms runs counter to the principles of the United Nations and also to the principle of the sovereign equality of States. Some imperialist States are inclined to hegemonism in their international relations; I have in mind in particular the United States of America. The repeated statements of American leaders on the use of force and the threat of the use of force in the Indian Ocean, and particularly in the region of the Arabian Gulf, the last of which was the declaration of President Carter on the visit of American forces to that region, confirm that the United States of America continues to believe in hegemony, domination and controlling the fate of free peoples. Other races and countries, like South Africa and the Zionist entity, practise the most abject forms of hegemony and domination. The Zionist entity has entirely occupied Palestine and part of the territory of three Arab States; it has imposed its hegemony and domination over these occupied territories, depriving the Palestinian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and to the creation of an independent State, and its right to return to its homeland.

(Mr. Bafi, Iraq)

The non-aligned States, since the creation of their Movement, have rejected the policy of hegemonism as represented by the will manifested by some States to dominate other peoples and countries. In all its conferences, the Non-Aligned Movement has stressed the principle of the equality of States, their right to self-determination and their sovereignty over their natural resources, as well as the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and the right of all States to follow the economic and social system of their choice. Thus the Non-Aligned Movement has expressed its full opposition to the policy of hegemonism and domination and has condemned the use of force and the threat of the use of force against other States. It has condemned occupation and domination in all its forms, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and zionism.

Iraq, which believes in the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations or the threat to use such a policy, and considers that the manifestations of that policy have created hotbeds of tension in the world, particularly in the Middle East, strongly condemns the policy of hegemonism in all its forms and manifestations. It is for this reason that we support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.1, which is before this Committee under agenda item 126, entitled "The inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations".

Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): Like the delegations of the speakers who preceded me, my delegation too would like to state its general concurrence in the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations". While the word "hegemony" is an old concept, its perception has invariably undergone changes from decade to decade, not so much in its concept but rather in its scope.

My delegation agrees with the definition of that word given yesterday by the Ambassador of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan when he said that, in essence, hegemony means the striving by States or groups of States to place under subjugation, to exercise by covert or overt action undue and illegitimate overriding influence over the behaviour and decision-making processes of other States and peoples. Concomitantly there was the phenomenon of colonialism, likewise the occupation of other States and peoples' territories, the exploitation of their human sweat and the cheap exploitation of their natural resources.

As a nation which has regained its independence through physical struggle, Indonesia is fully aware of the denigrating effects of the policy of hegemonism towards other human beings. Born out of the struggle against the policy of colonialism, Indonesia has from the very outset expressed itself against the policy of one State's arrogating to itself the right to subject another State. That attitude therefore found its reflection in the preamble of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, where the principle is explicitly laid down that Indonesia is against the subjugation of one nation by another.

Having freed itself from the shackles of colonialism, Indonesia felt and continues to believe that it is incumbent upon other independent States to help other colonial peoples to obtain their fundamental rights, in particular their right to exercise self-determination. For that purpose the Bandung Conference - sponsored by Burma, Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan and Indonesia - was held in 1955 and attended by States and peoples from Africa and Asia. That Asian-African Conference adopted, inter alia, a Declaration on World Peace and Co-operation in which it agreed that nations

(Mr. Kamil, Indonesia)

should live together with one another in peace as good neighbours and develop friendly relations and co-operation on the basis of the following 10 principles:

1. Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.
2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.
3. Recognition of the equality of all races and nations, large and small.
4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of other countries.
5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively in conformity with the United Nations Charter.
6. Abstention from the use of arrangement of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the big Powers, and abstention by any country from exerting pressure on other countries.
7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.
8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means such as negotiation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, as well as other peaceful means of the parties' own choice, in conformity with the United Nations Charter.
9. Promotion of mutual interest and co-operation.
10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

Those are the Bandung 10 principles, also called the Dasa Sila of Bandung.

To realize those 10 principles in international relations, the primus inter pares of which is the recognition of the equality of all races and nations, large and small, the first Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries in 1961 at Belgrade continued to pursue its campaign against hegemonism and for the democratization of international relations. In the first place, emphasis was placed on the struggle for colonial peoples to gain their independence. Once they have acquired their political independence, the process of democratization of international relationship continues in the economic, cultural and other aspects.

(Mr. Kamil, Indonesia)

The ideal of building a New International Economic Order also stems from the conviction that a policy of hegemonism should not have a place in the international community of today. While much remains to be done to realize that principle, it is a fact that more and more nations are becoming aware that in today's world no single international problem can be solved unilaterally by one State without critical repercussions from other quarters.

The recent Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September 1979, adopted the following paragraph in its Final Declaration expressing its principles and aims, which clearly are very much opposed to any policy of hegemony:

"National independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, sovereign equality and the free social development of all countries; independence of non-aligned countries from great-Power or bloc rivalries and influences and opposition to participation in military pacts and alliances arising therefrom; the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, ... foreign occupation and domination and hegemony; active peaceful co-existence among all States...; non-interference and non-intervention in the internal and external affairs of other countries; freedom of all States to determine their political systems and pursue economic, social and cultural development without intimidation, hindrance and pressure; establishment of a New International Economic Order and development of international co-operation on the basis of equality; the right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and alien domination and constant support to the struggle of national liberation movements...; opposition to the division of the world into antagonistic military-political alliances and blocs and rejection of outmoded doctrines such as spheres of influence and balance of terror; permanent sovereignty over natural resources; inviolability of legally established international boundaries; non-use of force, or threat of use of force and non-recognition of situations brought about by the threat or use of force; and peaceful settlement of disputes."

(Mr. Kamil, Indonesia)

I have referred to actions at the national and international levels, and specifically to actions taken by the Non-Aligned Movement to which my country belongs, all of which constitute rejection of the policy of hegemony, and it is clear that the discussion of the item proposed by the Soviet Union is timely and necessary. Indeed, if I may go back, a policy of hegemony can be exercised and imposed on other countries in very many ways. I have mentioned the classical ones, namely, colonialism and imperialism. But it can also be imposed, for example, by a richer country on a poor one; by a more populated State on a sparsely populated one; by a coastal State on a land-locked country, and so on.

In our region of South-East Asia, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) is making constant efforts to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality with a view to eliminating as far as possible outside interference, intervention and pressure.

(Mr. Kamil, Indonesia)

Thus, to Indonesia hegemony not only is a global phenomenon between great Powers, but also exists on a regional scale, where meddling by a stronger Power constitutes a policy of hegemony exercised over weaker neighbours. Indeed, this policy can take on various forms and guises, as I stated earlier. For Indonesia and the neighbouring countries comprising the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), therefore, hegemony, whether it be global or regional, should have no place at all in this present-day world.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I think the statements that we have heard today - particularly those of India, Zaire, and Indonesia - and that of Jordan yesterday indicate how much importance the Non-Aligned Movement as a whole, and small countries in particular, attach to this item. Therefore, my delegation very much appreciates the Soviet initiative, especially since it is intended for the benefit of the weaker countries.

You have suggested, Mr. Chairman, that discussion of the substance of the item should be deferred to a subsequent occasion; therefore, I shall abide by your wish.

As our colleague from Zaire has pointed out, the word "hegemonism" is of Greek origin, and I understand that even though it is of Greek origin it was derived from an earlier language, which just goes to indicate how ancient this idea is and that its practice has not been unknown over the centuries.

Thus we seem to have lived with it in the past, and it was never felt necessary to raise it to the level of a principle. Moreover, in the explanations that have been given, I believe we have already found that it is an amalgam of several principles which are fundamental to the Organization - principles which we have been discussing for a long time.

Therefore, in the view of my delegation, we have to consider seriously whether it is a question of the Committee taking up time to define something which is already contemplated in various aspects of our work, in which case it would seem to my delegation to be more efficient for us to concentrate on the work already being done in the same direction so as to achieve not simply a declaration but the effective implementation of declarations.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

I think that in the general debate there was a pronounced tendency to say that what we need at this session is action rather than words, and I believe that it is this objective that we should constantly keep in mind when exercising our options - and we have an open-mind on this - concerning the most efficient way of treating the concept that we are trying to define.

As our colleagues from the Non-Aligned Movement have indicated - and the representative of Indonesia has read out the relevant paragraph - the non-aligned countries are concerned with many, many aspects that would fall totally within the concept of hegemonism, and at their Havana meeting they made specific recommendations on them that I hope will be taken up by this Committee at the appropriate time.

The definition of hegemonism given in my dictionaries - I used an American and an English dictionary - goes beyond the definition being proposed to us by the representative of the Soviet Union. For instance, it contains the element of leadership, and, as we know, leadership can be good, bad or indifferent, with various shades in between. But we the peoples of the United Nations have given a particular role of leadership to the permanent members of the Security Council, and it seems to my delegation, judging from the past experience of this Committee, that this is unfortunately what we have found to be lacking - that the special prerogatives that have been given to the permanent members of the Security Council have not been utilized, and at times perhaps have been utilized in the wrong direction. Again, this is one proposal that the non-aligned countries are making, and if the permanent members of the Security Council would co-operate with the non-aligned countries in trying to give effect to the organizations which we have but which have not been utilized in the past, I think that that might be the most productive exercise we could carry out at this session.

There is one other thing that worries my delegation, which is that very often in our attempts to define new concepts we seem to circumscribe old concepts that have already been agreed to. That is, for instance, what has happened to us with the notion of arms control rather than disarmament. Again, the notion of détente is certainly very much in fashion these days, but it is less specific than disarmament, and less comprehensive than the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Peace and Security. Therefore, we should guard against

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

diminishing what we have already agreed to, particularly in the Charter of the United Nations, by attempts to define new concepts - perhaps in a very restrictive way.

We should utilize our time, as I have said, in giving concrete expression to those concepts which we have already subscribed to. I think this is of particular importance to us at this session.

It is in that perspective that my delegation will look into the question when we come to discuss it at a later stage, and on that occasion I may have a lengthier statement to submit for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Iran, who wishes to offer a clarification.

Mr. BAYANDAR (Iran): It is with much regret that my delegation feels compelled to make this point of clarification in connexion with the statement made a few minutes ago by the representative of Iraq. In the course of his statement he referred to the Persian Gulf by a fictitious name. While my delegation can identify itself with much of what he said on the substance of the question of hegemonism, I must nevertheless remind him that trying to change a historical and universally accepted geographical term is in itself a manifestation of hegemonism, which I very much hope he will avoid in future.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other member has expressed the wish to speak on agenda item 126 at this time, I shall now call upon those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I should like to remind members that, as is pointed out in document A/BUR/34/1, Part I, the General Committee has adopted a decision in which it is stated that delegations exercising the right of reply should do so at the end of a meeting, and, most importantly, that no reply should last longer than 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAN (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French):

In exercise of my right of reply to the representative of Mongolia, I should like to make the following statement.

Everyone knows that the peoples of the world want to live in independence, to have their national sovereignty and territorial integrity respected, and to maintain relations of friendship and co-operation among themselves on the basis of strict legality and mutual advantage. Everyone knows also that the people of Kampuchea fully share these noble aspirations. But everyone knows too that it is the Hanoi authorities, whose hegemonistic ambition concerning Kampuchea and South-East Asia has become an obvious truth, that are responsible for the tragic situation that has prevailed in Kampuchea since 25 December 1978 and the tension and conflict now prevailing throughout South-East Asia and the world.

Specifically, this hegemonistic ambition of the Vietnamese is reflected in the invasion of Kampuchea, the flagrant aggression against it and its occupation by more than 200,000 Vietnamese soldiers who are now massacring the people of Kampuchea and starving them in order to break their heroic resistance and to drive hundreds of thousands of our countrymen from the land of their birth and from their homes.

In just 10 months of this war of aggression and genocide of the Hanoi authorities against Kampuchea, more than 500,000 of my compatriots have been savagely and brutally massacred by the aggressors without discrimination as to sex or age. Indeed, the criminal design of the Vietnamese hegemonists is to exterminate our people through force of arms and starvation in order to annex Kampuchea. Already this fascist and Machiavellian policy of the Hanoi hegemonists has led to the death from starvation of another 500,000 of my countrymen, and is in the process of starving several million others.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

This tragedy, whose scope is unprecedented in the history of Kampuchea, and, no doubt, in the history of the peoples of the world as a whole, is the result of the hegemonistic policy of the Hanoi authorities, for to achieve their annexationist ambitions in Kampuchea, they have already implanted more than 250,000 Vietnamese settlers in the place of the Kampucheans they have driven out and murdered.

The hegemonistic policy of the Hanoi authorities not only inflicts indescribable suffering upon our people and vast ruin and devastation upon our country, but also constitutes a mortal danger to world peace and security, and to the peace and security of South-East Asia in particular.

That is why all the peoples that cherish peace, justice and independence in the world are firmly opposed to the hegemonistic policy of the Hanoi authorities and condemn the Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea and call for its cessation forthwith and the immediate withdrawal of all the forces of occupation from our country so that the people of Kampuchea may decide their destiny for themselves without foreign interference. The peoples of the world demand of Vietnam and its supporters not treacherous and fallacious professions of faith but concrete deeds. It is not enough for the Hanoi authorities and their accomplices to proclaim in words their support for what they call the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations to exculpate themselves from the monstrous crimes committed in Kampuchea or transport themselves into architects of peace or international security. They must also prove their intention by deeds.

In the case of Kampuchea, which is opposed to the policy of hegemonism, the best way of showing the world their good faith would be to put an immediate end to the war of aggression and genocide and to withdraw all the occupation forces from Kampuchea. Any other position on their part would be nothing but deception, which would only serve to expose them even further in the eyes of the world as the sole and the real supporters of the policy of hegemonism in international relations.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): It is with great reluctance that I am forced, so early in the proceedings of this Committee, to ask to be allowed to speak in exercise of my right of reply, but the statement of the representative of Iraq this afternoon leaves me with no choice.

I suppose it would be too much to expect of the Iraqi delegation that it would forgo an opportunity - such as that which presented itself with the inscription of an item the exact meaning of which is more than nebulous - to attack Israel with all the well-worn clichés with which we have all become so sadly familiar.

Iraq's appearance in this Committee as the propagator of good-neighbourly relations, defender of human rights and upholder of international law and the Charter banks heavily on the failure of the collective memory of this Committee.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

This, after all, is a Committee which deals principally with disarmament and, as such, it would be appropriate to mention that, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Yearbook of 1979, Iraq is the largest importer of arms in the third world. Those weapons are, of course, principally directed against Israel, but not against Israel alone. Iraq is striving to extend its hegemony over other States in the Persian Gulf so as to become the dominant Power in that very sensitive part of the world.

As for the right of peoples to self-determination, which the Iraqi representative has just mentioned, I would advise him to address his remarks to the Kurds of Iraq, against whom the Iraqi army has conducted a war of national annihilation for more than a decade.

The spectacle of the representative of a country which is bent on the expansion of its territory and the extension of its zones of hegemony beyond its borders, a country which has openly declared its intention to destroy a Member State of the United Nations coming before this Committee to censure hegemonism is an example of the kind of palpable hypocrisy that causes the world more and more to regard United Nations proceedings with impatient contempt. I said "impatient" because the world, living under the shadow of nuclear confrontation, expects the United Nations to do more than be a stage for the kind of performance which we have witnessed this afternoon from the representative of Iraq.

Mr. BAFI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): It is astounding that the representative of Israel should dare to deny the policy of hegemony practised by Israel in our region. The press of the whole world is filled with news of what is taking place in the Middle East. The hordes of the Israeli army now occupy Arab territory. The Palestinian people suffer from that occupation and, as the world knows, daily resist it. The Israeli army occupies the Territory of three neighbouring Arab States. And despite this, the representative of Israel dares to come before the First Committee and deny the hegemonistic designs of international zionism as represented by Israel. He denies that Israel seeks to impose its hegemony over the region.

(Mr. Bafi, Iraq)

The Zionist representative said that Iraq was the largest importer of weapons in the third world. I do not know where he gets his information or statistics, because the whole world is well aware of the fact that at the present time Israel is in fact an arsenal of American weapons - weapons that are used by American imperialism to impose political hegemony over the peoples of the region of the Middle East, over the peoples of countries neighbouring on that State.

We would have expected the representative of Israel not to speak on the question of hegemonism, because the whole world points an accusing finger at that State, based on aggression, whose dark annals are filled with pages which deal with the three wars against the Arab nation, wars which led to the deaths of thousands of women and children throughout the Arab world, including Palestinians.

With respect to the statement made by the representative of one of Iraq's neighbour States - I refer to the representative of Iran - the Gulf in question has always been an Arabian Gulf. It has been called the Persian Gulf because of the actions of certain Westerners who came to our part of the world. It is Arab, and at least half of its western area is inhabited totally by Arabs. Therefore, the Arabian Gulf will remain Arab for ever.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has ended its preliminary consideration of agenda item 12C, on which introductory remarks have been made by 19 representatives. The Committee will resume further consideration of this item on 30 November.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to make two statements. First, I should like to remind the representatives that the list of speakers in the general debate on disarmament items is to be closed on Friday, 19 October, at 6 p.m. It appears from the list that I have before me that the Committee will have to cancel a number of meetings for lack of speakers, unless members inscribe their names before the deadline.

(The Chairman)

Secondly, without wishing to give the impression of protesting too much, and while thanking many representatives for complying with my request, I should like to say that although I am sure the members of the Bureau appreciate compliments, I would once again urge observances of rule 110 of the rules of procedure with regard to congratulatory remarks.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.