



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)  
(Vice-Chairman)

later: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF  
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

- (a) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES
- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION

Statements were made by:

Mr. Kochubey (Ukrainian SSR)  
Mr. Handl (Czechoslovakia)  
Mr. Dolguchits (Byelorussian SSR)  
Mr. Baleta (Albania)  
Mr. Harmon (Liberia)  
Mr. Chan (Democratic Kampuchea)  
Mr. Dumevi (Ghana)  
Mr. Houngavou (Benin)

\* 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.53  
7 December 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 46 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:

- (a) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES;
- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION

Mr. KOCHUBEY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The complicated processes occurring in the world today have made it absolutely clear that it is necessary to take effective measures designed to strengthen peace and eliminate existing hotbeds of tension. In the circumstances, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR sees the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security as an important basis for the activation of further efforts of Member States of the United Nations to preserve lasting international peace, deepening the process of détente and making it irreversible.

At the present time the attitude to the easing of international tension has become a watershed of a kind, discriminating between those who are sincerely aiming at peace and comprehensive development of international co-operation, and those who are doing everything they can to stop the inexorable movement of the peoples to peace and progress, those who would wish to return to the times of the cold war of evil memory and to practise a policy of hegemonism in international relations.

For the countries of the socialist community, peaceful co-existence and the easing of international tension is not just a passing but a long-term and permanent phenomenon in their policy. They are firmly in favour of supplementing political détente with military détente, and have repeatedly introduced concrete proposals to limit the arms race and bring about disarmament. They have always based themselves on the fact that it is necessary to strive for a decisive breakthrough in disarmament, in parallel with and indissolubly linked with the preparation of international political measures to strengthen the security of all States.

(Mr. Kochubey, Ukrainian SSR)

More than four decades have gone by since the beginning of the Second World War. In the years that have passed, in the European continent where it broke out, bringing innumerable disasters and the conflagration of war, a Rubicon has been crossed in the path of developing mutual understanding between nations and the confirmation of the principles of peaceful co-existence of States with different social systems. A decisive factor in relations between European States was the easing of international tension. At the same time, a great deal remains to be done for the European continent to be able properly and genuinely to be called a continent of lasting peace, good neighbourliness and co-operation. Above all, we need to bend our collective efforts to put into effect the provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and on the adoption of effective measures to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe, while ensuring equal security for the States of the area.

The programme of the socialist countries for the strengthening of peace in Europe embraces all the basic aspects of military détente in that continent, and includes a reduction of nuclear and conventional armaments and confidence-building measures. Of particularly great importance at the present time is the new proposal of the Soviet Union unilaterally to reduce from the present level the number of nuclear devices of medium range deployed in the western regions of the USSR, on the condition that in western Europe there will be no additional stationing and emplacement of medium range nuclear devices and that an immediate start is made on talks with regard to the reduction of this kind of weapon as deployed in Europe. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the implementation of this proposal would mean a genuine strengthening of military security for all European countries and an increase of trust in their mutual relations.

An important concrete manifestation of goodwill on the part of the socialist countries is the decision taken by the Soviet Union, after consultation with the other States of the Warsaw Treaty, to reduce unilaterally the strength of Soviet troops and armaments in central Europe, and this was stated by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. Brezhnev, in Berlin on 6 October of this year.

(Mr. Kochubey, Ukrainian SSR)

The hotbeds of tension which exist even to this very day in various parts of the world, to one degree or another affect the interests of the security of European States too. The stubborn reluctance of certain States to renounce the use of force as a means of pursuing their policies has led to the outbreak of conflicts and crises in various parts of the world. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that one of the most important tasks in the whole business of strengthening international peace and security is the elimination of hotbeds of tension. A dangerous crisis is still being maintained in the Middle East. Israel continues its policy of aggression against Arab countries. They are still being subjected to attacks by Israel from the air, from the sea and on land. Those attacks are aimed against the peaceful population of the sovereign State of Lebanon and against Palestine refugee camps. The strengthening of the aggressiveness of Israel with regard to the Arab countries and peoples is the direct consequence of the Egypt-Israel separate Treaty. Such a development of events in this part of the world makes it absolutely clear that separate agreements and deals in disregard of the interest of other Arab States, and in defiance of decisions of the United Nations, not only fail to bring a Middle East settlement nearer, but actually complicate and place its implementation in a state of deadlock and preserve an explosive situation which is fraught with the possibility of the outbreak of new conflicts. A cardinal solution of all the aspects of the Middle East problem can be assured only on the basis of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of aggression; the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967; the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and the creation of its own independent State; and the guaranteeing of the right of all States of the Middle East to a secure and independent existence and development.

(Mr. Kochubey, Ukrainian SSR)

The interests of the strengthening of international security would be met by a total and final elimination of all the remnants of the system of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. As was pointed out by Mr. Brezhnev:

"A source of threats to international détente is the policy directed against those peoples which are waging a struggle for their liberation from colonial and racist oppression, against neo-colonialism and for independence and social progress, and not by any means the struggle of the peoples for their rights in and of itself".

The Ukrainian SSR is unswervingly in favour of ensuring as soon as possible genuine independence for Zimbabwe and Namibia, with the transfer of power in those countries to the representatives of the people, the patriotic forces headed respectively by the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in Namibia, striving for the elimination of the outrageous system of apartheid in South Africa.

A threat to peace and security in the Far East is the policy being pursued by certain countries, a policy of converting South Korea into a military camp which is in radical contradiction with the aspirations of the Korean people to a peaceful democratic reunification of the country. This year there has been a sharp exacerbation of the situation in South-East Asia as a result of the aggression of China against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. As an open opponent of the easing of international tension, preaching the inevitability of a world war, the Peking leadership for many years now has been torpedoing all measures to ensure and strengthen international peace and security. Now they have adopted a course of open intervention in the internal affairs of neighbouring sovereign States. The failure of their armed adventure against the people of Viet Nam was quite justified and inevitable. It not only bared before the eyes of the whole world the true face of the Peking expansionists, but also showed that in the circumstances of détente aggressive circles are severely limited in their actions and inevitably meet with defeat when they attempt to realize their criminal designs with regard to other peoples.

(Mr. Kochubey, Ukrainian SSR)

The United Nations must call upon all States strictly to observe a fundamental principle of international relations - that of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States - and must bring to bear the weight of its authority to exclude from international life the use or threat of force in its endeavour to eliminate hotbeds of tension, which are so dangerous to peace.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the discussion at this session of the Assembly of the question of implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security should promote international détente, spread it to all continents, and supplement political détente with military détente, as well as develop mutual understanding and broad co-operation among States.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): Nine years have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. In that period, as confirmed by our annual discussion of its implementation, the Declaration, in keeping with its purpose, proved to be an important instrument of the United Nations for the strengthening of peace, security and co-operation throughout the world. These deliberations not only make it possible to draw the attention of Member States to a higher degree every year to the most timely questions of safeguarding international security, but, at the same time, and no less important, they have resulted in the adoption of other significant documents serving the same objective, such as the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, adopted last year. In its foreign policy, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully respects the principles set forth in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and it strives consistently for their effective application in international relations.

We believe, furthermore, that the main political prerequisite for safeguarding firm international security is provided by dynamically promoting the policy of détente on a worldwide scale, in keeping with the Declaration on the Deepening and Strengthening of International Détente adopted by the General Assembly in 1977.

While appreciating the role played in this sphere by the United Nations, we must emphasize at the same time that much more remains to be done in the most important area of the efforts aimed at the safeguarding of peace and security throughout the world - namely, in the field of disarmament.

The General Assembly, at its special session last year devoted to disarmament, outlined a broad Programme of Action relating to real measures aimed at halting the arms race and at disarmament. It quite unequivocally ranks nuclear disarmament as a priority task of primary importance. It must, however, be noted that the actual progress achieved in the negotiations has been far from satisfactory.

That is why, as we have repeatedly emphasized, we regard the earliest possible ratification and entry into force of the new Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, signed between the Soviet Union and the United States in Vienna last June, as a matter of fundamental importance. We expect that this Treaty will

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

significantly strengthen international security and, at the same time, provide a strong impetus towards progress in all other disarmament negotiations.

Of great importance for the strengthening of stability and international security is the reduction of tension on the European continent, especially in the military sphere. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is the co-author of a broad programme of concrete measures proposed to that end by the countries of the socialist community, most recently at the session of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty in Budapest last May. As is known, the socialist countries are proposing that all the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) should conclude an agreement in which they undertake not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other; they are furthermore proposing an expansion of confidence-building measures among States, the adoption of an agreement not to expand the military-political groupings in Europe, and a number of other measures aimed at improving the European political climate and increasing security. They also propose that a conference on a political level with the participation of the European countries, the United States and Canada be convened as soon as possible for a practical consideration of all the issues relating to military relaxation. The socialist countries are also prepared to conduct negotiations relating to military détente in Europe at the meeting of the signatories of the CSCE Final Act, to be held in Madrid next year.

Together with other countries of the Warsaw Treaty, Czechoslovakia has for a number of years been making every effort to achieve progress at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, and it is co-author of a number of highly constructive compromise proposals that went a long way towards meeting the positions of the Western participants in the talks.

All these proposals by the socialist countries testify to our sincere endeavour to make progress in the relaxation of international tensions and to our genuine interest in the safeguarding of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world. These are realistic and balanced proposals which do not give unilateral advantage to anybody. We are therefore convinced that substantive negotiations on them must be initiated, and we are prepared to



(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

consider whatever proposals might be submitted by the other side. As was noted by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at this session of the General Assembly:

"We intend to negotiate patiently and with perseverance with all partners on our proposals as well as on theirs at any place and at any level, including the highest." (A/34/PV.10, p. 78-80)

However, we must frankly say that the response of our partners in Europe - the NATO countries - has so far been just the opposite. Up to now these countries have not unequivocally expressed their willingness to meet at a negotiating table or at least to reach an agreement in the negotiations that are already in progress. Nor have they submitted any new proposals to that end. Instead, they speak of the need to increase the hectic armaments race. How else can one understand the well-known plans for the deployment of hundreds more American medium-range nuclear missiles in the territories of European NATO countries? The implementation of these plans would disturb the historically established balance of forces on the European continent. It would mean a considerable step backwards in the policy of détente and would result in producing a threat to peace and security in Europe and in the whole world. It would also undermine the foundations for continued negotiations that have been built with so much difficulty. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, like all the States members of the Warsaw Treaty, resolutely rejects these plans.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

That is why we support with all determination the significant proposals submitted on 6 October 1979 in Berlin by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid I. Brezhnev, aimed at replacing the increase of armaments by negotiations, to be started without delay, on the reduction of nuclear missiles in Europe. Equally we welcome and support the broadminded decision of the Soviet Union unilaterally to reduce its forces in Central Europe by up to 20,000 soldiers and 1,000 tanks in the course of the next year. All that provides further proof of the peaceful intentions and the goodwill of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty. It must, however, be understood that if, despite all that, the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) embark on the implementation of their dangerous plans, the socialist countries will have no other choice but to take the necessary measures to ensure their own security. We are convinced that the important proposals and steps by the Soviet Union, guided by the desire to break the deadlock in the long-standing efforts to relax military tension on the European continent, will meet with the agreement of the nations of the whole world and move the NATO countries to start the necessary negotiations.

While on this point, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to document A/C.1/34/10, containing an appeal by the representatives of the Parliaments of the Warsaw Treaty countries to the Parliaments of the countries of the world, and including also a special appeal to the Parliaments of the countries members of NATO, adopted at a consultative meeting held in Prague on 16 and 17 October 1979.

That important appeal issued by the highest legislative bodies of the Warsaw Treaty countries is another expression of our genuine desire to resolve the pressing questions of military détente in Europe at the negotiating table and in a mutually advantageous way. It stresses the exceptional responsibility and significance of the current period in which a question of vital importance not only to the peoples of Europe but also of the whole world is being decided upon. Either there will be another hectic round of armament in the field of nuclear missiles, with all the resulting dangerous consequences, or that will be effectively prevented and it will thus become possible to continue along the road towards the consolidation of peace and security in Europe as well as

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

beyond its borders. That peaceful road is clearly indicated by the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is exerting consistent efforts for the policy of détente to be extended from the political sphere to the military sphere also and is convinced of the necessity to activate on a broad scale and intensify efforts towards the solution of the whole range of disarmament issues in keeping with the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. We deem it necessary to achieve a higher degree of co-ordination among States in their actions relating to this sphere, one reason for this being that the continuing efforts to reach the established objectives of disarmament should not be frustrated by continuing armament. In an endeavour to contribute to that end, Czechoslovakia, on the initiative of the President of the Republic, Gustav Husak, submitted to the current session of the General Assembly a draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament, which was adopted recently in this Committee by the overwhelming majority of delegations. We believe that that document too will make a contribution to the efforts for increased international security.

In addition to the potential threat posed by the arsenals of destructive weapons, international security is being immediately threatened by the on-going conflict situations and hotbeds of tension in various parts of the world.

In this connexion I should like to emphasize in particular that Czechoslovakia resolutely and deeply condemns the aggression this year against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, which was committed in direct contravention of the most fundamental principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic stands firmly on the side of the Vietnamese people striving for the elimination of the consequences of that aggression and extends to them and will continue in future to extend, all-round needed support and assistance. We are convinced that the United Nations must categorically and once and for all reject any "teaching of lessons" by one country to another. We fully support the legitimate demands contained in the statement on 4 December of the Permanent Representative of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Ambassador Ha Van Lau.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

We also support the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine, whose legitimate rights have been infringed by the conclusion of the separate agreement between Israel and Egypt. Czechoslovakia supports the efforts of the Arab nations for the achievement of a comprehensive and just settlement, on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, of the situation in the Middle East, which continues to be a cause of serious concern.

We have consistently expressed our support for and solidarity with the peoples in southern Africa, which are continuing their struggle for freedom, independence and self-determination, irrespective of the manoeuvres by the racist and colonial régimes. However, we are deeply concerned over the reports of the growing nuclear capability of South Africa, and we fully support measures by the United Nations aimed at eliminating that danger.

We warmly sympathize with the endeavour of the people of Cyprus to safeguard the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus.

We also give our full support to the efforts of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to bring about a peaceful democratic reunification of Korea. Therefore, we call for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the southern part of the country.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic proceeds consistently from the fact that the firm safeguarding of international security requires, as a matter of necessity, full respect for the Charter of the United Nations and the effective application of its security system in keeping with the generally recognized norms of international law. We fully respect the important principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and support the augmentation of its effectiveness. We resolutely reject the policy of hegemony in all its manifestations and welcome the fact that, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, this policy has been effectively condemned in the United Nations. That fact represents an important political step aimed at the strengthening of international security and improving the international political climate. It is also necessary, however, to reinforce the material basis of the system of international security, the peaceful settlement of disputes and relations of equality among States. With that end in view, we attach great importance to a speedy elaboration and conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always actively striven for the strengthening of the positive role played by the United Nations in the process of international détente and for its increased effectiveness in safeguarding international peace and security in keeping with its Charter. It was with these goals in mind that Czechoslovakia has consistently acted in the last two years as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and it is prepared to work for these goals also in the future.

Mr. DOLGUCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The position of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was set forth in the reply of the Byelorussian SSR to the inquiry of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in document A/34/193/Add.1. Therefore, our delegation would like in this statement to dwell only on certain aspects of this problem.

Ten years have elapsed since the Soviet Union submitted to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly in 1969 the question of the strengthening of international security. The Soviet initiative at that time met with widespread support and understanding from an overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations, and it was finally adopted at the twenty-fifth or commemorative session as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The Declaration was quite rightly viewed as a programme of concrete action. It duly concentrated the attention of States Members of the Organization on the carrying out of some key tasks connected with making a breakthrough in the development of international relations so that they would move away from the cold war and towards détente.

The proclamation of the declaration of the principles of the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes among States, the development of international co-operation and other matters, promoted the adoption of a number of important practical steps to strengthen international peace and security.

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

The progress which has been made so far in this endeavour is quite clear compared with the situation which existed 10 years ago. At that time, the political situation was much more complicated and tense than it is now. The forces of imperialism and reaction were calling into question the results of the Second World War and the strategic nuclear arms race was being conducted out of all control at an absurd rate. Now the possibility of criminal actions by the supporters of the cold war have been severely limited and détente and co-operation are gaining ground. It has been possible quite perceptibly to ease the threat of a world nuclear conflict and the principle of the peaceful co-existence of States with different social systems has become much more widely put into effect in international relations. These principles are more than ever accompanied by substantive measures and are being converted into universally accepted standards of international life.

The States Members of the United Nations approved as an event of tremendous significance, the signing of the Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons (SALT II) and favour its coming into force as early as possible.

The Soviet Union proposal on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations has received widespread support at this session, which can be seen by the results of the discussion of that item which ended a few days ago in our Committee.

But with all that success, the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has lost none of its immediacy or urgency. The forces of imperialism and reaction of all shades and stripes have been unflagging in their attempts to resist détente and the normalization of the international situation, efforts to ensure lasting peace and international co-operation, as well as efforts aimed at the freedom and independence of peoples. We are firmly convinced that the greatest danger to the cause of peace and détente is the arms race which has been unleashed by imperialism, although it has been possible to limit it in certain areas through certain international treaties and agreements which are in force.

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

Incidentally, within the framework of such limited measures we take a very positive view of a number of decisions recently adopted by our Committee on disarmament problems, particularly questions with regard to the need for talks by all nuclear States on the cessation of nuclear weapon testing and the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States and the non-emplacement of nuclear weapons on the territory of those States where they do not exist at present; on the need for concluding an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the development, manufacture, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

We have been seriously alarmed by the recent course of events in Europe. In order to strengthen and develop the process of détente in Europe, we must make further progress and, in particular, we must supplement political détente by military détente. To judge by the words of the leaders of certain western Powers, they also seemed opposed to it. However, as the founder of the Soviet State himself, Vladimir I. Lenin, stated, "With regard to policy, people do not believe words, and they are quite right not to".

How can one view the plans for the emplacement of new types of United States nuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe other than as an attempt to heat up the situation, to whip up military preparations and to tilt the existing balance of power in Europe in favour of the NATO bloc? Those plans are being conducted by noisy hypocritical and propagandist campaigns to the accompaniment of the old played-out record of so-called Soviet military superiority. Nevertheless, when the time comes to demonstrate to the electors how concerned they are about defence, western leaders like to assure them of the absolute military superiority of the West.

Of course, in the face of these efforts on the part of the NATO militarists, the socialist countries of Europe would be compelled to take appropriate measures to strengthen their security. Nor should we forget that over many centuries now Europe has been the source of the most bloody wars, including those supremely devastating wars, the First World War and the Second World War.

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

Moved by the profound concern for the future of Europe and the whole of mankind, the Soviet Union has recently come forward with some important new initiatives set forth by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Part of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Brezhnev, in his speech in Berlin on 6 October this year. First, he mentioned the readiness of the Soviet Union to reduce, in comparison with the present level, the number of medium-range nuclear devices deployed in the western regions of the Soviet Union on condition that there is no further deployment of medium-range nuclear devices in western Europe.



(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

Secondly, the Soviet Union has confirmed that it would never use nuclear weapons against those States which have renounced the manufacture and acquisition of such weapons, and have none on their territory. Thirdly, the Soviet Union, in accord with the leadership of the German Democratic Republic and after consultation with the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, has taken the decision unilaterally to reduce the strength of its forces in central Europe. Over the next 12 months, as has already been pointed out here, up to 20,000 Soviet troops will be withdrawn from the territory of the German Democratic Republic, as well as 1,000 tanks and a certain amount of other military technology. Fourthly, by way of further expansion of military confidence-building measures in Europe, the Soviet Union has proposed that there should be an agreement that the preliminary notice provided for in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference of major military exercises of land forces should be given in respect of a longer period of time and not when, as now, 25,000 men are involved in the exercise, but when fewer men - that is, 20,000 men - are concerned. The idea was not to carry out military exercises involving more than 40,000 to 50,000 troops, and that early notice should be given not only of military exercises, but also of land troop movements of more than 20,000 men.

The proposal of the socialist countries with regard to giving notice of major air and naval exercises carried out in the vicinity of the territorial waters of other States parties to the European Conference still stands. These initiatives, like the proposals put forward earlier by the Soviet Union on the questions of limiting the arms race and promoting disarmament, questions of the strengthening of international security such as the conclusion among the participants to the European Conference in Helsinki of a treaty on the non-first-use against each other of nuclear and conventional weapons and also the convening of a conference at a political level on the strengthening of confidence among States, the easing of military confrontation and a subsequent reduction of the concentration of arms and armed forces in Europe - all these initiatives testify to the firm resolve of the Soviet Union and other States of the socialist community to follow consistently a course of peace and détente.

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

A month ago, Mr. Brezhnev, in answering a question from a Pravda correspondent, proposed that an immediate start be made on talks on medium-range nuclear devices. He stressed:

"It is important, however, that no hasty action be undertaken which might complicate the situation and hinder the attainment of positive results. There will be a better chance of achieving such results if before the end of the talks no decisions are taken on the manufacture and deployment in Western Europe of these above-mentioned devices. In fact, these chances would be undermined if such decisions were actually taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)".

So, before it is too late, the leaders of the Western States members of NATO should display statesmanship and adopt this proposal and embark on such talks if they really cherish the interests of peace and security in the European continent and throughout the world.

With regard to the strengthening of international security, the elimination of existing hotbeds of tension and conflict is of the highest importance, as is the establishment of the inadmissibility of the creation of new hotbeds of such a type. It was precisely one of these hotbeds which was created in Indo-China as a result of the expansionist and hegemonistic policy of China which, in February of this year, committed aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and is threatening to repeat its invasion.

China is continuing to intervene flagrantly in the internal affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea. We express our full solidarity with the peoples of those countries. It is the right of each country to be the master of its own fate and this right is a sacred one and must be strictly observed.

We must strive for a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East on a comprehensive basis with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and not by means of separate deals which only make the explosive situation which exists in this area even worse, more complicated and more acute.

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

It is the duty of all States to do everything in their power to promote the immediate implementation of the inalienable rights of the people of southern Africa to self-determination and independence, the transfer of full power to the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, as represented by their true representatives, the Patriotic Front and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and the elimination of the outrageous system of apartheid in South Africa.

The Byelorussian SSR supports the just position of the Korean People's Democratic Republic in its struggle for a peaceful, democratic unification of Korea without outside intervention and for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea.

The corner-stone of international life and further progress in détente has been and remains the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, no matter what trumped-up pretext might be put forward in order to violate that principle. Next year, we shall celebrate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The United Nations, whose principal goal is the maintenance of international peace and security, should bring to bear all its influence and authority in order to deepen and strengthen international détente, to halt the arms race and to make a start on genuine disarmament. These are the major tasks of the day. It is also important to have all States conscientiously implement the Declaration adopted on the initiative of the Polish People's Republic on the preparation of societies for life in peace.

For its part, the Byelorussian SSR, like the other socialist countries, will spare no effort to ensure the carrying out these tasks and the putting into effect of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The eighth decade of the twentieth century, which has witnessed the greatest revolutionary changes in the life of peoples and of human society as well as the most cruel wars of aggression, is coming to an end. In the context of the question which we are considering at the moment, one might wonder whether the present decade has been marked by substantial progress in the strengthening of international peace and security. To reply affirmatively to this question would be tantamount, in our view, to deliberately ignoring the dangerous world situation and the great instability and insecurity which have existed and still persist in international relations.

It is not easy, in the context of a statement, to tackle in its entirety so vast and important a subject as international peace and security. That is why we shall confine ourselves to putting forward our views on only some aspects of the problem and on certain events we have singled out because of the importance we attach to them.

One of the main characteristics, the most important and encouraging feature of the international situation today is the determination of peoples who struggle to throw off the yoke of all forms of oppression and foreign domination and fight for social emancipation in their struggle against the policies of aggression and war, interference and plunder practised by the imperialist Powers and super-Powers. People are becoming increasingly aware of their strength and more determined to consolidate the results they have achieved and to move along the path of revolution and revolutionary change.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The enormous escalation of the anti-imperialist struggle was illustrated once again by the popular uprising in Iran which was a powerful explosion of the people's hatred, ending in the overthrow of the corrupt and blood-thirsty régime of the Shah, the executioner of the Iranian people and a minion of American imperialism in the Middle East oil basin. Another vivid example of the rising strength of the peoples' struggle was the popular Sandinista uprising in Nicaragua which overthrew the Fascist Somoza régime, another puppet of the United States.

Our people hailed these victories and supports the people of Iran and Nicaragua, just as it supports the Palestinian people, the Arab peoples, the peoples of Namibia, Azania and Zimbabwe and all those peoples struggling to recover or to defend their national freedom and independence.

The course of events in international affairs strengthens our conviction that the future belongs to the people. But we must at the same time keep in mind the real dangers that are a growing threat to the freedom and independence of peoples and sovereign States as well as to world peace and security.

The root cause of these dangers and of the tense situation is to be found in the aggressive policy of imperialism, social-imperialism and world reaction, which are trying in every way to halt the process of revolutionary change and to silence the just claims and the struggle of peoples for the achievement of a change in the unequal political, economic, social, cultural and other relations which currently prevail among States.

It is not possible, in our view, to paint an optimistic picture of international peace and security when faced, for example, with an increasing number of violations of the most elementary principles of international law, and of acts of aggression and imperialist and social-imperialist interference in the affairs of many States. The same can be said when we note the continued existence of hotbeds of crisis and tension in many regions or the emergence of new conflicts and the outbreak of new regional wars. How can we take an optimistic view of the strengthening of international peace and security when the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers have amassed stockpiles of weapons which exceed the fondest dreams of the worst war-mongers of the recent past, and pursue their frenzied arms race at a mind-boggling rate? How can we speak of strengthening international peace and security when we are confronted every day by the criminal acts of imperialism, social-imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and zionism?

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

To date, there has been no true peace and security in the world. No session of the General Assembly has met without there occurring somewhere a grave crisis, a new conflict or a new hotbed of war and tension brought about by the interference of the imperialist super-Powers. The 1970s have been marked by intensification of the aggressive, expansionist and hegemonist activities of the Powers and especially of the imperialist super-Powers. Such activities assumed even more dangerous proportions because they occurred in the middle of the greatest capitalist-revisionist crisis in the world. The crisis of the 1970s, because of its dimensions, intensity and ruinous effect and because of the duration of the depression and its natural cycle, was greater than that of the period from 1929 to 1933. In order to avoid the effects of that crisis, the imperialist Powers and super-Powers have done everything they could to place the burden on other peoples, thus aggravating the international situation even further and sabotaging international peace and security.

The two imperialist super-Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - have been and still are the greatest enemies of sovereign peoples and States and the biggest manufacturers and purveyors of weapons, and represent a constant threat of aggression. They provoke conflicts and disturbances everywhere and intervene politically, economically and militarily in all continents. Their rivalry for world hegemony is a great threat to general peace and security. The United States and the Soviet Union can under no circumstances conceal their aggressive and hegemonistic aims and acts with demagogic slogans about "détente", "peaceful coexistence", "the need for a balance of forces" and "the need to take into consideration interdependence in order to serve peace", or through the clamour surrounding the SALT agreements or the talks on the reduction of military forces.

The situation in the world has become even more complicated and the elements of war and aggression are increasing now that social-imperialistic China is endeavouring to carry out its plan of becoming a hegemonistic super-Power and ensuring for itself its share of zones of influence alongside the other two imperialist super-Powers.

The aggressive, expansionist and warlike activity of China which, to achieve its objectives, relies first of all on its alliance with American imperialism, has been particularly obvious as a danger to international peace and security since

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

the beginning of this year. The Chinese leaders have for a long time extolled the virtues of a world war and have even set the time for its unleashing: the end of the century, when China will be ready for it, having completed its four modernization phases. But it did not wait for the end of the century to launch its barbarous aggression against Viet Nam under pretexts which are strikingly similar to those used by Hitler in his attack against Czechoslovakia and Poland, and in accordance with its imperialistic doctrine of "teaching a lesson". The Albanian people and the People's Republic of Albania strongly condemn China's aggression against Viet Nam, just as it denounces every form of aggression by one State against another State.

During the plenary discussions in the General Assembly on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East, we noted once again the blows struck against international peace and security and the threats made against them by the continuation of Zionist-imperialist aggression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and the interference of the imperialist super-Powers, especially the United States and the Soviet Union, in the affairs of the Middle East. This danger is steadily increasing as a result of the attempts by the American imperialists and the Israeli Zionists to impose the Camp David agreements and the separate treaty on all Arab peoples and their attempts, through provocation and blackmail, to force the Iranian people to capitulate, and to sow discord between the Iranian and Arab peoples.

World-wide imperialism, and that of the United States in particular, are afraid that the Iranian example may spread.

The conference on so-called security and co-operation in Europe has often been cited as an example and model of "détente" and of peace and security. This does not correspond to the truth or to reality. We believe that it is wrong, even for those who sincerely want security in Europe, to take something for granted simply because they would like it to happen. This would be to enable the imperialist super-Powers to continue to benefit from the demagoguery which they have already demonstrated for many years.

Nothing has changed in Europe since the Helsinki Conference. Never since the Second World War has tension in Europe and the world been more acute than today. The super-Powers have not renounced their policies, their designs or

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

their intrigues in Europe. The aggressive blocs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and of the Warsaw Pact continue to confront each other. Intensive efforts are being pursued by the United States and the Soviet Union to strengthen their control over Europe and to increase their military budgets and their military potential. The NATO and Warsaw Pact countries are in a permanent state of alert. They maintain forces three or four times larger than those they had on the eve of the Second World War. The firing power of their forces, bearing in mind their arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, is several hundred or thousand times greater than in the period we mentioned.

The armies in a state of alert in the two aggressive blocs are in a position to attack anywhere in Europe without a general mobilization being required. The United States and the Soviet armies are still stationed on the territory of many European countries 34 years after the Second World War. The navies of the two super-Powers are constantly on the move around Europe. Military manoeuvres of a massive and offensive character by NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries are becoming increasingly frequent. Manoeuvres of this kind are always a prelude to aggression and do not become less dangerous because observers from the opposite side are sometimes invited to attend them.



(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The rare symbolic reduction for demagogic purposes in the number of troops or out-moded weapons announced by the super-Powers with much fanfare in no way affects their military strength in Europe and can serve as camouflage for the qualitative increase in that strength. In these circumstances, what peace and security in Europe is there for us to speak about or congratulate ourselves on?

We believe that the situation in Europe, instead of improving, may deteriorate further as a result of the international situation in general, since Europe cannot remain a quiet zone in the midst of situations of turbulence. We are compelled to note also that other extra-European factors tend to influence the situation in Europe. Social-imperialist China is now making a much greater effort than before to incite an increase of tensions in Europe and to exacerbate existing disputes with the ultimate aim of provoking a generalized confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. As the Chinese leaders see it, the third world war must begin in Europe in order that China may see the United States and the Soviet Union destroy each other in the fires of an atomic war and the peoples of Europe incinerated in that war, and be left as the only great Power, dominating the world. China preaches in favour of a united imperialist Europe in the hope of using it for its own ends, first against the Soviet Union and then against the United States. The leaders of Chinese social-imperialism, during a recent visit to Western Europe, begged for economic assistance and at the same time attempted to throw oil on the fire of inter-imperialist differences in Europe. It is very significant that they were given their warmest welcome in the city of Munich, where they were delighted with the identity of views they shared with the revanchists, who extended them a special hospitality.

As a Mediterranean country, Albania shares the concern of other peoples that are truly interested in seeing the disappearance of the factors that are threatening freedom, independence and peace in that area and eager to make the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and tranquillity. But unfortunately the existing situation does not lend itself to satisfactory or optimistic stocktaking *and conclusions as might be wished.*

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The situation in the Middle East is still a source of danger and prevents the improvement of the situation in the Mediterranean as a whole. First it has to be said that this problem must be solved. The imperialist-Zionist aggression and the interference of the imperialist super-Powers must end. It is also necessary to eliminate another source of tension and possible complications. I am referring to the question of Cyprus. We hope that that question will be settled as soon as possible by the parties directly concerned.

Above all, however, it must be emphasized that the situation in the Mediterranean has become tense and can become worse because of the aims and activities of the United States and the Soviet Union, which have sent large war fleets into the Mediterranean to present a standing threat to the peoples and countries of that region and to engage in mutual rivalry.

We have always supported the idea that to serve the cause of peace and security in the Mediterranean it is of primary importance to oppose the policy of the imperialist super-Powers and to compel them to withdraw their war fleets. In our opinion, the coastal countries must to this end categorically refuse to grant naval bases and supply depots to the American and Soviet fleets; no port facilities must be accorded them, and they must not be received on so-called friendly visits.

As we have already had occasion to emphasize, it is our opinion that initiatives designed to proclaim zones of peace or "nuclear-free zones" in various parts of the world, or the idea of setting up such a zone in the Balkans, do not remove the threats of war and weaponry. The over-armed imperialist Powers and super-Powers that remain outside such zones will have no difficulty, should conflict arise, in violating the status of those zones or in turning them into battlefields.

The People's Republic of Albania has been and will always be a factor of peace and stability in Europe, in the Mediterranean and in the Balkans. It has always maintained just and principled attitudes on the problems affecting peace and security in its part of the world. Our people are eager to live in conditions of good-neighbourliness with the countries of the Balkans and the Adriatic. Our country's relations with neighbouring countries are developing

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

satisfactorily and we favour their further development, always on the basis of the policy of good-neighbourliness. Albania has on many occasions stated that in the future, as in the past, no ill or danger of any kind will come to its neighbour States from its territory. We believe that the success of the policy of good-neighbourliness depends in large measure upon, among other things, the firmness with which the States of a region oppose the designs and interference of the imperialist super-Powers.

In conclusion, I should like to express the opinion of the Albanian delegation that the struggle for true international peace and security turns on the peoples' struggle for national liberation in the defence of freedom and national independence.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): The Liberian delegation would like to address itself to the agenda item before us entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". In so doing, we take note of a number of very interesting views stated by a number of States, as reported by the Secretary-General in documents A/34/192 and A/34/193 of 4 October 1979, the first of which specifically concerns non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

Liberia is not among the States that encapsulated their views on non-interference in that report, although the tenor of our views has been outlined in our statement on the item on hegemony.

We are not implying that the two issues are identical. For us, they are related, in the sense that, without breaching the concept of non-interference, hegemony is difficult if not impossible. In fact, we would venture the thought that the tactics of meddling, manipulating and interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign States are the very tool, thrust and spearhead of hegemony and domination. Domination begins with interference, at first subtly, and proceeds gradually to end in control of varying degrees, and it does not rest until it reduces its victim to the paradoxical state of a virtual colony under a face-saving flag.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

If, as we said in our statement of 30 November, we seem to be living in an age of hegemony, it is because its deep roots are planted in a period of rampant interference by one State or a group of States in the internal affairs of another.

We in Liberia may say without being boastful that we have jealously guarded our sovereignty and independence. We take pride in our historic birthright, in sharp contrast to those States which unfortunately come into the world with a kind of pre-natal interference. Even now, we are all watching from this Assembly hall two illustrations of this type of attempted interference, in Rhodesia and Namibia, where a dominating Power is trying to create two States in its own dominating image.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Historians will have to list in the assets column of the United Nations that in the sum total of the decolonization period it has upheld the principle of non-interference in the self-determination process by the administering Powers, and on the whole, in our opinion, has done so successfully.

It is to the honour of the Assembly that at this session and at previous sessions it has maintained the principle of free birth against this type of pre-natal interference. Upheld is not only a moral principle, but beyond that an important safeguard against war and the struggle for power that begets wars, for a State born under the ill-star of outside interference is in danger of becoming a puppet State, adding to the war-like ambitions of its ill-advised parent or reacting with a violent rebellion against the tyranny of its colonial parenthood. In either case, violence is the consequence.

There are still a number of areas in the world that are in the process of self-determination - mini-areas and islands, which lend themselves to heavy pressures against their thin walls of self-determination.

The Liberian delegation ventures to suggest that this is the time when the principle of free self-determination must be asserted with greater emphasis than ever as an important contribution to the strengthening of international security.

On this more general item it seems to the Liberian delegation that there is, on the whole, a formidable consensus on the major principles amply formulated in the resolutions adopted in 1977 and 1978, and almost equal consensus on how those principles might be implemented, to the point of monotonous repetition, although pending adequate implementation, reaffirmation and restatement must remain the tool of parliamentary will.

This is our reply to those who dismiss the United Nations as an Organization of words, talk and so-called rhetoric. To them we say, "So is every parliament, so is every parliament". It is a fair guess that the daily output of words at the United Nations is still only a fraction of the daily verbal output of most parliaments.

Words, too, are implementation - or it would never have been said that the pen is mightier than the sword.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

On the question of implementation my delegation would prefer to add to the restatement of principles and implementation a third approach. The question is, how much progress was made in the implementation of the two resolutions? This is important because, by measuring the steps of progress, we determine the effectiveness of the Declarations.

I shall not list this approach with reference to the various provisions of the two Declarations. Representatives are familiar with the comprehensive scope of their coverage. They are indeed Declarations, with guidelines that in their totality could bring peace even in our own time. So in a manner they are an index that will not be exhausted for many years to come.

The Declarations are two years old. How much progress has been made in their implementation in this very brief period of time? In our opinion, it is more substantial than is generally credited if we detach ourselves from the pessimistic headlines and keep an eye on the general trends.

The question of completing the era of decolonization I have already mentioned. In the Fourth Committee and in the Committee of 24, we see administering Powers inviting United Nations observer missions - Powers that were previously shy about receiving them. This is progress; I say with emphasis, important progress.

In the disarmament sector, the two big Powers have taken another step forward to avoid pushing the arms race into the peril of the strategic missile systems, with SALT II, and we hope they press for SALT III.

In Europe, the Soviet Union has taken the initiative towards reducing the confrontation of military forces in central Europe, and one hopes that this trend will continue.

In the United Nations itself, an important organizational approach was born with the creation of the Committee on Disarmament, and at this session we have registered continued progress towards attaining a complete test ban, and progress in the area of dangerous conventional and chemical and biological weapons and in the area of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace. We see more crystallization in the very important progress of big nuclear-Power guarantees to non-nuclear States. Resolutions have been adopted against States trying to break through the walls of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Again, in the political arena too little emphasis, in our opinion, has been placed on the normalization of diplomatic relations between China and the United States of America, two permanent members of the Security Council. Some see their primary mission as a card game in a new cold war, but we believe sincerely that the influence of the normalization of relations and of the United Nations will prevail. Similarly, during this period we have witnessed the resumption of negotiations between China and the Soviet Union over their differences. Together, three permanent Powers on the Security Council are involved, all moving in the direction of a more orderly world in the spirit of the Declaration.

In the tragic episode of the refugees from Kampuchea, the United Nations moved in, transforming a situation of chaos into some semblance of order and moving in a United Nations caravan of food to relieve the Kampuchean famine, thereby endeavouring to overcome political difficulties.

A number of peoples have overthrown their dictators and tyrants, under the banner of United Nations human rights. Even foreign policies are sometimes bent to appease the rising human rights movement, while the United Nations banner is flying in the wind of various liberation movements.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

The United Nations Year of the Child was a great victory for the children of the world while the cry for peace itself is now being heard in the name of the child.

Here in the United Nations, men of all faiths have joined in the the Pope's visit to the United Nations with his own indomitable spirit of peace, goodwill and human rights, expressed on the highest plane of faith and hope that lifted the hearts of men to a new realization of the universal mission of the United Nations, bringing to millions a new awareness of its work, its aims and its goals.

Consequently, now, before our very eyes is the great challenge of Iran, floundering for weeks in the foul climate of recriminations and confusion, but which has veered more hopefully towards the United Nations Security Council, as the first possible breakthrough in a near-war confrontation in a region where war could shake the world.

And this therefore brings us to one more development on the positive side of implementation. The United Nations Secretary-General, faced with two simultaneous crises threatening to get out of hand, assumed formidable initiatives in Indochina and Iran, in a demonstration that adds a new force to the growing power of the United Nations.

This then brings me to the important draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1, submitted by Romania and 15 other sponsors, on the implementation of the Declaration on the strengthening of International Security. I strongly recommend its favourable consideration by this Committee.

Yes, there is also a long column of liabilities which the 20-nations draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55 amply lists in accurate appraisal.

Yes, there are also wars - perhaps there will always be more wars - almost inevitably in a changing world.

As I conclude these remarks, let me leave with this Committee these words: the Declaration, under the Charter, is being implemented, haltingly, stumblingly, but demonstrating that the Declaration is sound and is amenable to implementation. Such is our hope on the eve of the new decade.



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

At the present time, all peace, justice and independence-loving people in the world have recognized that, far from being strengthened in accordance with their profound and legitimate aspirations, international security remains more than ever an illusion, a slogan, a propaganda point, used everywhere by the colonialists, the neo-colonialists, the racists, the imperialists and, above all, the expansionists and hegemonists, great and small, throughout the world.

Clearly, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted 10 years ago by our Organization, is itself nothing but a mere declaration of good intentions, without effect, and this is because of the determination of those who continue to violate with impunity the Charter of the United Nations, and particularly the principles of respect for national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, by resorting to the threat or use of force by acts of military intervention, by acts of interference and by occupation of foreign States or of part of their territory. It is all those acts, therefore, which underlie the general insecurity which marks the current situation in the world where new conflicts have emerged which seriously imperil international peace and security.

The debates in our Committee and in the General Assembly have testified to this. It suffices in this regard to recall that our Committee adopted on 30 November last the draft resolution condemning hegemonism in its forms, whether global, regional, or sub-regional. It should also be recalled that the General Assembly, following the debate held from 12 to 14 November last on the situation in Kampuchea, adopted by an overwhelming majority resolution 34/22, whereby the General Assembly expressed its profound concern at the spread of the Vietnamese war of aggression in Kampuchea to other countries of the region. The General Assembly also expressed its profound concern at the state of generalized hunger from which the people of Kampuchea are suffering because of this war of aggression and genocide, and also manifested its serious concern at the massive and uninterrupted exodus of hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans to Thailand, people fleeing from the massacres committed by the Vietnamese troops and from the policy of famine used as a weapon by the Vietnamese aggressors to break the resistance of our people and to exterminate the Kampuchean race in order to occupy and totally annex the territory of Kampuchea.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

This situation, so dangerous and alarming for international peace and security, has already been duly noted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who stated in his annual report:

"... the long and cruel war in Indo-China not only threatens the peace and stability of South-East Asia; it could very well also become a threat to world peace". (A/31/1, p. 5)

On 19 October last, at his press conference, the Secretary-General, interpreting the profound concern of the international community, described the tragedy of the people of Kampuchea as a tragedy unprecedented in history because the very survival of a whole people was at stake.

In the face of the universal condemnation heaped on them by our Organization and from the international community, the expansionists and hegemonists of Viet Nam are seeking desperately to justify their war of aggression and genocide in Kampuchea and to camouflage their expansionist ambitions in South-East Asia by treacherous manoeuvres, slander and lies, cleverly presented in the form of professions of good faith and humanitarian or progressive slogans. Actually, we can assert unambiguously that the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists are the only ones in the entire history of the world to have outdone the other colonialists, neo-colonialists and imperialists known to date.

Indeed, in order to annex and swallow up Kampuchea and Laos - small countries with small populations, in comparison to Viet Nam with its 50 million inhabitants and powerful army - the Vietnamese expansionists wanted to create an "Indo-Chinese Federation" under Vietnamese domination. By subversive manoeuvres and the military occupation of Laos by more than 50,000 Vietnamese soldiers, the Hanoi expansionists have already succeeded in taking their first step towards satisfying this hegemonistic ambition. The so-called Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation, signed on 18 July 1977 between Hanoi and Vientiane merely acknowledges and legalizes Vietnamese suzerainty in Laos. Everyone knows this now. But the Lao people rose up against this Vietnamese colonization of Laos. Hundreds of thousands of Laotians perished in the course of the patriotic struggle to safeguard national independence, while hundreds of thousands of others chose forced exile in Thailand in order to escape the massacres committed by Vietnamese troops.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

With regard to the case of Kampuchea, which constitutes the second link in the chain of the Vietnamese "Indo-Chinese Federation", the Hanoi expansionists have had recourse to the same manoeuvres as in Laos, but these manoeuvres failed, thanks to the vigilance and determination of our people and Government. That is why the war of aggression, genocide and racial extermination waged in Kampuchea by the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists is the logical consummation of a whole series of acts of subversion, undermining, sabotage and the murder and assassination of Kampuchean patriots committed by the Vietnamese fifth column, which for scores of years had been infiltrating Kampuchea with the aim of annexing it after the elimination of colonialism, through an "Indo-Chinese Federation" under Vietnamese domination.

In this regard, it is worth recalling some important dates. From 1945 to 1954 Viet Nam, on the pretext of fighting the colonial occupier, established itself in Kampuchea and Laos and took advantage of the circumstances to infiltrate those countries with its agents and to recruit more on the spot, on the basis of a so-called proletarian internationalism and the cult of "Indo-Chinese Federation".

In the period from 1954 to 1970, pursuant to the Geneva accords of 20 July 1954, the Vietnamese were forced to withdraw from Kampuchea, but they took with them about 2,000 Kampuchean, who, after 15 years of indoctrination, had become the servile agents of Vietnamese hegemonism and expansionism. Furthermore, beginning in 1965, the Vietnamese known as the Viet Cong took refuge in Kampuchea in vast sanctuaries and took advantage of the Kampuchean people's hospitality and assistance to continue to infiltrate that country with their agents and to recruit agents locally in order to establish the necessary conditions for annexing Kampuchea after liberation.

During the period from 1970 to 1975 the number of these Vietnamese installed in Kampuchea grew to 2 million. They continued even more intensively and more systematically to carry out their subversive activities, their infiltration and their sabotage of the struggle of the people of Kampuchea.

Over these periods the agents of the Vietnamese fifth column were able to climb to different levels of the organs of both civil and military power in the State.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

During the period from 1975 to 1978 the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists refused to leave the sanctuaries in Kampuchea and carried out ceaseless attacks and acts of aggression and encroachment along the frontier. Through their fifth column agents who had infiltrated Kampuchea, they carried out an intense campaign of subversion, undermining and sabotage within Kampuchea and, against the civilian population and Kampuchean cadres deemed to be too independent, they committed odious crimes aimed at fomenting trouble inside Kampuchea, destabilizing and overthrowing the Government of Democratic Kampuchea from within and installing in its place a puppet régime, as well as annexing Kampuchea without arousing world attention, just as they had annexed Laos by means of the so-called Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation of 18 July 1977, to which I referred earlier.

It should be recalled that immediately after our liberation the Vietnamese expansionists in May 1975 committed aggression against and occupied the Kampuchean island of Koh Way, situated in the Gulf of Thailand. This is eloquent proof of the fact that the Hanoi authorities have always sought to annex Kampuchea by all possible means and at all times, by using both brute force and subversive manoeuvres in order to dominate Kampuchea.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

But, as those activities were not successful and did not prevent Democratic Kampuchea from developing, the Vietnamese hegemonists and expansionists had recourse to naked aggression on a large scale against Democratic Kampuchea, for the first time in December 1977 and, after the failure of that attempt, a second time on 25 December 1978.

The history of relations between Kampuchea and Viet Nam, particularly since the independence of Kampuchea, is one of stubborn struggle between the consistent policy of independence and non-alignment of Kampuchea and the policy of regional hegemonism, expansion, domination and the formation of blocs of the Hanoi authorities. It is the history of antagonistic opposition between the unshakable will of the people and the nation of Kampuchea to live, like all other peoples and nations, in independence, with honour and national dignity, within its own frontiers, on the one hand, and the determination of the Vietnamese hegemonists and expansionists to enslave the people and the nation of Kampuchea in all possible ways, on the other.

It is now well established that the Vietnamese regional expansionists and hegemonists in their relations with Kampuchea have always intervened in the internal affairs of Kampuchea, used force and the threat of force and carried out political assassination and attempted coups d'état aimed at realizing their ambition of swallowing up Kampuchea through the "Indo-Chinese Federation". Between 1975 and 1978 they murdered approximately 10,000 of our countrymen and, with machiavellian cunning unprecedented in history, distorted the truth in order to escape responsibility for their odious crimes and attribute it instead to the Government of Democratic Kampuchea with a view to justifying their aggression against Kampuchea and concealing the odious crimes of genocide which they had committed and are still committing against the people of Kampuchea by force of arms, starvation and the use of toxic chemical weapons. At the present time, more than 1 million Kampuchean have already been murdered by Vietnamese troops. Hundreds of thousands of others have been forced to take refuge in Thailand. In their place the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists have already installed more than 300,000 Vietnamese, just as Israel has installed its settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

The war of aggression and genocide now being waged by the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists against Kampuchea is a war sui generis without precedent in history. It is even more cruel and barbarous than the colonialist and imperialist wars, for it is aimed at exterminating an entire people, an entire race and an entire nation. It constitutes a danger to peace and security in South-East Asia and in the world as a whole. This danger is all the more real because the Hanoi authorities, through the refugees, are pursuing a policy of destabilization in South-East Asia. For, in the final analysis, through the massive exodus of refugees in South-East Asia, Viet Nam intends to destabilize this region, which has prompted an Asian statesman to declare quite rightly:

"Every junk loaded with men and women that is sent to our coasts is a bomb aimed at destabilizing the ASEAN States and sowing trouble and dissension."

The flames of this war have already reached Thailand and are liable any day to engulf the whole of South-East Asia, Asia and the Pacific region and to lead to a new world war. The underlying cause of this danger is the regional expansionism and hegemonism of the Vietnamese.

It is fitting to stress here that, in terms of its area, its population and its army, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is at present the supremely imperialist and expansionist country in the world. Indeed, with more than 220,000 men in Kampuchea and more than 50,000 others in Laos, 30 per cent of the Vietnamese armed forces are stationed on foreign territory; secondly, the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists are occupying foreign territory of an area greater than their own territory; and, thirdly, these expansionists have also occupied by force certain of the Nansha islands, which from time immemorial have belonged to China, while they unjustly claim the Xisha islands from China.

Genocide and the indescribable sufferings of the people of Kampuchea owing to the regional expansionism and hegemonism of the Vietnamese have caused an upheaval in the international community. This regional expansionism and hegemonism of the Vietnamese represents an undeniable threat to international peace and security for all the peoples that love peace and justice.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

Nevertheless, the Le Duan clique in Hanoi is persisting in its crimes, continuing to flout the United Nations Charter, the principles of non-alignment and the laws governing international relations and pursuing a code of conduct internationally that includes lies, slanders, travesties and macabre orchestrations in order to conceal its monstrous crimes committed with a view to slaking its thirst for expansion in South-East Asia.

On 4 December last in this Committee, the representative of the Hanoi expansionists and hegemonists had the audacity to recite the same lies and slanders in order to distort the facts. I should like to draw our Committee's attention to the following points.

First, with regard to the so-called aggression of Kampuchea against Viet Nam, Mr. Georges Hilderbrand, an American specialist on South-East Asia, made the following comment:

"In September 1978 Hoang Tung, editor of the Vietnamese Communist Party newspaper, Nhan Dan, revealed that the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party had in 1972 held a debate on whether to intervene to change the direction of the Kampuchean Communist Party. Let us think about that for a few moments. In 1972 no one was talking about non-respect for human rights in Kampuchea. Nor could anyone say that China was using Kampuchea against Viet Nam, and there was certainly no detectable trace of a frontier dispute. It is clear that none of the reasons invoked by Viet Nam to justify its current aggression existed in 1972. What makes the direction taken by the Government of Democratic Kampuchea so unpalatable for the Vietnamese is the policy of independence pursued by the Kampuchians."

Secondly, the people of Kampuchea have never called upon the clique of expansionists and hegemonists of Hanoi to send their troops to Kampuchea, and the facts prove this. On 25 December 1978 that Hanoi clique committed aggression against Kampuchea, on 7 January 1979 set up in Phnom Penh a puppet régime entirely under its thumb and on 18 February 1979 signed with those lackeys a so-called treaty of friendship and co-operation.

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

The assertions of the Hanoi expansionists and hegemonists are therefore aimed only at camouflaging the "Indo-Chinese Federation" under Vietnamese domination. It is worth while recalling that the same Hoang Tung on 26 October last confessed to Agence France Presse in Hanoi that Vietnamese troops were responsible for defending "Indo-Chinese frontiers" and that they were massacring the people of Kampuchea as one "slaughters a chicken".



(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

Thirdly, the Vietnamese hegemonists and regional expansionists consider the resolutions adopted by our international Organization as just scraps of paper. It should be pointed out that their representative voted on 15 December 1978 for resolution 33/75 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, in operative paragraph 5 of which the General Assembly

"Reaffirms its opposition to any threat or use of force, intervention, aggression, foreign occupation or measure of political and economic coercion which attempts to violate the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and security of States or their right freely to dispose of their natural resources."

Ten days after that vote, on 25 December 1978, the Hanoi expansionist and hegemonist clique embarked upon their aggression against Kampuchea and put it to fire and sword. It should also be said that three months before that act of aggression, the Prime Minister of that Hanoi clique had solemnly assured the ASEAN countries that Viet Nam would respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all neighbouring States.

Fourthly, on 14 November 1979 the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority adopted resolution 34/22, calling on Viet Nam to cease its crimes against Kampuchea and its people, immediately to withdraw all its troops from Kampuchea, to end its intervention in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kampuchea. Nevertheless, in arrogant defiance and scorn of the international community and all peace-loving and justice-loving people in the world, the Hanoi clique had no hesitation in describing that historic vote as a farce and as illegal.

Fifthly, not only do the Hanoi regional expansionists insult the international community and the United Nations, but, what is more they are stepping up their aggression against Kampuchea as well as their massacre of the Kampuchean people. They are diverting assistance sent by humanitarian organizations to the Kampuchean people in order to feed their army of aggression in Kampuchea and to serve their policy of starving and exterminating the whole Kampuchean people. On 28 November 1979, Mr. Pascal Clement, a

(Mr. Chan, Democratic Kampuchea)

UDF deputy, stated in the French National Assembly, on behalf of the seven UDF deputies who had just returned from Phnom Penh:

"We are convinced that a large part of this assistance is today being stocked and that when the aid is distributed it is distributed on the basis of political criteria. In order to be able to eat, it is necessary to collaborate with the occupation army."

That occupation army is nothing other than the more than 220,000 Vietnamese soldiers in Kampuchea.

From the military standpoint, the Vietnamese forces of aggression have been stepping up their military operations, driving hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans towards Thailand and posing an ever-greater threat to security in South-East Asia. In spite of this well-known fact, the Vietnamese expansionists talk perfidiously of alleged Chinese preparations for attack against Viet Nam. That is done for the purpose of concealing the escalation of their own aggression against Kampuchea and diverting international public opinion from their own odious crimes committed against the people of Kampuchea.

In their words, the Vietnamese expansionists and hegemonists speak of peace and security, but in their deeds they are trampling underfoot the fundamental national rights of neighbouring States and threatening to extend their war of aggression to other States in the region. How is it possible to speak of strengthening international security while the Vietnamese regional expansionists and hegemonists have no intention of stopping their war of aggression, genocide and extermination against Kampuchea and its people, against an independent and sovereign State, Member of the United Nations.

In conclusion, my delegation calls upon the international community to be vigilant in the face of the manoeuvres of the Vietnamese Government and to force it to abide by the terms of General Assembly resolution 34/22. It is on this condition alone that Kampuchea will succeed in regaining its independence, its sovereignty and its territorial integrity, that the people of Kampuchea will be able to live in honour and in national dignity, with its own identity, and that peace and security will be preserved in South-East Asia and throughout the world.

Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana): Ghana has already submitted its views on the question of the strengthening of international security and on the related subject of non-interference in the affairs of States to the Secretary-General in compliance with paragraph 13 of General Assembly resolution 33/75 of 15 December 1978. A statement embodying our views on this important item has been published in document A/34/193, dated 4 October 1979, which is now before this Committee. However, we welcome this opportunity to restate our position.

Ghana attaches great importance to the principles of non-interference in the affairs of States. In the view of Ghana, this principle guarantees every State the fundamental right to order its affairs without any hindrance, in accordance with the wishes of its people. Since the attainment of its independence, therefore, Ghana has consistently observed the principle of non-interference in the affairs of States in keeping with the provisions of the Charter of this Organization and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

Furthermore, the Ghana delegation has consistently supported all General Assembly resolutions which seek to enforce this principle because, in our view, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States is an integral part of the strengthening of international security.

Ghana considers the General Assembly Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States (resolution 2625 (XXV)) and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security (Resolution 2734 (XXV)) as significant achievements of the United Nations in its search for global peace. Those documents state clearly the broad principles which should guide States in their relations with each other and constitute, in our view, fundamental principles in the conduct of foreign relations by States.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

Since the adoption of these historic documents, efforts within and outside the United Nations to strengthen international security have not been unimpressive, given the fundamental political and security interests of States. The Non-Aligned Movement, for instance, has spared no efforts in using its Ministerial and Summit meetings as platforms for examining major international issues with a view to issuing guidelines for the promotion of peace and security. One such effort culminated in the convening of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Final Document adopted at the end of that session laid down fundamental principles for tackling the problem of disarmament as a step in the process of strengthening international security.

Over the years, quite an impressive number of former colonies have attained statehood and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The on-going dialogue on the New International Economic Order aimed at ensuring fair and equitable international economic relationships between the industrialized nations and those dependent on the export of primary products promises well for the promotion of international stability.

Similarly, the peace talks on European security and co-operation, particularly the forthcoming conference in Madrid in 1980, augur well for further strengthening the security and co-operation of States in Europe, provided the necessary political will and support are forthcoming from the States concerned.

Furthermore, pronouncements over the years by key Government officials and statesmen, particularly leaders of the major Powers, on world peace and security strengthen our belief that the United Nations objective of world peace enjoys universal support.

In spite of these endeavours, hotbeds of tension remain in several parts of the world, particularly in southern Africa, the Middle East and Cyprus, to mention just a few. These crisis situations clearly show that it is imperative that the international community move fast not only to defuse these situations, but, more importantly, to remove the root causes of the problems before they explode into wider conflicts with serious implications for peace and security throughout the world.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

The situation in southern Africa is a case in point. As a delegation from Africa, we are naturally concerned over the daily reports of conflicts in that area arising from the racist policies of the Pretoria régime and the refusal of that régime to comply with the decisions of the majority represented by the United Nations. That régime is holding on to Namibia in spite of General Assembly decisions which have declared its presence in the territory illegal. Pretoria has also, through a series of manoeuvres, hampered the implementation of the United Nations independence programme for Namibia and, worst of all, it continues to support the Salisbury régime in its launching of unprovoked attacks against the territories of the neighbouring African States of Angola, Mozambique and Zambia. These attacks have not only resulted in loss of life and considerable damage to property, but they occur with such frequency that they pose a serious threat to international security, since Africans cannot be expected to tolerate these provocations indefinitely without effective reaction.

The Middle East situation also continues to pose a dangerous threat to international stability, since it appears that the international community has yet to agree on an acceptable approach for resolving major issues in this conflict.

In the view of Ghana, therefore, additional efforts must be exerted to strengthen international security. We feel, in this connexion, that the following measures are vital: first, strict adherence to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and the General Assembly Declarations on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States; secondly, the removal of hotbeds of tension wherever they may exist through a gradual eradication of the arms build-up and the promotion of confidence-building measures which take into account specific political and military situations; thirdly, the elimination of apartheid and racism in all its manifestations and we feel in this regard that our Western friends have a special responsibility in exercising effective control over the private businesses, corporate organizations and institutions in their respective countries which continue to maintain trade links with the apartheid régime and also continue to support in various ways that régime's nuclear programme; fourthly, the elimination of all vestiges

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

of colonialism and the promotion of arrangements for the speedy attainment of the independence of colonies; fifthly, the prohibition of either direct or indirect assistance in or fomenting of interference in the political, social and economic systems of another country by any State; sixthly, the promotion of determined and sustained efforts, involving the necessary political will of the international community, to correct the present imbalance in the levels of wealth as between the industrialized countries and the poor developing world; seventhly, the strengthening of the United Nations in its peace-keeping functions and in particular the improvement of the capacity of the United Nations for responding quickly and in a more organized manner to potential threats to peace.

I should like in this connexion to state Ghana's position on the current problems of finance for United Nations peacekeeping functions insofar as such problems could adversely affect the United Nations role in this important area. Although, in most cases, peacekeeping operations are funded by compulsory contributions, a number of Member States have stated that they will not pay if they do not support a particular operation.

My delegation does not wish to question the premise of such attitudes which have been expressed by some Member States. It is Ghana's view, however, that if this attitude is allowed to continue unchecked, the withholding of assessments may lead to a serious cash-flow problem for the United Nations, and may affect programmes in other areas as well. It could even provide a precedent which other Member States might then wish to apply to programmes which they do not support. In our view, improvement of the United Nations capacity in peace-keeping operations demands that all Members pay their assessment promptly in accordance with United Nations financial regulations.

Having said this, my delegation is not unaware of the views that have been expressed on revitalizing other areas of the United Nations machinery for the effective promotion of peace.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

We do recognize that the political situation now is quite different from what it was in 1945, when the Charter was formulated. But it is Ghana's view that the question of review of the Charter needs to be considered with great care lest a new legal structure come into being which might not represent any improvement on the existing system. It is the view of my delegation that recent instances of open aggression, the use of military force and serious violations of human rights stemmed more from the lack of respect for the norms embodied in the Charter and the lack of political will to uphold the principles and purposes of the Charter than any deficiencies in the Charter itself. We think that this point needs to be borne in mind because, in our view, the effectiveness of our Organization depends above all on the respect which Member States have for its principles.

As we approach the end of a decade marking the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, perhaps a very worthy contribution to the peace efforts will be a firm dedication by all States to the principles and purposes for which the United Nations stands. Therein, in our view, lies the surest path for the effective strengthening of international security.

Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (interpretation from French): Agenda item 46 of the current session which is at present under discussion in our Committee is sufficiently important to elicit comments from the People's Republic of Benin, which attaches great importance to international security and is working actively towards strengthening it through every necessary means. The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is an indispensable condition for the preservation of international security and the promotion of peace.

(Mr. Houngavou, Benin)

The revolutionary process under way in the Republic of Benin since 1972 is a positive factor for international peace and security because of its anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist, anti-neocolonialist, anti-racist and anti-Zionist nature. Our revolutionary process is a positive factor for security because it tends to combat the causes and eliminate the dangers to and threats against international security. The revolutionary movement in Benin has participated since 1972 in a strengthening of international security at several levels. At the international level, within the Non-Aligned Movement and in the United Nations, the People's Republic of Benin has added its efforts to those of many countries of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe to demand international justice in the fight against the subversive acts of international imperialism and its agents.

In fact, today the main contradiction which exists in the world lies in the desire for and the manifestations of exclusive domination of international imperialism over other peoples and their wealth, on the one hand, and in the unrelenting will to resistance of all those peoples against international imperialism, on the other.

The imperialist Powers, through their daily practices and policies of domination, endanger international security all over the world. The imperialist Powers bear the true responsibility for the crises, sector wars, threats and tensions which shake the world and which give us ground for serious concern.

The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security requires the manifest will of peoples to struggle against imperialism and to compel it to put an end to its political designs, organized economic exploitation and political and cultural oppression of peoples. My delegation denounces and condemns once again all those Western capitalist Powers which wish to impose on the world



(Mr. Houngavou, Benin)

their values and their policy of domination which is endangering the peace and security of the world. When we assess the degree of implementation of that Declaration, which was adopted some ten years ago, we cannot but feel a sense of profound frustration at the current state of affairs today. In fact, in Asia, in Latin America and in Africa all the crises and tensions leading to sectoral conflicts are due to the actions of those same Powers.

Africa in particular - our great, beautiful and rich continent - is a privileged target of imperialism; otherwise, how could we explain the continued existence on our continent of minority white racist and colonialist régimes? It is obvious that in that part of the world we cannot speak of security as long as the apartheid régime has not been eliminated. For us, in Africa, the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security calls for the overthrow and elimination of all those minority white régimes, that is to say, the Pretoria régime and the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia, and the end of the unlawful occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria racists. All of this should bring about the end of barbarous aggression against the front-line States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola, Zambia, Botswana and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

We must note that the news of the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Pretoria - if that information were confirmed - would cause great harm to the cause of international security. Those States which have helped the Pretoria régime to acquire nuclear weapons will thus be able to gauge the gravity of the situation which they have brought about through their collaboration, which was condemned here in the United Nations and in all international forums because it is based on the protection of narrow short-term interests.

(Mr. Houngavou, Benin)

The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security also implies the need for all countries to maintain good relations with all other countries, in particular, with their neighbours. Since 1972 the People's Republic of Benin has practised a foreign policy based on non-alignment, mutual respect for sovereignty, mutual advantage and national dignity. In our sub-region of Africa we have practised and shall always practise a policy of brotherhood and co-operation while respecting our mutual national interests. That is why we shall give our support to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54/Rev.1 which was introduced by Romania.

We are jealous of our independence and cannot tolerate any interference in our internal affairs. We condemn it because we ourselves were the victims of aggression by imperialism through its mercenaries in January 1977. We condemn all policies of aggression and intervention by foreign neo-colonialist Powers in our continent. The armed interventions by international imperialism in Africa constitute a barbarous crime and a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The attempts at colonial reconquest by those Powers in Africa are reprehensible acts which endanger security and peace in Africa. The entire international community must condemn all these attempts at colonial reconquest. The People's Republic of Benin reiterates its condemnation of all those Powers and of their policies in Africa which they claim to be carrying out in order to protect peace and security.

The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States is a cardinal rule of international life to which my country attaches great importance. In Asia, my country is concerned over the situation brought about by imperialism in Korea and reaffirms that only the withdrawal of all occupation troops will help to settle all problems between the northern and the southern parts of that country in order to allow their inhabitants to rejoin each other under one roof.

(Mr. Houngavou, Benin)

My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1, A/C.1/34/L.56 and A/C.1/34/L.57 because they contain principles dear to my country which make it possible to ensure respect for and to strengthen international security and to attain peace and justice in the world.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that Zaire has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.54, and Romania of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.57.

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I should like to refer to document A/C.1/34/L.58, which has just appeared this morning, concerning the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

Paragraph 4 of that document states:

"Meetings of the group of experts would require the provision of interpretation in five languages (Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish) and translation of pre-session, in-session and post-session documentation of a total volume of 100 pages."

I should like to ask the Secretariat why the Arabic language does not appear among the working languages mentioned here.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that it will be possible to give an answer to that question at this afternoon's meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.