

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
46th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 28 November 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 46TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

UN LIBRARY

UN/ISA COLLECTION

AGENDA ITEM 122: SETTLEMENT BY PEACEFUL MEANS OF DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Wu Zhen (China)
Mr. Sucharipa (Austria)

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

Statements were made by:

Mr. Gurinovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Glaiel (Syrian Arab Republic)

* 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.46
30 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 122 (continued)

SETTLEMENT BY PEACEFUL MEANS OF DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES (A/34/143, A/C.1/34/L.45 and L.49)

Mr. WU Zhen (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The peaceful settlement of international disputes is one of the important principles of the Charter of the United Nations and is also a principle that States should universally abide by. The Chinese Government always stands for peaceful settlement of international disputes. We consistently hold that in international relations the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence should be followed. They provide the basis for settling disputes between States by peaceful means. Countless instances demonstrate that as long as the aforementioned principles are followed and as long as there exists the spirit of friendly consultation and mutual accommodation it is entirely possible to settle disputes between States through negotiations or other peaceful means.

Regrettably, however, this principle has been repeatedly violated by imperialism, colonialism racism and hegemonism. States practising hegemonism, in particular, relying on their powerful military capabilities, are engaged in unbridled interference, domination and aggression against other States, and crudely trample upon this sovereignty and independence of others, thus posing a grave threat to international peace and security. Therefore, to ensure the application of the principle of peaceful settlement of international disputes it is necessary to oppose the hegemonist policies of aggression and of war.

We fully endorse the view expressed by some representatives that the peaceful settlement of international disputes should not prejudice the right of States to exercise individual or collective self-defence in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. We maintain that every country or people that is the victim of oppression or aggression has the right to use all means for winning and safeguarding its national independence and State sovereignty.

(Mr. Wu Zhen, China)

We support the proposal submitted by Romania and other States on elaborating a declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States and are prepared to work together with other delegates to contribute to the effective application of the principle of peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) (interpretation from French): Our Committee and through it the General Assembly are called upon today to discuss the question of the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Austria does not hesitate today, any more than in the past, to put forward its views on the question. That should provide proof that my country has always attached the greatest importance to the obligation of States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

The concept of the renunciation of force and of the peaceful settlement of disputes has been enshrined in all the great schools of religious and philosophic thought throughout history.

But a whole succession of long and painful wars, a whole series of acts of violence of every kind had to take place before the idea of an international legal obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means instead of by the use of force in relations between nations could begin little by little to be recognized at the universal level. The Covenant of the League of Nations was the first reflection, however rudimentary, of that idea which, subsequently, was elaborated further in the famous Briand-Kellogg-Fact.

Article 2 of that Covenant associates in very clear terms the condemnation of war and the obligation of all parties to find a peaceful settlement to disputes or conflicts, regardless of their nature or origin, that may arise between them.

I should like in that connexion to mention that Austria, which joined the League of Nations in 1920, often used that rostrum to defend that idea, in particular when it accepted the Geneva Protocol of 1924 on the peaceful settlement of disputes and when it voted in favour of the draft common treaty on mutual assistance which was then before the League.

Following the universal catastrophe of the Second World War, the commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes emerged even more strongly than before. The United Nations Charter, in its article 2, contains the firm obligation assumed by all Member States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, so that international peace and security, as well as justice shall not be jeopardized.

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

This brief historical account would be incomplete were we not to mention the fact that the combined principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non use of force were adopted, recently -- in a very creative manner, I might say -- by a number of States, so that they might establish new more stable and constructive relations between them.

Lastly the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe once again reaffirmed the validity of the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. In its Final Act it qualified that principle as one of the principles which should govern relations between participating States.

In addition, one year ago the States parties to the Final Act met in Montreux at the invitation of the Swiss Government to discuss additional measures for the implementation of that principle and Austria was happy to take an active part together with other signatory States.

We all know that despite the continued efforts of the international community to strengthen the effectiveness of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, that fundamental standard of international relations is constantly violated and the agenda of this General Assembly is replete with crisis situations which stem from such violations.

We think that the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes should be considered as a necessary corollary to the obligations of States, in accordance with international law, to refrain from resorting to the threat or the use of force against either the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State. If States undertake to refrain from resorting to force and if that undertaking is really to have meaning, they must have at their disposal other means for the peaceful settlement of any dispute that might arise and, indeed, the development of appropriate machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes represents for us the only possible way of achieving a strengthening of the generally acclaimed principle of non-recourse to force.

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

The principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes is also an important method of preventing conflicts. If we want truly to realize the principle of non-recourse to force, the international community, rather than waiting for the outbreak of conflicts, should devise methods to make possible early detection of conflicts and to provide just solutions for such disputes before they lead to major political confrontations or even military confrontations. May I be permitted at this stage to refer to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Austria, Mr. Willibald Pahr, during the general debate of this session of the General Assembly, in which he stressed the following:

(spoke in English)

"We must find new ways to resolve conflicts. Such measures are already the subject of intensive study by the scientific community, particularly in the field of peace research.

"We should try to apply science and its perceptive capacity to the organization of international co-operation and to the cause of improving the political decision-making process. A mere fraction of the human intelligence and ability now being wasted on the development of vast military arsenals could, if used in these positive directions, yield promising results.

"In any event, greater use must be made of science and scientific knowledge in order successfully to face the ever-growing problems and dangers which plague mankind today and which are often the root of political conflicts." (A/34/PV.9, p. 62)

(continued in French)

I should like to mention now a third consideration which is of particular importance in the context of our discussion today.

The community of States as it exists in our time encompasses States of varying economic and military strength. In the interest of truly democratic relations among all States this real difference has found its counterweight in the principle of the sovereign equality of States; and, it goes without saying, our Organization reflects that principle. But

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

that principle must be applied through certain institutions and rules of international law. Among those institutions and rules the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means and, first and foremost, mandatory procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes by international decisions assume a very important role. Through such procedures States engaged in a conflict find themselves placed on the same level and must assume the same obligations despite differences in their strength.

Article 33 of the Charter enumerates no fewer than seven different methods which States are invited to use to settle their disputes. What appears to be indispensable at this stage is that States should use those means effectively while at the same time giving proof of sufficient imagination to perfect further and to develop the existing instruments for the peaceful settlement of disputes, as was done, for instance, in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Austria, as a small neutral country, has every interest in seeing procedures and means for the peaceful settlement of disputes developed and perfected, and I have just indicated our absolute preference for the procedures which, like the observance of binding international legal decisions, guarantee the equality of States.

At a lecture given some years ago, in honour of the very distinguished Brazilian jurist, diplomat and poet Gilberto Amado, Mr. Manfred Lachs, distinguished member and, later, President of the International Court of Justice, presented the following thoughts on the basis of his experience:

(spoke in English)

"The essential issue which we face, or, I would rather say the basic premise which we must accept, is that there is a peaceful solution for every problem, a proper remedy for each and every disagreement - whatever its character - facing States in international relations.

(continued in French)

At the conclusion of his lecture on "Law and the peaceful settlement of disputes", Mr. Lachs ended his comments on the following optimistic note:

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

(spoke in English)

"There is no need to despair. Though the world is teeming with disputes and disagreements dividing States, we do have the means to resolve them. The new forums for international discussions facilitate them and provide not only a sounding-board, as is often said, but also, for those who are aware of their genuine self-interest, an unsurpassed and ready-to-hand medium for the absorption of the shock-waves of inter-State disputes. We can see that in practice our new possibilities have emerged in addition to the traditional resources. Thus the catalogue of means available has been considerably enriched. The choice open to States is greater than ever before. The essence of the problem is that States should agree in general, or in specific cases, to resort to them and should choose the most effective and satisfying method or methods."

(continued in French)

We can certainly draw inspiration from the wise words of one of the most distinguished diplomats and jurists of our time.

My delegation is grateful to the delegation of Romania for the initiative it has taken with a view to strengthening the efforts made to develop methods aimed at the peaceful settlement of disputes and their practical application. We are convinced that this debate will give a new impetus to present regional and international efforts. We have taken note of the substantive proposals submitted by the Romanian delegation for our consideration, and we welcome its presentation of a number of interesting and valid ideas that deserve careful consideration.

The Austrian delegation considers that our debate, as is natural for the Political Committee of the General Assembly, will deal with the most essential political considerations and provide an appropriate basis for further discussions of legal aspects in the relevant and competent bodies.

In this context we cannot overlook the fact that some of the proposals made in this Committee this morning are already the subject of rather advanced study in other bodies, first and foremost among them the Sixth

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

Committee and the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation therefore wishes to express the hope that those bodies will draw new inspiration from our debate and redouble their efforts to arrive at widely acceptable proposals and solutions for the significant strengthening of the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee that Greece has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.45.

AGENDA ITEM 126

INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF HEGEMONISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
(continued) (A/C.1/34/L.1, L.8 and L.52)

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR welcomes the highly important proposal of the Soviet Union concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. That initiative opens up a further avenue in the struggle of all countries to ease international tension and to ensure that détente will be a universal phenomenon and universal in its application.

The policy of hegemonism is not a new phenomenon; it is characterized by one set of Governments and States striving to dominate other States and peoples. Without wishing to embark on any complicated historical excursions, one can recall as an example of a policy of hegemonism the struggle of the Western European countries for domination of sea and land, the colonial domination of other peoples, the imperialist wars for the reconstruction of the world and for the establishment of spheres of influence.

That same policy of hegemonism and the unwillingness of certain Western countries to join with the Soviet Union in rebuffing it led to the Second World War, unleashed by Hitler's Germany. In that case, hegemonism manifested itself as fascism.

Today the world is again witness to numerous manifestations of the policy of hegemonism on the part of imperialist and reactionary forces. These include local wars, incidents verging on an outbreak of war, the use of mercenary troops, the use or threat of use of force, the hegemonism of the racists in southern Africa, the oppression of national liberation movements and economic domination. Specific actions born of a policy of hegemonism have always been accompanied by the development and fomenting of hegemonistic ideology and war propaganda: virulent infection invariably follows the growth of harmful microbes.

There are numerous doctrines and ideas in the world today which are distinctly hegemonistic in nature and are spreading their dangerous and nefarious influence: the hegemonist doctrines of fascism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, and racism in all its forms and manifestations. The United Nations, whose principal purpose is the strengthening of international peace and security, is struggling, and will have to continue steadfastly to struggle, against those unacceptable phenomena.

In these circumstances, we must emphasize the timeliness of the raising of the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism and of adopting measures aimed at preventing its occurrence in the future. The present international climate favours the achievement of such a purpose. The colonial empires which were built over the centuries have crumbled and, in the atmosphere of easing international tensions, there is a constant strengthening of the principle of the sovereign equality of States. There is a growing resolve on the part of peoples to take, to use the words of the Charter, "effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace" and also to resolve their internal affairs without outside interference.

A large number of decisions have been adopted in the United Nations condemning individual aspects of the policy of hegemonism. What is needed now is a complete and general rejection by all States of recourse to the policy of hegemonism, a rejection which would also exclude the possibility of manipulating the term 'hegemonism' to justify the aggressive and reactionary policies of any country.

In the earliest hours of the victory of the great October socialist revolution, the Soviet State annulled all unequal treaties - "treaties of plunder and repression" as they were characterized by Vladimir Ilych Lenin - and has been conducting since then a Leninist policy of peace and has spoken out in favour of the strengthening of the security of peoples and of broad international co-operation. I should also like to recall that at the first all-Byelorussian congress of the joint soviets of the soldiers', farmers' and workers' deputies in early February 1919 an address was adopted, in which the congress, in accordance with the provisions of the Leninist decree on peace, solemnly proclaimed on behalf of the millions of workers and farmers of our Republic "its will to live in peace and friendship with all peoples".

Unfortunately, however, in 1941 our people was compelled to take up arms in order to repulse the dastardly attack made upon our country by Hitlerite Germany, which was practising a policy of hegemonism in its most abominable form. We all know the dire consequences for mankind as a whole, and for individual peoples, of that policy of hegemonism. The Second World War alone resulted in more than 15 million deaths, without speaking of the great destruction and annihilation of the material and cultural values which had been built up by the toil of the peoples of various countries.

Indeed, every people has its own account to settle with those who have conducted a policy of hegemonism. This includes the peoples of those countries whose ruling circles have been conducting such a policy.

Permit me to cite some specific data on the consequences of the policy of hegemonism in its fascist guise upon the territory of Byelorussia, which was temporarily occupied by the Hitlerite aggressors from 1941 to 1944. By the terms of the 30-year Ostplan, a plan for the colonization of occupied territories, Hitlerites provided for the destruction or deportation of 75 per cent

of the population of the Republic. During the three years of occupation, they annihilated more than 2,230,000 human beings, or more than a quarter of the population of Byelorussia, and transported into forced labour in fascist Germany approximately 380,000 of our citizens. As the Committee will see, this dastardly plan of genocide was implemented at an accelerated pace, for that part of the population not marked for destruction was exploited mercilessly for agricultural work. This was in accordance with the thesis of Himmler, who stated at a meeting of SS Gruppenführer in October 1943 that

"whether other peoples live in a welfare State or whether they die of hunger is of interest to me only to the extent that they are needed as slaves to our culture".

Accordingly, cities were destroyed, villages laid waste and national and cultural monuments were destroyed. In Byelorussia 209 cities and towns were destroyed, more than 8 million square metres of dwelling areas, and in addition 9,200 villages - 1.1 million buildings - were in ruins. Of these, 186 villages have not returned to life in the years since the war: no one was left to rebuild those villages.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Approximately 3 million persons were left without shelter. The Nazi Gauleiter in Byelorussia, Wilhelm Kube, before he was killed in his own bed by partisans and underground operators in occupied Minsk, said, "There is no need to restore the destroyed cities of Byelorussia, because the city spoils the Byelorussian."

The scale of the destruction that was wrought upon the national economy may be judged from the following data.

During the three years of occupation, Byelorussia lost more than half of its national wealth. In October 1944 - that is, six months after its liberation - the volume of industrial production amounted to only 10 per cent of the volume of production in December 1940, the year before the war. During the years of occupation, arable land was reduced by 43 per cent, and only one third of the livestock was left. Scientific, educational, health and culture establishments were totally destroyed. Direct material damage was estimated to be 35 times as great as the budget of the Republic for the year 1940, the year before the war.

We believe that many delegations - especially delegations of countries that have liberated themselves from colonial domination and countries fighting against aggression and foreign interference and liquidating their consequences - could present their own accounts of hegemonism. And, of course, we must all remember that the United Nations was born in the struggle with the dark forces of fascism and militarism, which were striving to achieve world domination and pursuing a policy of hegemonism.

Thanks to the efforts of the Governments of the socialist community and all the forces of peace and progress, this is the thirty-fifth year in which it has been possible to prevent the unleashing of a new world war. During these years, under the powerful blows of the fighters for freedom, colonial empires have crumbled, and most States, including the new independent countries, are working for the economic and social progress of their peoples and developing co-operation among themselves in an atmosphere of peace.

This year in the Byelorussian SSR there is to be a solemn commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the liberating of the Republic, with due honours being given to those who fought against fascism, and veterans of the war.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byrlorussian SSR)

Not only has the damage caused by the war now been repaired, but last year industrial production exceeded the pre-war level by a factor of 25 and this year the crop harvest has increased by a factor of 3.6. There have been unprecedented achievements in science and technology. But our development continues to be negatively affected by the great reduction of our population.

We have great hopes for man's future. It is quite natural that we are most actively in favour of international peace and security and that we favour the deepening and strengthening of détente in international relations for the development of peaceful co-operation between States and peoples. We are just as resolutely in favour of the cessation of the arms race and disarmament and the just solution of other topical problems. It stands to reason that we are opposed to the superiority of one group of States over another, the threats and blackmail that may be used, and any aggressive actions or attempts to maintain colonial and racist domination. In other words, we are against the policy of hegemonism as a whole and any of its manifestations.

After all, the policy of hegemonism has always brought sorrow and sufferings to peoples. It is especially dangerous today, because the means of mass destruction may be placed at its service.

The Byrlorussian SSR notes with satisfaction that the General Assembly has, with our active participation and steadfast support, accumulated a sufficient amount of experience in the elaboration and adoption of decisions that create barriers to any attempts to conduct a policy of hegemonism in international relations. We have in mind the resolution condemning war propaganda; the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States; the resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition for all time of nuclear weapons; the Declaration and subsequent resolutions on the strengthening of international security; the Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind; and the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, and a number of other international agreements.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byrlorussian SSR)

Yes, indeed, a large number of important and progressive documents have already been adopted. They contain the principles of peaceful and equal relations between States. Much is being done to put them into practice. However, it is entirely clear that the United Nations cannot slacken its efforts in this direction even when the forces of peace and progress are being strengthened. That is precisely the reason for the new initiative of the Soviet Union on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism and international relations, the need to adopt which is based on the arguments contained in the letter of a member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Comrade Andrei Gromyko, and in statements of the Soviet delegation;

We have repeatedly said that it is necessary to condemn the policy of hegemonism in whatever forms it may manifest itself as being completely incompatible with the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international security. We invite others to follow this course. The adoption of the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, and scrupulous compliance with it by every State, will further contribute to positive transformations in the easing of international tension and the strengthening of peace. That will increase the significance of earlier decisions on the strengthening of peace and co-operation.

Let us, then, all together unanimously state on behalf of the peoples of the United Nations that never, in no circumstances, and for no motive whatsoever, will a State or group of States be allowed to aspire to hegemony in international relations or to strive to assume a dominating position, either in the world as a whole or in any given region of it.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Such a decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations would be in keeping with the demands of peoples, and with the obligation under the United Nations Charter to free succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to unite our efforts to maintain international peace and security, and to establish conditions favourable for co-operation in the economic and social progress of all peoples. We will strengthen the principle of the sovereign equality of States by excluding from the practice and life of international relations the policy of hegemonism.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The word "hegemonism" is an expression which has a very clear, precise meaning in the Arab language. The meaning of this word indicates that it is a negative concept from every point of view and in all its results. Hegemonism as a concept is not confined to one aspect of relations between States. There is individual and collective hegemony. There is political and economic hegemony. There is cultural and social hegemony.

Therefore hegemonism is an attempt made by one party against another to exercise its influence against that other party and to exploit it. Starting from this premise, international treaties have not neglected or overlooked this concept and have in fact referred to it as a concept that can be accepted by no one since it constitutes a threat to world peace while running counter to the principle of the sovereignty and the political and economic independence of States. It also runs counter to the principle of the inadmissibility of the occupation of a territory by force, the principle of self-determination or the principle which enables all States to choose the system they deem fit. Everyone throughout the world has unanimously rejected that concept of hegemonism.

My country, which had the honour of participating in the creation of this international Organization and which is a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement, together with that Movement and in principle, rejects the policy of hegemonism and the exercise of hegemonism in international relations - the more so since we still continue to be the victims of the

(Mr. Glaiel, Syria)

practice of hegemony by a régime which is in fact making a reality of that phenomenon. The policy of racial discrimination as practised by the régime of apartheid in South Africa and in Rhodesia in order to dominate the peoples of southern Africa, as well as the practice of hegemony and expansionism as practised by the régime of Tel Aviv, are both parts of that evil which we call hegemonism. It is hardly necessary for me to go into details as to the sufferings of the Palestinian people and the peoples of the Arab countries as a result of the practice of that policy by an intruder régime. I am in duty bound to refer directly and unequivocally to the positions taken by the States of the Non-Aligned Movement since its inception in the light of that phenomenon.

I shall not refer to previous conferences which have been mentioned by a number of speakers. I shall simply quote from a resolution of the last Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana. Under the heading, "The policy of non-alignment and the strengthening of its independent role", in paragraph 12 we find the following:

(spoke in French)

"... the Sixth Conference reaffirmed that the quintessence of the policy of non-alignment, in accordance with its original principles and essential character, involved the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism including Zionism and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony, as well as against great-Power and bloc policies.

other words, the rejection of all forms of subjugation, dependency, interference or intervention, direct or indirect, and of all pressures, whether political, economic, military or cultural, in international relations." (A/34/542, para. 12)

(continued in Arabic)

In paragraph 13, the Heads of State or Government again reaffirmed the foregoing principles as manifestations of the major and essential objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement. On this basis, and in accordance with these principles, my delegation considers that the inclusion of this item on the agenda was an excellent idea. A constructive discussion of this item would

(Mr. Glaiel, Syria)

be beneficial to mankind, clarify positions and put an end to all misunderstandings while strengthening international peace and security.

For all these reasons, and by virtue of these principles, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52 which was submitted by a group of non-aligned countries and it invites all delegations to support it.

The meeting rose at 4.00 p.m.