



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2059
21 October 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 20 October 1975, at 3 p.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. MIKANAGU (Vice-Chairman)	(Burundi)
<u>later:</u>	Mr. GHORRA	(Lebanon)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. ARTEAGA ACOSTA	(Venezuela)

- Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Secretary-General /49/ (continued)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 22 OCTOBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 27 OCTOBER 1975.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 49 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/10205 and Add.1; A/C.1/L.717 and L.718/Rev.1)

Mr. KALENCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Five years ago, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which called upon all States to adhere strictly to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter in their international relations and recalled the solemnly proclaimed resolution of peoples to preserve future generations from the scourge of war and to unite their efforts to promote peace and security.

If from the standpoint of this present session of the General Assembly we look at all the efforts made during those five years by the United Nations to implement that important declaration of principle we realize the importance and the fruitfulness of the efforts made by the international community to carry out the essential task of our times. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers -- and, as can be observed from the statements of representatives during the present session, this opinion is shared by almost everyone -- that the gains made by society in the way of strengthening of international peace in recent years have been significant and reassuring, and that today détente has become a fact and a dominant tendency of international development. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is being translated into reality in the successful realization of the historic peace programme proclaimed by the 29th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, which is the embodiment of the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Government. This is a comprehensive programme of active and innovative work in furthering international détente and for the safeguarding of a truly stable peace throughout the world for the present and for succeeding generations. It not only proves the inflexible will and sincere conviction and purpose of the citizens of the Soviet Union but also, we are convinced, represents the most profound aspirations of a peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

Acting dynamically and purposefully, working shoulder to shoulder with its friends and allies, the States of the socialist community, and together with all democratic progressive forces, the Soviet Union has achieved remarkable successes in carrying out its programme for peace.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian, SSR)

These achievements have been cumulative and have led to a healthier international atmosphere and made it possible to overcome the imperialist policy of aggression and cold war; they have made it increasingly clear that the principles of peaceful coexistence are the only reasonable basis for relations among States, with different social structures.

Recently also the conflagration of the war in Indo-China consumed thousands of human lives and threatened explosive and serious consequences for all mankind. The peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia, with exceptional courage, heroism and valour in the defence of their freedom and independence, and with support and aid of all kinds from the socialist countries, this year won their battle against foreign intervention and internal reaction. The victory of the Viet-Nameese and other Indo-Chinese peoples represents the liquidation of a hotbed of chronic tension in South-East Asia, which has made a great contribution to creating a better international atmosphere as a whole.

For many years, through no fault of the Soviet Union, the state of Soviet-American relations was marked by confrontation and tension which created ever-increasing anxiety about the fate of peace on our planet. The series of summit meetings of the heads of the two States, the signature of various agreements regulating relations between these two countries and aimed at maintaining peace, preventing a nuclear war and limiting the arms race, represent important factors in the establishment of détente and a movement towards the defence of international security.

The relations between European States in the more than 20 years since the Second World War have suffered from the heavy burden of the question of the recognition of existing frontiers. This problem has now been settled in the interest of peace because, as members of the Committee know, the Soviet Union and other socialist States concluded agreements with the Federal Republic of Germany following the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussia SSR)

The Helsinki Conference, in which the leaders of 35 countries participated, was a remarkable event, without precedent in the history of the European continent, which has been the main theatre of two world wars and which for many centuries was the centre of the most dangerous international contradictions. The agreements reached at that Conference are in the interests of all the peoples of Europe. As has been pointed out by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev:

"At Helsinki there was no victor and no vanquished, no winner and no loser.

It was a victory for common sense; a victory for all those who love peace."

The Conference marked the beginning of a new phase of détente. It was an important stage in the strengthening of the principles of peaceful coexistence, the establishment of fruitful and equal relations and co-operation between States with different social and political systems. The significance of the charter of peace, adopted in Helsinki, goes far beyond the framework of the European continent. The results of the Conference express the hopes of all mankind and contain the principles for a constructive solution of the problems of the regional and therefore the international security of the peoples.

It is most important that these legitimate and equitable principles be translated into practical action and become the unchallenged basis of international life. In this direction much remains to be done in order to overcome the obstacles and difficulties created by forces opposed to peace and détente. The forces of war, reaction and aggression have not abandoned their attempts to destroy the present progressive forces. They exacerbate the arms race, oppose détente and interfere flagrantly in the internal affairs of other countries, striving thus to jeopardize the struggle of peoples for democracy and freedom and discredit the policy of peaceful coexistence. The world cannot be built on a powder keg of nuclear weapons. It is not possible to ensure the security of peoples as long as there are hotbeds of tension and conflict in the world.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

In the Middle East it is a fact that the key problems of the region remain unsolved. The occupation of Arab territories by Israeli troops still persists. No agreement has been reached concerning the implementation of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine and in particular its sovereign right to create an independent State. In the eastern Mediterranean, thanks to certain NATO circles, the fate of Cyprus continues to be the subject of military and political manoeuvres. The decisions of the United Nations, which provide for the guaranteeing of the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus, the cessation of all foreign interference in the internal affairs of that State, the withdrawal of all foreign troops from its territory and the possibility for the Cypriot people, to resolve their problems themselves, have yet to be implemented.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

In South Korea there are still foreign troops, and this is the main obstacle to the attainment of the peaceful unification of Korea.

On the African continent there exist to this day reactionary racist régimes which, with the support of the forces of imperialism, resort to political blackmail, economic pressure and even armed provocation of the liberated African States.

Life teaches us the following: For peace to become really stable, persistent, well-directed efforts must be made by all the forces of peace. There must be firm resistance to those who oppose peace and security. A tenacious struggle must be waged to develop and intensify détente. We must struggle to eliminate all hotbeds of tension, bring about a just settlement of international conflicts and consolidate understanding and co-operation among States.

It is particularly urgent at the present time to consolidate political détente by concrete measures in the field of military détente. Arms must be limited and progress must be made towards general and complete disarmament. It is obvious that the world will never feel secure until an end is put to the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction. Détente is incompatible with factors of intimidation which some remember in the West. The measures to be taken to limit the arms race and for the radical suppression of weapons and armed forces must become the material basis for an intensification of political détente.

In the declaration by those who participated in the international meeting of the partisans of peace in the capital of Byelorussia last May, it was stated that:

"The establishment of a stable and lasting peace in conditions of freedom, national independence and social progress is in the vital interests of all the peoples of the world."

The process of détente must be extended to all continents. The useful experience gained at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe must be taken into account in the practical implementation of measures which will make it possible to strengthen international security and create effective security systems at the regional level.

The task of strengthening security is indissolubly linked to the need to eliminate existing areas of tension and conflict, whether in the Middle East, in the eastern Mediterranean, in Korea, in southern Africa or elsewhere. Those to whom this applies should learn, the sooner the better, the lessons of the total

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

obliteration of imperialist aggression in various parts of the world. In our time no force is capable of resisting the irreversible will of the peoples to accede to freedom and independence. The victory of the liberation forces is the inevitable result of the struggle of all that is new and progressive in the world against all the reactionary movements which impede the march of mankind towards a better future. That is the inexorable law of historical development, indeed the dialectic of life itself.

The strengthening of peace and security demands the immediate and complete implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the complete elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid. So that this favourable progress may proceed in conditions of the required stability, détente must become increasingly solid. It must be supported by the establishment of fruitful and beneficial co-operation at the economic, scientific and cultural levels among all countries, on a basis of equality, respect for the sovereignty of others and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. This co-operation requires the reform of international economic relations on the basis of fair, equal and democratic principles -- an indispensable condition of the eradication of the economic consequences of colonialism from which the developing countries are still suffering.

To establish détente throughout the world and make it an irreversible process is the task which the international community must undertake. In order to carry out this task, the energy, common sense and goodwill of all States must be harnessed -- in every hemisphere and whatever the size of their territory or their population. A stable peace cannot be established without the common efforts of all States without exception. There is enough work for everybody and the contribution of each to the establishment of peace is a noble obligation.

Peace is not a question of security alone; it is also the most important condition of the solution of the problems of modern civilization, problems common to all mankind and increasingly in the forefront of our preoccupations. Among these is the question of stable economic development and the general triumph of the principle of social justice. Today we are duty-bound to work with the future in mind; by combining our efforts to achieve détente we shall be working at the same time for the future of mankind.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

During the past five years the United Nations has adopted a number of important documents capable of contributing to the solution of present-day international problems in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Those resolutions include, in particular, those concerning the non-use of force in international relations, the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the convening of a world disarmament conference, the reduction by 10 per cent of the military budgets of the States permanent members of the Security Council and the prohibition of action to influence the climate and the environment for military purposes.

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

Increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations authority so as to enable it to perform its fundamental task, namely the maintenance of international peace and security, will require full application of the most important positive decisions the Organization has taken, such as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. It seems to us to be essential to make mandatory such resolutions of the General Assembly as those on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. To this end, appropriate resolutions should be adopted by the Security Council.

The effectiveness and authority of the United Nations are indissolubly linked to strict compliance by all States with the Charter of the United Nations, which, as experience has shown, has victoriously resisted the trials of time.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wishes to emphasize once again that during the five years that have elapsed since the United Nations adopted the Declaration, it has contributed in a certain degree to détente, to the strengthening of peace and to the reduction of the danger of war. And for us, this is not a mere abstraction.

Recently we celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of our victory in the Great Patriotic War and we pay a sincere tribute and express our eternal gratitude to the liberating armies of the Soviet Union and the partisans. We have honoured the memory of the victims of our war against fascism, particularly the more than 2.2 million citizens of our Republic who sacrificed their lives in the struggle against the enemy. One of the mass meetings devoted to commemorating and mourning those who fell was held near the city of Minsk, at the site of Khatyn, formerly a village of Byelorussia which, like hundreds of others, was wiped out by the Hitlerite occupying forces, with all its inhabitants, young and old, burned alive. There is now a memorial, the only form of cemetery to be found in that village that has been for ever destroyed. All those who visit that place will keep in their minds and hearts the words, regularly accompanied by the mournful tolling of the bells of Khatyn, that are inscribed in granite and addressed to our contemporaries:

"Men of goodwill who pass by here, remember: we loved life, we loved our country and our dear fellow men. We were burnt alive in the fire. Our prayer

(Mr. Kalenchits, Byelorussian SSR)

to you all is that our grief and suffering may become your strength and courage, so that you may be able to bring peace and tranquillity on earth for all time, and so that human lives will never again, anywhere, be sacrificed in the raging flames."

Everything must be done to prevent a new world conflict; the consequences of which would be even more grievous and deadly for mankind than in the past. To this end, we must contribute by every means at our disposal in the United Nations, the first duty of which is to exercise an active and effective influence for détente, for the strengthening of peace and international security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to state that the delegation of Cuba has become a sponsor of the revised draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1.

Mr. AL-DOY (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, I have the pleasure of offering you, on behalf of my delegation, our congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman of the Committee. This is not merely a traditional courtesy on our part, because your election is but a recognition of the great qualities you possess as an experienced diplomat. Your country, our sister State of Lebanon, is known for its attachment to the cause and the principles of international peace and co-operation. The fraternal relations that bind our two countries are as ancient as history itself.

Allow me also, Mr. Chairman, through you, to extend the congratulations of our delegation to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur.

In doing this, I also wish to pledge the full co-operation of the delegation of Bahrain and to state our certainty that our Committee will most surely achieve fruitful results under your wise guidance.

My delegation also wishes to give its warm welcome to those delegations that have recently joined our Organization: the Republic of Cape Verde, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, and Papua New Guinea. These delegations, through their contributions to our deliberations, will enrich our work here for international peace and security.

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

A great and important and far-reaching transformation has recently been witnessed in international relations that has led to a reduction in the points of confrontation throughout the world. Undoubtedly, the increase in the number of areas of agreement between the Powers of the world, especially the great Powers, has contributed to this transformation, which has also had its reflection in the state of affairs within our Organization. The need to strengthen international peace and security more effectively and more permanently and to establish social justice that emerged following the Second World War and that resulted in the establishment of the United Nations for the improvement of world relations among States on the basis of mutual respect, equality and the right of self-determination we find even more intense at the present time. The United Nations is seeking to strengthen and mobilize all efforts to keep the wheels of development turning for the social and economic progress of all peoples. The co-operation and unity that characterize the stand of the non-aligned countries in our Organization do not constitute a dictatorship of the majority, as some have sought to make world public opinion believe. They result rather from a growing realization on the part of the great majority of our United Nations that the disorganized state of affairs in international relations that prevailed before must be brought to an end. The need for this was one of the principal reasons for the creation of the non-aligned group in the United Nations. The Lima Conference was further confirmation of that need. And in this connexion, I would like to express the increasing satisfaction of my delegation at the co-operation between the Arab and the African countries, as this is a further affirmation of their desire to achieve prosperity for all peoples.

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

The delegation of my country has noted with great satisfaction the results of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Final Act and Declaration of that Conference issued at Helsinki. We consider this a serious step on the road to co-operation and understanding among the countries which have signed that Declaration because it constitutes an affirmation of the principles upheld by the United Nations Charter, in particular the non-resort to military force.

While welcoming the détente which prevails in Europe, we hope that that détente will not be restricted to Europe but that it will be extended to every part of the world, and in particular to where there are pockets of tension.

My delegation shares the happiness of the peoples of Indo-China at the return of security and peace there and wishes to see both Viet-Nams assuming their positions amongst us here in this international Organization so that the wounds of that war may finally be healed. There is no doubt that there is a legitimate basis for the two Viet-Nams to assume their places here.

In Africa, racist discrimination and white minority domination in South Africa and the illegal régime of Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia constitute sources of tension which threaten peace and security in Africa and deprive the peoples there of the basic rights stipulated in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

We call upon all countries to uphold the arms embargo against South Africa in implementation of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, to enable the peoples of Azania, Zimbabwe and Namibia to achieve their rights to self-determination, the realization of majority rule and sovereignty. This would effectively contribute to removing tension from southern Africa and would instead promote peace and security in that part of the continent.

One of the most prominent obstacles which hamper relations between countries is the aggressive acts of certain States against the territories of others and their acquisition of those territories by force. In the Middle East there is the most acute example of this. In spite of the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

and other United Nations organs with regard to Israel and its occupation of Arab territories, Israel continues in its intransigence and insists on maintaining and preserving its occupation of those Arab territories, which prevents any peaceful and just solution of the Middle East problem. This action by Israel is a dangerous threat to international peace and security. The Middle East will not find true peace until Israeli forces are withdrawn from all the Arab territories which they occupy illegally and the Palestinian people's rights to their nation and to self-determination are recognized; these are prerequisites for the establishment of international peace and security in the Middle East.

Bahrain has followed a policy based on non-alignment and mutual respect among all peoples, nations and countries. In its foreign policy it attempts to deepen relations of friendship with all countries, and in particular with the countries of the Gulf region. The internal and external policies of the Government of Bahrain, and especially with neighbouring and friendly countries in the Gulf area, are based on the provisions and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Bahrain pays a tribute to the agreement recently reached between Iraq and Iran to settle the matters pending between those two countries. That agreement will bring further and better prospects for peace and security in the Gulf region.

Because during the past three decades since its establishment the United Nations has asserted its role in the defence of peace and the maintenance of international security, and because during the past few years it has also worked as a mediator and a proponent of dialogue, we celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the foundation of the Organization, which we consider the main instrument for the preservation of international peace and security.

The strengthening of international security is closely linked to the problems of development and complete disarmament. As long as there are rich nations which exploit poor nations, the world will not enjoy peace. The

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly are true indications of our Organization's determination to bridge the gap between the poor and the rich. They are also evidence of the determination of Member States to solve the problems which are of concern to all the peoples of the world.

My delegation hopes that efforts will be jointly exerted by all nations -- bilaterally, regionally or internationally -- to solve the problems faced by our world in the political, economic and social fields, in order to strengthen further international peace and security for the well-being of all mankind.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Bahrain for the kind words and congratulations he addressed to the Chairman and other officers of the Committee.

Mr. KAMANA (Zambia): Mr. Chairman, since I am addressing this Committee for the first time, I wish to express my delegation's congratulations on your election and our confidence in you and in the other officers of the Committee who, together with you, will provide enlightened leadership in this year's First Committee deliberations.

Many previous speakers have rightly alluded to the fact that contemporary international life is characterized by a mood of conciliation and understanding among the peoples of the world. At the same time, it cannot be denied that international peace and security are still threatened by the existence of crises in many parts of the world.

This year, which marks the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations, provides us with an opportunity to examine carefully and to take stock of the progress made on the difficult road of peace keeping and peace making. In a consideration of the question of the strengthening of international security, the existence of positive trends is sufficient demonstration of the fact that the world is moving in the right direction.

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

I therefore wish to salute the peoples of Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos whose relentless struggles over more than a generation have put an end to foreign aggression in their respective countries and have ushered in a new era of nation building.

The attainment of independence by Mozambique, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe, Papua New Guinea and the Comoro Islands marks a significant stride in international efforts towards the strengthening of international security.

The Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was yet another endeavour in efforts to strengthen international peace and security. The Conference was a reaffirmation of the fact that the cold-war tensions that beset Europe for a generation have continued to abate. In my delegation's view, the Conference was a faithful reflection of the current state of détente. It can only be hoped that the decisions of Helsinki, if implemented, will contribute significantly to peace and security in Europe.

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

In general, positive trends were manifestly demonstrated during the seventh special session. That session showed that the age of East-West ideological confrontations has been supplanted by a genuine dialogue between the countries of the north and south on the critical issues of development and international economic co-operation.

In spite of these positive aspects in today's world order, there are also numerous areas of conflict which call for the urgent implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The deployment of troops in the southern part of the Korean peninsula under the United Nations flag constitutes an anachronism reminiscent of the cold war. The potentially explosive danger to security is in direct contradiction to the aspirations and desires of the peoples of Asia to strengthen security in the region.

In the larger Mediterranean area, a region historically associated with the balance of power, ominous threats to international security emanate from Cyprus and the Middle East as focal points of crises. The situation in Cyprus has deteriorated following the breakdown of the intercommunal talks between the two communities. In the meantime, the question of refugees remains unresolved and foreign troops are still stationed in the island.

In the Middle East, an uneasy peace prevails. As long as the rights of the people of Palestine are not recognized by Israel, and as long as there is no unconditional withdrawal by Israel from the occupied territories, lasting peace and security in the area will be remote. At this stage, my delegation wishes to commend the efforts of the Government and people of Egypt in regard to the Sinai Agreement.

Elsewhere, domination is a constant feature of international life and poses a serious threat to international peace and security. For instance, the perpetuation of the colonial status of Puerto Rico and its forceful maintenance as a military base by a world super Power, a situation that has in some measure been extended to sovereign Cuba and Panama, is a major cause for concern with regard to the security of that region.

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

Another periodic cause of varying uneasiness in the field of peace and security is the question of disarmament. In recent years, the world has witnessed a growth in the number of countries with nuclear power. Among the traditional nuclear Powers there has been a qualitative improvement in nuclear sophistication.

My delegation pauses to wonder whether nations should prepare for peace and security by the proliferation and sharpening of nuclear capabilities. We wonder because we are convinced that peace is not built on the foundation of the quantitative and qualitative improvement of military arsenals, but on that of disarmed nations. Quantitative and qualitative improvement of arms leads to the preparation for war, not its elimination. We also believe that peace could be achieved by disarming the armed and not by arming the unarmed.

However, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its faith in nuclear technology exclusively devoted to the opening of new vistas in the peaceful uses of nuclear power. Such technology would go a long way in alleviating the problems of economic development in the new countries of the third world.

In this regard, the question of disarmament, therefore, more than ever before, should engage international attention. This attention should be drawn to the urgent need for a world disarmament conference to adopt new stratagems which will put an end to the arms race and usher in a new era of sustained world peace and security.

The commitment of my Government and the people of Zambia to the creation of peace everywhere is well known. But nowhere have we followed that commitment more closely than in southern Africa. That commitment is all the more pressing because there are in that region the remnants or vestiges of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid. Their existence constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

However, we find solace in the realization that there are in this region progressive forces that now share our aspirations on the question of colonial domination. I am specifically referring to the Portuguese Government which has come to realize the inevitability of the triumph of the gallant struggles of the peoples of Mozambique and elsewhere in Africa and has promised independence for Angola on 11 November this year.

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

In this connexion, my delegation wishes to welcome to this Committee the peoples of Mozambique, Cape Verde, Papua New Guinea and Sao Tome and Principe. Their admission into the United Nations is a major contribution to the fulfilment of the universality principle of the world Organization. We are convinced that they will make positive contributions in regard to the multifaceted questions considered in the First Committee in particular, and in the United Nations in general.

The situation in Angola constitutes a hotbed of conflict of unprecedented proportions. The problem in Angola has been compounded by external forces ranging from super-Power rivalry to lesser-Power inclinations to have spheres of influence in that country. The shipment of military weapons to liberation movements after it became clear that they would attain independence on 11 November meant that they would turn those weapons on one another for hegemonic reasons; it has served only to escalate the interfactional strife.

The support each liberation movement received gave a false sense of power over the others. That, in turn, gave rise to overwhelming political bigotry among the liberation movements such as to make them engage in a war of attrition amongst themselves. The state of war in Angola tends to throw overboard the optimism of 25 April 1974 when the coup in metropolitan Portugal promised to end Portuguese colonialism in Africa in the light of the relentless armed struggles by liberation movements which demonstrated that the Portuguese had always been fighting a losing game.

Angola's political debacle is a major preoccupation for Africa. We believe that the toll in human life that has been taken in Angola in recent months in no way helps preparations for independence on 11 November, this year. On the contrary, it is only a concerted effort on the part of all the segments of the population to confront all the problems of a nascent régime that will constitute the preparatory work for independence.

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

However, my delegation wishes to reiterate its optimism that Angola will accede to independence as scheduled on 11 November, and expresses the hope that lasting peace and security will be maintained in Angola.

In Rhodesia we have witnessed a pathological desire by the racist minority régime to dominate the indigenous people of that country. But that domination will be short-lived. It is a matter of time before the majority of the people in Zimbabwe achieve their independence. The onus lies on the rebel leaders to bring about peace in that country or opt for a non-peaceful alternative, in which case the people of Zimbabwe will be forced to make the final onslaught on the Smith régime by armed struggle. Peacefully or otherwise, independence in Zimbabwe is inevitable.

In Namibia it is a matter of sardonic comment that South Africa's illegal occupation of that Territory still persists in spite of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and calls by the international community on South Africa to withdraw its occupation. As recently as last year the South African régime made empty promises that dramatic changes would be instituted to accommodate the new realities in southern Africa as a result of the accession to independence of the Portuguese colony of Mozambique and the promised independence of Angola.

Such empty promises summarize the undercurrent of apprehension within the Government of South Africa. So far no significant changes have taken place. The so-called constitutional talks in Namibia were calculated to suit the South African régime itself by allowing only its puppets to participate in them and banishing the authentic representatives of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), so that they did not have the time or the opportunity to pronounce themselves on the bogus constitutional talks designed to suit and perpetuate the status quo. For our part, South Africa will be judged not by the promises it makes but by the promises it keeps in Namibia.

In South Africa, as in Rhodesia, continued chastisement of the minority régime by world public opinion goes unheeded. The greatest challenge to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security in southern Africa more than anywhere else, is constituted by the authors and practitioners of the ignominious policy of apartheid. We have in South Africa

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

a classical case of chronic delinquency, chronic delinquency in its perpetration of racial discrimination and apartheid, which the United Nations has termed crimes against humanity because of their inhuman nature.

For years and years various committee of the United Nations, including this one, have debated South Africa's apartheid policy as a threat to international peace and security. South Africa's response has always been fraudulence and indifference. In the meantime, colour and race remain the determining factors in the conduct of human relations in South Africa. Consequently, those who do not belong to the white race, who are the indigenous majority, are treated with callous indifference.

The views of my Government on the question of apartheid are well known. We believe that so long as inhuman policies persist in southern Africa peace and security will be a remote dream. The situation, therefore, calls for international action more than ever before in the light of the positive trends that characterize contemporary international life. The entire world is on the brink of numerous positive developments, but these developments are constantly being stalked by such negative trends as the persistence of apartheid, racial discrimination, colonialism and localized conflicts. Peace in southern Africa can only come about after the end of the "diaspora" existence of the black majority, and not by verbal platitudes by the minority régimes about the maintenance of the archaic institutions of separate development, which is not development as such, but retrogression.

It is therefore timely to counsel those die-hard régimes in southern Africa to take a cue from the developments that have taken place in Angola, Mozambique and elsewhere in Africa in recent months. After many years of struggling for independence, the indigenous populations in those areas have inevitably forced the colonial Power to cross the Rubicon.

In conclusion, Africa will be a symbol of peace when the last vestiges of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid have given way to majority rule in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. It is therefore up to those concerned and those endowed with the power to put an end to minority domination and to do so without delay. It is through that act that the implementation of the Declaration on international peace and security will be achieved in southern

(Mr. Kamana, Zambia)

Africa, thus contributing to the general trend towards narrowing the negative areas and widening the areas of positive development. An atmosphere should therefore be created in which conflict regulation will be supplanted by conflict resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Republic of Zambia for his warm congratulations to the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee.

Mr. HUERTA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The item with which we are dealing, on the strengthening of international security, is one of the most far-reaching being discussed by the United Nations since it is indissolubly linked to its origin, the reason for its existence. The Charter and the principles which inspired it, which have been progressively developed during the 30 years of its existence.

It is suitable and timely for this Political Committee of the General Assembly regularly to examine the problems pertaining to international peace and security, in regard to which the Charter attributes fundamental responsibility to the General Assembly, which is the supreme body of the United Nations. On rereading the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was adopted on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, we realize how very up-to-date it is.

The solemn Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is closely linked to other important resolutions, such as resolution 262⁴ (XXV) entitled "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States", which is one of the most significant achievements in the entire history of the United Nations. That Declaration succeeded in defining and specifying that States must refrain from the use of force and settle their disputes by peaceful means and the principles of non-intervention, co-operation among States, equality of rights, the self-determination of peoples, and the equality of States. Last year, in a long-awaited result, the General Assembly, in resolution 331⁴ (XXIX), defined aggression, thus complementing the set of principles which should govern the conduct of nations and on which international co-operation should be based.

(Mr. Huerta, Chile)

A first and basic conclusion which arises from consideration of this item is, therefore, that international peace and security depend primarily on strict compliance with the principles which the international community has itself determined.*

* The Chairman took the Chair.

(Mr. Huerta, Chile)

A second conclusion which appears from the text of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the subsequent resolutions is their connexion with development, disarmament and the progressive advance of international law. The living conditions of peoples, the practical application of international solidarity, the participation of all States in the major decisions which determine the destiny of mankind, that series of problems which comes under the heading of "economic development" all have a very clear connexion with peace and security. The same is true of disarmament, because the arms race renders insecurity more acute, threatens peace and drains away most of the funds which could be used to contribute to the economic development of peoples.

It would take a long time to develop the contrast between principles and reality. There are a number of centres of conflict in the world that may be added to the more than 50 local wars that have occurred since the last world war. The reality of international tensions, the arms race, the political and ideological struggle and the marked stagnation of development are very far from the ideals we pursue. Principles, especially those of the self-determination of peoples, the legal equality of States and non-intervention, are frequently violated.

We do not wish to appear pessimistic. So much is said today about "détente" and the resolutions which we discuss tend to substitute "détente" for "peace". Yet we must never lose sight of the fundamental objective of this Organization -- peace; that is to say harmony among peoples on the basis of justice and an international order which has as its foundation the principles proclaimed by this Organization, which are a part of the law of nature. Relaxation of tension, as the term implies, is not peace. It is a lessening of tension, the causes of which subsist but the effects of which it is attempted to mitigate. In that connexion, and despite the obvious short-comings of its present historical manifestation, it must be assessed as positive as long as it does not allow us to forget or take us away from the ideal we pursue.

(Mr. Huerta, Chile)

Undoubtedly the absence of world wars and nuclear conflicts can be counted a success. We must also rejoice at the progress achieved by the United Nations in such vital fields as the progressive development of international law and on subjects such as the sea, outer space and the environment. A light seems to have shone out in the long twilight of negotiations on economic development with the achievement of the agreements of the recent seventh special session of the General Assembly and the prospects for renewed international co-operation based on the interdependence of nations that those agreements embodied.

I shall not now refer to the disarmament since my delegation will speak on that subject when the item comes before the Committee. However, I am saying nothing new when I affirm once again that the results that the conference of the Committee on Disarmament has to offer us are feeble and insignificant, as are the parallel negotiations being carried on by the great Powers in other forums. At the half-way mark of the disarmament decade we are presented with an almost total lack of results.

In this description I have given mention must be made of one of the major imperatives of our times: effective international co-operation. A philosopher has said that peace does not occur; it is built. Another, the famous historian Arnold Toynbee, has said that perhaps the major crossroad of history will be the transition, in the nuclear era, from a world divided into two centres of power to a world authority rendered imperative simply by the existence of atomic energy and modern technology.

On the positive side we welcome the strengthening of regional organizations, which the Charter wisely provided for, and the achievements in various parts of the world which contribute to the solution of international problems. The work of the regional organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of American States, which emphasize solidarity and joint action in their respective regions; the regional and subregional economic groupings that have developed or expanded in various areas; the extension of denuclearized zones, which constitute an effective barrier against nuclear proliferation and the nightmare of an atomic war; and a whole series of proposals

(Mr. Huerta, Chile)

and accomplishments all prove that lesser things can influence greater and regional co-operation can contribute decisively to international co-operation and, accordingly, to peace.

In Latin America, the Ayacucho Declaration, which was read out in this room last year, has been followed by a renewal of the Pact of Reciprocal Assistance at the Conference of San Jose, Costa Rica, by new integrationist initiatives and achievements and by substantial contribution to the cause of disarmament in the Andean region. The six countries of the Cartagena Pact adopted positive agreements at their meetings in Lima and Santiago regarding the limitation of military expenditures, and proposed the extension of those discussions to the entire South American region. At those meetings my country had the honour of submitting a draft treaty on the strengthening of peace that gave contractual form to the provisions on aggression adopted last year in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX).

In concluding this statement, I should like to reaffirm the total dedication of my country to the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law adopted at the twenty-fifth session and are now complemented by the definition of aggression and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which serves as the basis and the framework for our debates and in general to the ideals of justice, peace and international co-operation which inspire the United Nations.

I should also like to express our support for the draft resolution submitted today in this Committee (A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1) which is in accordance with the principles my country upholds.

Mr. SHARAF (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, speaking in this Committee for the first time, allow me to present to you and to the sister State of Lebanon our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the chairmanship of this important Committee. Your choice was a recognition of your personal qualities and wisdom. There is nothing strange in seeing Lebanon assume a leading position in this great international Organization. Throughout its modern history it has assumed great human and world responsibilities, perhaps much larger than its geographic size, which it has always carried out with success and enthusiasm. Although Lebanon is today undergoing a tragic test, that is because it is carrying great responsibility in its area, the area of the Middle East, and is at the very heart of its sufferings and aspirations. But, as we all know, Lebanon is overcoming and will continue to overcome all difficulties and tests in order to carry out its great Arab and international role.

The basic principles on which international security is based are very clear. They are included in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security which has become an important historical document since its adoption at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Although this historic document is comprehensive, it is necessary to review it annually, particularly since such revision is an attempt to link it to the general principles of the international situation and its changing trends.

Since the adoption of the Declaration there have been international changes which the international community must assimilate in the light thereof in order to understand the meaning of international security. I shall deal with two changes in particular without going into the details of all of them. The first of the two changes concerning the question of international security is the intellectual revolution which has taken place recently as regards the world economy. That intellectual revolution added a new and important dimension to the concept of international security, that of world economic interdependence. It also deeply impressed on the international community the need for international economic justice as the basis of international peace and security. Secondly, during the past two years the United Nations has passed a difficult test as regards its effectiveness and its ability to retain the loyalty of its Members

and their belief in it as an Organization able to ensure international security, settle contemporary international conflicts and change the international order by peaceful means, in accordance with the desires of the overwhelming majority of the world's population. That test to which the United Nations was subjected was taking place at the same time as an intensive debate on the future of the United Nations and the direction of its future action.

Allow me to deal at rather greater length with these two main topics which have been introduced into the question of international security over the past few years. First, the new economic dimension. During the past few years the world has become aware of a very important issue with regard to contemporary international relations -- the need to reorganize the international economic order by establishing new economic relations based on equity, equality, justice and international interdependence. This world awareness can be described as an intellectual revolution which opened up new and major dimensions in the world. It is no less important and no less profound than the intellectual revolution which followed the elimination of imperialism and the restoration to the peoples which had been subjected to imperialism of their independence, their national will and the right to manage their own affairs. The liquidation of imperialism was a revolution which took place in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s; the intellectual revolution which followed, and which occurred at the same time as the development in economic relations, began in the 1970s.

At its sixth special session, the General Assembly of the United Nations crowned this growing international awareness of the cause of economic justice in the world by adopting historic documents aimed at establishing a new international economic order. At the following regular session another comprehensive document was adopted, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. At the seventh special session the General Assembly strengthened this trend and expressed it very clearly in an over-all programme of work and negotiations to implement the basic principles embodied in the idea of establishing a new international economic order.

These revolutions have made us aware of a fact that has been ignored in international relations, namely that one of the bases of international security is sound international economic relations based on co-operation, justice and equity. Today, when we speak of international security we must be aware of its close links with sound international economic relations. At a time when the United Nations and countries individually and separately are trying to control armaments, implement disarmament and settle conflicts in various parts of the world by such peaceful means as negotiation and mediation and other means provided by the Security Council, they should first of all establish economic justice with regard to the prices of raw materials, trade relations, trade conditions and the development of the economies of developing countries. These are truths which must be taken into consideration when we consider the question of international security.

As regards the role of the United Nations, in the past two years there have been thorough discussions in the international community on the future trend and effectiveness of the United Nations. A point of crisis has been reached. The importance of this debate is that it concerns the very existence of the United Nations, which is the best instrument we have for the protection of international security in the world today.

What are the reasons for this debate, this argument? The main reason is that the United Nations is now facing new and profound changes in its very structure, in the balance of power, in its orientation and in the interests that seem to dominate the thinking of its Members. All this reflects the profound changes in international realities, which are reflected in the United Nations itself.

The United Nations began as an organization of limited membership, dominated by countries belonging to European groups and the European concept of an international organization. The past 20 years have seen great changes. There have been many new Members from different civilizations, with different values, living in conflict or in dialogue with each other. The United Nations began as

an extension of previous international organizations which had emerged in Europe at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. When it was established its primary interest was to provide a balance of coexistence and co-operation among countries with similar structures and of more or less the same size. Now, the United Nations is an organization of change just as much as of balance -- perhaps even more of change than of balance.

Within its own framework the United Nations has put into effect the liquidation of imperialism. It has isolated racist régimes such as those of South Africa, Rhodesia and the aggressive State of Israel. The United Nations has also become the target of criticism from proponents of the old system, those who want to maintain the current system and those who benefit from the privileges available to a strong minority. The United Nations has now become a field in which new, revolutionary ideas are pitted against the old economic system and are calling for a new world economic order.

Irrespective of the successes or short-comings of the United Nations, the important thing is that it remains the framework of change, just as it is the instrument for the protection of international peace and security. This basic change in the targets, objectives and methods of work of the United Nations cannot be ignored or belittled, because the world community must assess and understand the question of international security. International security requires that the international community take account of the inevitable current changes in the world and the new balance of world power, in order to prevent greater conflicts and conflagrations, which would show that the world was unaware of the need for change. The world must absorb the great changes that are taking place, particularly with regard to the balance of power between the small minority of rich strong countries and the great majority of poor or developing countries which perhaps have not yet achieved their independence or sovereignty. International security is organically linked to the success of the international community in achieving just settlements of conflicts, particularly those conflicts between peoples that have not yet achieved independence or the right to self-determination and the Powers which dominate them and the struggle carried on by most of the peoples of the world to rid themselves of economic backwardness and unequal economic relations against the injustice of the current systems. This is one of the dimensions of the system of international security.

In addition to all this, there is one important work aspect of international security which requires further effort: it is the control of the use of force in international relations. During the past few years the international community has achieved great success, but this means that its basis must be made

more secure and must be strengthened. During the past few years a spirit of détente has developed between the Soviet Union and the United States, and its influence has been felt throughout wide areas of the world. All of us in this international Organization welcome this trend and hope that it will be extended and developed. Détente has reached an advanced stage, and this was particularly noticeable at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in Helsinki. At the same time important, though limited, steps have also been taken in the field of both nuclear and conventional disarmament. One of the most important was the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, but adherence to that Treaty is not yet comprehensive or universal. There is also the partial nuclear test ban, and there is a growing interest in the world in establishing nuclear-free zones. It is suggested that one of these be in the region of the Middle East, and the United Nations General Assembly last year commended that idea. The Arab nations, among them Jordan, responded favourably to that resolution, but Israel opposes with intransigence and violence the desire to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to implement that resolution of the General Assembly.

The international community has also achieved limited progress in the field of conventional weapons, but the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction has not been followed by a similar convention relating to chemical weapons.

These international measures on disarmament and the control of weapons are still modest and limited. We all know that the success of those agreements and their extension is linked to growing mutual faith and better relations between countries. These practical measures are closely tied to political and psychological aspects.

This brings us back to the new broad and comprehensive concept of international security based on equitable and stable international relations. Once again, international security cannot be separated from an international régime which would establish world justice and co-operation, thus settling conflicts and achieving a great change in the relations between the rich minority

countries and the overwhelming majority of poor countries which are trying to set up new economic and political relations based on development, freedom, justice and equal co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to thank the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for his congratulations to me and for the feeling of brotherhood that he has shown to me and to my country, Lebanon.

Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): At the risk of being admonished for disobeying the wishes of the Chairman, allow me, Sir, personally and on behalf of the Iraqi delegation, to extend to you and to your country, Lebanon, our heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the chairmanship of this important Committee. The efficient and able manner which distinguish your chairmanship of this Committee is precisely what all of us have come to expect of a person of your ability, experience and distinction. We wish you all success and request you to convey to the other officers of the Committee our appreciation of their work and our wishes for their success.

The passage of five years since the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security makes this an appropriate moment for Member States to take stock of the results that have been achieved and implemented under this Declaration and other relevant United Nations resolutions, and to consider what effects those achievements have had in strengthening security in the various regions of the globe. We must also consider what other possible steps can be taken in the future, and define issues and problems which pose an imminent threat to international peace.

Let me at the outset express my delegation's satisfaction at the organic development of the process of détente between the two great Powers. This historic process cannot but benefit all mankind, as long as the rights of each State are respected. But it also gives the international community an opportunity to base their multilateral and bilateral relations upon a new conceptual structure of relations between the great Powers, which have decided to seek co-operation rather

than confrontation, to search for peace rather than engage in actions that may lead to war. But let us remind ourselves that the process of détente was not born in a vacuum, nor is it a mere agreement between the two great Powers in isolation on new events and new developments in international life. Perhaps the most important of these developments is the birth and the growing strength of the non-aligned movement and its increasingly important contribution to the strengthening of international security. The recent Lima Conference, for instance, represents the latest important contribution by the non-aligned countries.

The other important reality in international life is the success of the developing countries in exercising their full sovereignty over their natural resources, without foreign exploitation and for the benefit of their own peoples.

The acceleration of the process of decolonization and the emergence of new States in Asia, Africa and Latin America is a primary factor contributing to world peace; but despite the process of détente we cannot but view with deep concern the many elements threatening international security that still exist in the various regions of the world.

(Mr. El-Shibib, Iraq)

Foreign occupation and alien domination still exist. Colonialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid are still in existence and are practised in various regions of the globe. In the Middle East we have a hotbed of conflict, and no country in the world can completely escape its consequences. It is not my intention to discuss the situation in the Middle East or the question of Palestine at this stage. These important issues will have their proper time and forum. However, no debate on the strengthening of international security can escape some alarming features that continue to exacerbate the situation in that region.

Israel is still as intransigent as ever, despite the recent war that cost thousands of human lives and billions of dollars in materiel. Despite the fact that some speakers see recent developments in the Middle East as steps towards a just peace, we cannot delude ourselves with these prophecies. The two central issues in the Middle East conflict are the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from all the occupied Arab territories, and recognition of the right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland and to exercise self-determination. On neither of these two issues has the so-called peace process shown any meaningful achievement. Israel refuses to declare itself for complete withdrawal from occupied Arab territories, nor has it pledged itself to refrain from further colonization and colonial settlement in those territories. As for the Palestinians' rights, the intransigent position of Israel is well known.

The world cannot afford to remain in jeopardy in order to make possible Zionist intransigence. The loss of global peace and the well-being of the peoples of the world is too high a price to pay for Israeli colonial designs.

The world has clearly pronounced itself in the numerous United Nations resolutions and through the decisions of the various international gatherings. What is required to put teeth into these resolutions is the will of the United States of America. The deplorable fact is that the United States frustrates any action to put these resolutions into effect. We must remember that Israel is a dependency of the United States; it depends on it economically, militarily and politically. No argument to the contrary can ever hold water.

(Mr. El-Shibib, Iraq)

Let us not concern ourselves with puzzling over whether it is the dog that wags the tail or the tail that wags the dog. In 1966 the United States showed its power to act when it has the political will and is ready to shoulder its responsibilities as a great world Power. Now, instead, we are faced with even greater United States support for and commitment to Israeli designs. Millions of dollars are being apportioned for further Israeli armament. New weapons systems and the most advanced technology are being given to Israel. Missiles that can reach almost every major population centre in the Middle East, with atomic carrying capability, have been promised by the United States to Israel. Little thought is required to comprehend the danger of this escalation of expenditures on armaments, and of the types of weapons that will issue therefrom.

We ask ourselves, why all these billions for arms? Why, when millions of starving people throughout the world could eat and live and even prosper with these billions, should they be contributed to buying destruction and death? Only the United States can answer that question.

My country firmly believes in the settlement of international conflict by peaceful means. The peaceful resolution of our differences with our neighbour Iran and the restoration of friendship and neighbourly co-operation between the two countries is testimony to our faith in that policy. But we are also firm believers in the right of peoples and States to struggle by all means to attain and defend their legitimate rights. The victories of the peoples of Viet-Nam and Cambodia give us hope and heart.

One issue which poses a great challenge to our concept of a just and peaceful world is the tremendous gap between the developed and the developing countries. Peace on our globe cannot be maintained with one part rich and prosperous and the other poor and turbulent. We believe that the sixth special session of the General Assembly recognized this problem. The Declaration that resulted offers hope for the future, but offers hope only when all States pledge themselves to translate it into a programme of action. Let us hope that this will be done.

Finally, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its faith in the United Nations and to state its firm belief that strict and consistent implementation of the purposes of the Charter and all the provisions of the Declaration on the

(Mr. EL-Shibib, Iraq)

Strengthening of International Security should be the basis for relations among States. Thirty years after the establishment of the United Nations, our Organization may not have achieved all that was hoped for, but a world order without it is too alarming even to consider.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Ambassador of Iraq for his statement and for his congratulations and friendly remarks about me and about my country. I also thank him for his congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Mr. Chairman, I hope you will not discriminate against me and rule me out of order if, like other previous speakers in this Committee, I break the rules to express to you, distinguished and beloved colleague and friend, my warmest congratulations on your unanimous election to the high post of Chairman of the political and security Committee of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly of our world Organization. Your wide experience, diplomatic talents and great personal charm will, I feel sure, help to guide this Committee towards a successful end and positive results.

The world today is watching closely and with great concern and sadness the current tragic events in your proud country, a real crossroads of world cultures. We pray that the present civil strife will not escalate any further and that peace and harmony will soon return to Lebanon. In the meantime, we appeal to all countries not to take advantage of that unfortunate internal situation, and to avoid any undue interference.

My congratulations, Sir, go also to the other officers of the Committee. I know that you will all have the full benefit of the advice and co-operation of the eminent Secretary of the Committee, our esteemed friend Mr. P. K. Banerjee.

The item dealing with the strengthening of international security has been before this body for several years now. In fact, the strengthening of international peace and security constitutes the very *raison d'être* of our Organization, which was created for exactly this purpose. The importance of our yearly discussion of this question stems from the necessity to update the ways and means for the strengthening of international security in a world characterized by fast and deep changes in all fields of human endeavour.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

The state of international security, we have to admit, is precarious, owing particularly to the continuing existence of focal points of crisis and tension in various regions, which endanger international peace and security, as well as acts of aggression, the threat of the use of force, foreign occupation and alien domination, and the existence of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

At the same time, we believe that the international détente which now exists offers favourable conditions for the solution of cold-war problems, as well as of the problems stemming from the danger of nuclear confrontation.

We have welcomed some positive results in international relations, such as the progress in decolonization, the liquidation of the hotbed of war in Indo-China, the successful outcome of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and, more recently, the Lima Conference of the non-aligned countries, as well as the encouraging results of the seventh special session of the United Nations General Assembly. However, the state of international security is dangerously affected by the ever-spiralling arms race and the increasing gap between the affluent economies based on an unjust international economic order and the social and economic deprivation of vast masses living in the developing world.

Against this background, against this precarious state of international security, I should like now to approach some ways and means which, in our view, could bring about the fulfilment of the high objectives enshrined in the United Nations Charter, in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and in other United Nations documents.

First, the mutual relations among States should be established firmly on unanimously agreed principles of inter-State relations, such as strict observance of national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs of other States, full equality of rights, mutual advantage, renunciation of force and the threat of force and the right of each people to decide its own fate for itself. Any violation of those principles should be considered an act against world peace and security and an attack on the cause of international co-operation.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

Secondly, all vestiges of the system of inter-State relations founded on political and economic subjection and discrimination should be wholly and urgently liquidated. The policy of apartheid and racial discrimination should be similarly abolished. More than ever, the strengthening of international security makes indispensable full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and all relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

Thirdly, the assertion of a new democratic spirit in international life requires that the settlement of the great issues facing mankind should be the outcome of the contribution of all States, small and large, developed and developing. States like Mauritius are carrying on a constant activity and are determined to make their contribution to the significant changes that are taking place in international relations. The action of the non-aligned countries constitutes a significant example of the role played by these States, and by their action in favour of peace, freedom and independence, the liberation of peoples, a new economic order and democratization of international relations, they have increased their influence and responsibility.

The countries of Africa are assuming an ever more important and constructive role in the world community. While ever attentive to our regional and national concerns, we have been giving increasing attention to helping to find constructive solutions to the grave problems afflicting many other regions of the world, and to the sweeping global issues.

We are living in a world of interdependence; this interdependence is universal. As we see it, the universality of interdependence means not only the participation of all States but also the interrelationships between the world's political, economic and social problems. The non-participation, under no matter what slogan, of some States in a position to contribute to the solution of any of these problems should, in my view, be regarded as an abdication of their international obligations. One cannot promote political stability -- or military détente, for instance -- without taking part in the reshaping of the present unfair economic order.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

States should develop a multiplicity of relations among all of them. The stronger the network of various relations among States of the world, the stronger will be international security and the more difficult will be a breach of the peace.

Fourthly, the rejection of force and the threat of force as a means of solving international problems implies the duty of States to settle their disputes by peaceful means only. We hope that the question of peaceful settlement of international disputes will receive the consideration it deserves, so that the rule of law will be strengthened.

Fifthly, real progress on disarmament is urgently needed. The whole present structure of international peace and security cannot but be shaken in the absence of effective disarmament measures aimed at general and complete disarmament.

Sixthly, a lasting peace cannot be envisaged as long as under-development exists and the world is divided between rich and poor. The eradication of under-development and the more rapid economic and social progress of the countries that are lagging behind are a primordial requirement for the development of the whole of mankind, for the establishment of collaboration and lasting peace in the world. The lag by certain countries is caused, primarily, by the policy of colonialism and neo-colonialism, by the relations of inequity of the past. That is why the closing of the gaps calls for a new policy in international economic and political relations. It is obvious that the phenomena engendered by the present economic and financial crisis, with all its consequences, are the result of the development of some States at the expense of others, more limited possibilities of economic development following the widening of the gap between the advanced and the developing States, the unreasonable consumption and the waste of raw materials and energy resources in a number of countries. This state of affairs emphatically indicates the necessity of establishing a new world economic order. One has to set out from the fact that the new order does not mean replacing the old wrapping by a new one. A mere change of wrapping will deepen the economic crisis and increase instability. The views of my country

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

on the various aspects of this problem are well known. They are the same as those of the countries in the Group of 77 and the non-aligned movement. I wish only to emphasize that it is extremely important that every Government and all the peoples should understand and admit the objective need for the new economic order. This is a prerequisite stemming from the realities of our time.

Seventhly, human solidarity manifested in a variety of forms constitutes today a power stronger than force. Peoples of the world should be properly informed of developments in international life so that they can better serve the cause of peace. They should become an active element in the struggle for a new and more just society.

The universality of interdependence makes universal peace and security indivisible. We exist in but one world. It is obvious that the solving of the complex problems of our universally interdependent world requires the existence of strong and efficient structures.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

With a membership of 142 States, the United Nations is the centre in which the States of the world can harmonize their efforts for the attainment of their common goals. The time has come to take full advantage of this structure of peace. Major problems of today's world should be debated here with the participation of all States, and the solutions adopted should represent everybody's contribution. The experience of the recent past shows that if such problems are brought before the Organization in time, adequate measures can be found for their solution. I would only mention the problems of environment, food and population for which plans of action have been adopted. The United Nations has the proper means to deal competently with international disputes and to bring about their peaceful settlement.

As the United Nations is entering its fourth decade of existence, we should admit that it has played an important role in promoting peace, co-operation and understanding among nations. Let us strengthen it and take full advantage of the vast resources of this structure.

Through their struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, fascism, racism, apartheid and any other form of foreign domination, the non-aligned countries have played a decisive role in the positive changes that are taking place in international relations. Consequently their influence and responsibility have increased. The recent Lima Conference of Foreign Ministers reaffirmed the attraction of this movement to the countries of the world. This movement is our chosen alternative to the policy of blocs, military confrontation, force or even diktat. It is an instrument in our struggle for the establishment of new political and economic relations in the world.

My country has done and will continue to do its best to strengthen this movement, a pylon in the world structure of peace and security.

In concluding, my delegation would like to join previous speakers in calling solemnly upon all States to seek strict and consistent implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and all the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security as a basis for relations among States irrespective of their size, level of development and socio-economic system.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

Finally, I wish to state, in reference to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1, submitted by a group of non-aligned countries, that it is perhaps wiser to leave the question of the dismantling of foreign military bases to bilateral negotiations. In that respect, I note that the paragraph does not "urge" or "request" but rather "reccmmends" the dismantling of foreign bases, creation of zones of peace, and so forth. I therefore feel I can add my country to the list of sponsors, and I should be grateful if the Secretariat would make a note of our sponsorship.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Ramphul of Mauritius for his kind remarks about me, his generous and friendly feelings towards my country, his congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, and also for his appeal.

Before I call on the next speaker, I have to announce that Tunisia, which is a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1, was inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors. I should like to confirm that Tunisia is a sponsor of the revised draft resolution.

Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all apologize for not having been present here when I was due to speak. It was simply that I was in the General Assembly for the election of members of the Security Council. Anyone who was present during that election must, I think, despair of our ever attempting to implement the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, considering the deadlock on that very simple issue.

Mr. Chairman, your long years at the United Nations have undoubtedly made you realize, as I do, that this is perhaps the largest and the most exclusive mutual admiration society in the world. Bearing that in mind and also your appeal to us to refrain from embarrassing you and the other officers of the Committee by extending to you our congratulations, I will refrain from doing so for the simple reason that, as I have always maintained, good wine needs no bush.

It is five years since the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted by the General Assembly. One would have thought, as I did, that we had discovered something new. And, if we examine the Declaration carefully -- and I say this in the full consciousness that we are a sponsor of the

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1 of 20 October -- it appears that there are no instruments in existence which set out the means by which we can strengthen international security. On the contrary, we have, as in many cases, all the instruments available for our guidance. All that we require is to observe them, and no mere repetition of them will strengthen our will and our disposition to abide by the provisions of the Declaration and the relevant instruments. What we need is the will.

During the last five years our approach to this question has been merely one of asking the Secretary-General to request information from various States regarding the measures they have taken to implement the provisions of the Declaration. Reading through all the verbiage -- and I say this with great respect -- in the latest report of the Secretary-General, it might be imagined that no one had realized what we should do, or not yet at any rate.

Some of the replies confined to three or four lines, I think, put the problem in its correct perspective, because the countries that submitted those replies realize that everything was there for our guidance and that all we had to do was comply with those provisions.

Another element -- and once again I say this in the full realization that we share responsibility for the sponsorship of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1) -- is that it is not just a matter of asking countries to send us eloquent memoranda regarding the measures they have taken to implement the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

There are three facets of this question to which countries should be required to address themselves and on which they should be asked to report in their replies: their acts of commission in the furtherance of the Declaration, their acts of omission in the furtherance of the Declaration, and any acts on their part in contravention of the spirit or the letter of the Declaration. On the third point, I am quite sure nobody would make any confession. At the moment, all that we get is a balance-sheet of developments that have been taking place since we last met, and that, too, in the report of the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

But that balance-sheet does not require any excuses or reports from any countries, or any professions of being dedicated or devoted to the cause of international security. The Secretary-General in his annual report makes an excellent analysis, and in his introduction to the report points out the areas in which there is a lack of co-operation as regards the strengthening of international security.

However, it is incumbent on us to review the developments that have taken place in the past year and to make an assessment of the progress that we have made towards the implementation of the Declaration, and it is on this point that I should like to say a few words.

First of all, I am sure that everyone will agree that the cessation of the horrible conflict in the former Indo-Chinese States -- Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam -- has greatly enhanced the prospects of international security. Secondly, by the same token, the partial settlement that has been reached in the Middle East also offers some hope, although there is much still left to be done in order to ensure a permanent and honourable settlement in that area.

Thirdly, there is the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which was recently concluded in Helsinki, with its emphasis on détente; and, fourthly, the progress made with regard to decolonization, which is perhaps the greatest single achievement of last year. We referred to this in the general debate and my delegation sees no need to repeat what we said then.

A great deal of emphasis has been laid on the importance of disarmament as a contribution to international security. Ever since the League of Nations, the world community has been fed and sustained on the illusion that disarmament is the best guarantee of peace and that if a few countries agree to reduce expenditure on disarmament, to cut down on the number of battleships and other weapons, peace will be assured. There could be no more dangerous illusion than that.

There are two approaches to the problem of disarmament. One approach is that adopted by the Romans of old when they said with, I think, great wisdom, si vis pacem, para bellum. That seems to be the policy that is being followed by the two super-Powers, not to mention others. In other words, they feel that

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

the only guarantee of peace is the greater sophistication of their armories both conventional and nuclear. A cynic would argue that the balance of terror had in fact saved the world from a global conflict, and I do not think that a cynic would be far off the mark in this respect. None of us can gainsay the fact that it is perhaps the competition between the super-Powers that has prevented a war between them, a war that would have embroiled the rest of the world.

At the same time, it has not resulted in peace elsewhere in the world. On the contrary, it has left them free perhaps -- and I do not say this of all, and I do not wish to make an invidious distinction -- to interfere in other areas of the world and even if they have not interfered they have certainly not prevented bloody conflicts elsewhere in the world. What then is left to us if disarmament is not a final and effective solution? We must seek positive measures in regard to the prevention of war and the maintenance of international security and peace. These positive measures are, in the first place of an economic nature. In the second place, they are not necessarily of an economic nature but of a political nature: that is, the removal of the causes of conflict. Unless we remove the causes of conflict no amount of talk regarding disarmament or the strengthening of international security, no resolutions adopted in eloquent language, will promote international security.

As regards the economic sphere, we have done everything that is necessary short of implementing the various resolutions and decisions of the Assembly at its sixth and seventh special sessions. We have, as I said earlier in the general debate, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the Declaration regarding the Second Development Decade. We firmly believe that the solution of economic problems must lead inevitably to relieving tension throughout the world and thereby promoting peace.

I referred to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe recently concluded in Helsinki. There, détente was the central theme. But détente in Europe alone cannot produce international security. It must be extended to other parts of the world, and those countries that participated in the Conference in Helsinki and contributed to the final result would, once again, be deluding themselves if they felt that in establishing security in Europe by means of détente they were ensuring peace throughout the world. On the contrary, we feel that

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

the reaching of détente in Europe might leave the major Powers free to interfere in other parts of the world, and that is something that causes us the gravest concern.

It is therefore in those areas left out of the orbit of the European security Conference that we must look for a solution of the problem or means of mitigating the conflicts that exist. One such measure has been initiated by us, and that is the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. There is also another proposal along the same lines, the declaration of the south Pacific as a zone of peace. We fully realize that those who are promoting the idea of the declaration of the south Pacific as a zone of peace have not shown the degree of ambition that we in the Indian Ocean region have. But what we are concerned about is the attitude of the great Powers to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. More than one resolution of the United Nations has called upon the great Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. Among them only two signal exceptions exist: they are one great Power, China, and one major maritime user, Japan. The others have shown a studied aloofness and indifference to what we consider to be one of the positive means of strengthening international security. There has been, in fact, a virtual boycott of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean by the four great Powers. This is a matter to which I shall refer when the question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace comes up in this Committee. I have to refer to it here only because it fits into the context of the strengthening of international security.

I find that the custom has recently been introduced into the United Nations of exhibiting one's support or sympathy for any cause or country by a public embrace, whether it be in the General Assembly or in the Third Committee is irrelevant. It is a lugubrious thought that the practices and customs of the funeral parlour should be introduced into the General Assembly, but I wish to assure the other four great Powers -- the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union -- that, if they make a positive contribution to the strengthening of international security by proclaiming their readiness to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, I shall publicly embrace them.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

I realize, of course, that the prospects of such a painful experience might deter them from extending their co-operation, but I would take that risk.

I have referred to one of the vitally important and positive measures, and that is one which lies in the area of international economic co-operation. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States has indicated the way for us. It is in the economic sphere, and in economic co-operation, that the best hope for international security lies, because it is economic insecurity that drives nations to despair and to adopt measures which threaten international security. This is an opportunity we must not miss, and I sincerely hope that the decisions and resolutions of the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly will be honestly and conscientiously implemented by the developed countries of the world and also by the developing countries, on which an equal responsibility rests for implementing and putting into effect those resolutions and declarations.

Finally I should like to refer, as speakers before me have done, to the recently held Lima Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries. The resolutions there adopted clearly pointed the way to the goal we are seeking: the strengthening of international security. The policies of the non-aligned movement, though they are sometimes viewed with disdain and ill-concealed contempt, offer us the best prospects of co-operation in the strengthening of international security. We commend our policies to all others, and we believe that their adoption holds out some hope --- and some positive hope --- for the strengthening of international security.

Reference has been made to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution of 20 October (A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1) of which Sri Lanka is a sponsor. Mention is made there of the convening of a world disarmament conference and the dismantling of foreign military bases. Regarding the convening of a world disarmament conference we have already indicated that as far back as 1961, when the first non-aligned summit was held in Belgrade, the Belgrade Declaration called for the convening of a world conference on disarmament. Regarding the dismantling of foreign military bases, the same Declaration called for the dismantling of such military bases.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

We wish to make it clear here that we mean all foreign military bases, wherever they exist. As long as such bases are maintained anywhere there is very little prospect of peace being maintained in a region, because the more the major Powers interfere in our affairs the more we become involved in their global strategies and their global policies; and there could be nothing more disastrous, more dangerous to international peace, than conflict with them in the pursuance of their global strategies and policies. I trust, therefore, that one day we shall be able to convert those impenitent sinners and get them to embrace the policies of non-alignment --- except so far as relations among themselves are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: I sincerely appreciate the fact that the representative of Sri Lanka complied with the rules, which he himself applies as an experienced diplomat and the chairman of so many committees and conferences.

I am sorry that I did not mention earlier that, as stated by Ambassador Ramphul, Mauritius has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for me to convey the sincere joy of my delegation at seeing you presiding over the first Committee. Lebanon is a small non-aligned country for which questions of international peace and security, to which it has always made a major contribution, are of significant importance. Your professional and personal qualities, Sir, are a source of inspiration and confidence for all. We should like also to offer our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

The strengthening of international security is the primary task of our Organization and therefore deserves constant and systematic review by the General Assembly. That has been carried out in recent years, ever since, on the happy initiative of the Soviet Union, it has been inscribed on our agenda.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

It is obvious that in dealing with this question it has been possible for States Members to review the main questions which affect international coexistence to analyse the salient trends in the evolution of world détente and to project coherent guidelines which will enable the United Nations to strengthen its role in promoting a more just system of relations.

The annual consideration of this item has contributed to the emergence of a new concept of international security which takes into account its various components, the various aspects of the present problem and the legitimate interests of all States and peoples.

The debate this year is being held at a time when it is possible to perceive a general line of sustained progress in the evolution of international relations. The victories of the peoples of Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos, the dissolution of the Portuguese colonial empire and the success of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe are expressions of that favourable tendency. They have contributed to bringing about a healthier international atmosphere and encouraging the peoples' hopes for a future which will guarantee for all suitable conditions of life and the possibility of organizing their lives as they wish, free from threats, pressures or interference of any kind.

Yet it would be naive to ignore the limitations which are still visible in that process. The world is far from having attained conditions which will guarantee the universal application of the principles of peaceful coexistence. We cannot ignore the obvious fact that the victories I referred to earlier were the result of the struggle of peoples. They were imposed by them on the imperialist Powers. They are therefore in no way the result of a change in the policy or the nature of imperialism. Colonialism, both the classical and the new type, racism and economic exploitation continue to be tragic realities which burden numerous peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

The situation in southern Africa and in the Middle East are sources of constant concern to our Organization and require the adoption of urgent measures to prevent both from becoming dangerous sources of war or conflict which could spread to the rest of our planet.

In Angola foreign intervention has been unleashed before our eyes without immediate mobilization of the international community to put an end to it. In this respect I should like to reiterate the firm opinion of my Government to the effect that the United Nations and all States which are really interested in liquidating colonialism should resolutely come to the aid of the Angolan people and of its only legitimate representative, the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola. The racists of South Africa and various NATO Powers, with the assistance of their local agents, are carrying out the dirtiest and most cowardly aggression against the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola. They are trying by all means to prevent the genuine independence of Angola on 11 November next. They are trying to ensure the repetition in that country of the tragic experience of the Congo. It is the duty of the world to prevent this.

The present Government of Portugal has a special responsibility. It is to be hoped that the Lisbon authorities will act consistently to frustrate the plans of imperialism and NATO to intervene against the people of Angola. They must proceed as agreed and transfer power to the Angolan people without conditions or reservations on 11 November next. Within that context they should speed up the withdrawal of Portuguese troops, which are concentrated in large numbers in Luanda.

The partial disengagements in the Middle East have not led to a solution which would enable all the Arab States, which were victims of Israeli aggression, to recover the territories which have been occupied. Threats and provocations against Syria continue, and there are daily reminders that peace is very distant in that part of the world. The Palestinian people are still being denied their most elementary national rights. An indispensable component of any system of international security must be respect for the sovereign right of peoples to dispose of their natural resources, to control and nationalize the transnational corporations which plunder their riches and distort or prevent economic development and to carry out social and political reforms which accord best

with their interests. If these rights are ignored or violated, it will be impossible to establish a structure of international security that satisfies the needs and aspirations of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The case of Chile offers unassailable testimony in this respect. The popular Government of President Allende was the victim of conspiracy and sabotage by imperialist transnational companies which the people of Chile, in exercise of their sovereign rights, decided to nationalize. Imperialism organized a commercial and financial blockade against that democratic Government, promoted hostile campaigns against it, and finally planned, organized and financed its overthrow.

Imperialist intervention against the Government of President Allende was recognized publicly and officially by the authorities responsible for North American foreign policy. Details of a CIA conspiracy against the Chilean people have been examined at open meetings by several legislative bodies of the United States. Exact figures of how much was paid to each of the agents to perpetrate that most ignoble treachery against the Chilean people have been accurately reported in the North American press and spread by all information media throughout the world.

The same interests which promoted and financed the liquidation of the Chilean constitutional order today come to the support of the genocidal régime which they procreated. The investors who promoted the coup d'état on 11 September 1973 are also guilty of the situation which now prevails in Chile, which is characterized by the imposition of the most brutal terror against the workers and the people.

In order to strengthen the positive tendencies of the international evolution and establish a system of genuine international peace and security, effective and simultaneous measures must be taken at various levels to eradicate the hotbeds of tension, promote general and complete disarmament, eliminate colonialism and racism, and radically transform the present structure of international economic relations. Among these measures, of particular importance and urgency, is the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which will guarantee for the Palestinian people the full exercise of their national rights. There must be

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

effective international action to put an end to racism, racial discrimination, apartheid, fascism and colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and in every part of the world; the prompt convening of a world disarmament conference and the promotion of agreements which would limit the production and testing of nuclear weapons and of new types of weapons of mass destruction; and the application of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

We are considering this item while we are commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the defeat of nazism and fascism and the establishment of the United Nations. The triumph of the democratic and peaceful forces, headed by the Soviet Union, three decades ago paved the way to progress in the direction of a more just world in which freedom and equality would benefit all nations. These noble ideals, enshrined in the San Francisco Charter, still constitute today the goal which many peoples endeavour to reach, in the face of the opposition of those who attempt to maintain their positions of predominance and exploitation. The common effort to secure compliance with the principles and purposes of the Charter is undoubtedly the best tribute to our Organization and to the positive work it has accomplished in the past 30 years.

We cannot ignore another significant commemoration. Soon, 15 years will have passed since we adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It is significant that mid-way in the existence of our Organization the General Assembly solemnly proclaimed the inalienable right of all colonial peoples to self-determination and independence. The aspiration contained in that historic Declaration, which has become a triumphant reality for many nations, nevertheless remains an objective still to be achieved in several areas of the world -- from southern Africa to the Caribbean and the Pacific -- where the retrograde forces of colonialism and racism still refuse to recognize the right of all peoples to be the sole masters of their fate.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

If we give appropriate thought to the coincidence of those two celebrations we shall have the key to the promotion of international peace and security everywhere in the world. These are the basic objectives which are still in force for our Organization, because genuine peace and lasting security can only be attained in a world in which unrestricted respect for the rights of all peoples is the rule which governs relations among States.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Cuba for her kind remarks addressed to me, to my country and to the other officers of the Committee.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity of expressing my delegation's satisfaction and our hearty congratulations on your assumption of the chairmanship of this important Committee. The cordial neighbourly and brotherly relations between our two countries are an added source of satisfaction to us on your assumption of the Chair. We feel sure that under your wise guidance, with your experience, tact and skill, the deliberations of this Committee will prove constructive and fruitful.

With regard to the item under consideration, I should like to consider it in relation to the effective function of the United Nations under the Charter generally and also in relation to the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations and the world situation that we have before us at this time in history, thirty years after the establishment of the Organization. Allow me in a few words to consider the subject broadly, as it should be considered.

The Charter of the United Nations lays particular stress and importance on matters of international security. The Preamble to the Charter makes it clear from the very start that the purpose of establishing the United Nations was:

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

Then it goes on to say that it is necessary:

"to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest" -- that is to say, the collective use by the United Nations.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The first Article of the Charter makes it still more plain that:

"The Purposes of the United Nations are:

"1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

This is the Charter and this is the United Nations as it has been for the last 30 years. It is regrettably an undoubted fact that the aspect of international security is the one that has been given the least attention and effect by the United Nations. The Organization has survived and the world has survived because of other converging circumstances, fortuitous or not fortuitous, but never by reason of international security under the Charter.

That being so, the proposal five years ago for strengthening international security -- and surely "strengthening" here can only mean making it effective; not that it was effective and merely needed a little strengthening, but that it needed strengthening by being made effective -- was appropriately and very wisely made, and the Declaration adopted is a document studiously executed, wisely conceived and adopted unanimously, except, I think, for one vote. It contains, with appropriate emphasis and order of priority, all the elements needed for international security through the United Nations. It also strongly urges and recommends the necessary measures for strengthening international security under the Charter. The Declaration has been generally justly approved and praised on all occasions.

Any real effort to strengthen international security should primarily give substance and effect to the Charter by complying with its relevant and basic provisions concerning international security. International security is therefore to be ensured, according to the Charter, by the appropriate function of the Security Council under Article 39, under which the Security Council decides on any matter concerning international security. The decisions of the Security Council are mandatory and full provision is made in the Charter

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

for their due implementation and for the enforcement of such implementation, where necessary, under Articles 42 and 43. The Declaration duly draws attention to these recommendations and:

"Recommends that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements in Article 43 of the Charter in order fully to develop its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter." (General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 9)

Surely, if the whole Declaration including this recommendation was adopted unanimously, except for one vote, this means that it was something more than mere adoption; that it was accepted by the whole membership that Article 43 should apply and that the provisions of the Charter should be complied with, as set out in the Charter.

But we see that in reality, at least in some cases, after a resolution is adopted by the Security Council unanimously, without even one vote against as in the case of this Declaration, the Security Council goes to sleep and is not aware of what is happening in the world and how far the resolution is or is not implemented. Even if the aggressor in a particular case not only does not comply with the resolution calling on it to cease its intervention immediately and withdraw its forces speedily, but on the contrary doubles and redoubles and increases its forces tenfold and sends them by air and by sea against a smaller, undefended, neutral, non-aligned country, without an army, without an air force, without a navy; even if it sends in its troops and its tanks and proceeds with that aggression and invasion, the Security Council only meets again after three or four days and repeats its resolution in stricter and more emphatic terms. But as soon as it has done so it goes to sleep again, and the aggressor continues unperturbed in undisguised and open violation of every concept of international law, as if there were no United Nations, no Charter, no relevant resolutions, and everything seems to continue smoothly all over the world.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

But the world is one and indivisible and there are no islands of security, no matter what armaments there may be. Either there is international security in our world or there is not. And if there is not, then every country and every State -- not only the small ones, but even the big ones -- is exposed to unthinkable dangers if it encourages international anarchy and insecurity. This is not just a theory I am putting forward here; it is said in every international document that there can be no international security without an international legal order. The Charter fully provides a legal order. It is, however, neglected and disregarded. This situation calls for serious consideration and should not be taken lightly. So far it has been taken lightly because there have not been sufficient flagrant cases of such aggression. But once there is even one, then what are the implications? The implications are very wide indeed. Of course, everyone knows that I am speaking about my own country, but if there is one case that is pertinent to international security at the present time, that is a flagrant and clear example of what is happening in our world, it is the case of Cyprus.

No one who reviews the world situation can ignore the situation that is still continuing in Cyprus after a whole year. What is that situation? The situation is not just one of aggression and invasion; we have had aggressions and invasions over the years at different times and places. But by this invasion over one third of the territory of Cyprus is occupied. The significance of this in recent history, the rare aspect of it, is that 200,000 indigenous Greek-Cypriot people of the area have been expelled by armed force -- one third of the whole population of the island, people of every denomination. They are not allowed to return to their homes and their usurped property, and those who try to return are killed outright. More significant still, massive numbers of Turkish people are being brought from Turkey to replace the expelled indigenous population. Furthermore, the whole project of expulsion and immigration is based on racial and ethnic discrimination. There was no reason for expelling the population other

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

than their ethnic origin and character, and no reason for bringing in the other population other than their ethnic origin and racial character. It was a blatant act of racial discrimination, quite apart from the criminal aspect.

This is the situation in a world of international security under the Charter of the United Nations. We had a contingent of the United Nations in Cyprus at the time that this happened. The irony of this situation is such that it would make history in itself.

What then is the effect of this upon the world? The effect is that all countries, but particularly the small countries, realizing that force alone can win in this United Nations era and that there is no international security, naturally turn to armaments and more armaments. The effect therefore is to move the international community away from disarmament and towards increased, redoubled armaments. Thus we see that expenditure on the arms race has suddenly jumped this year to \$300,000 million -- at a time when there is dire need for development; at a time when we have held a special session emphasizing the need for development and have been told at that session that unfortunately there are no funds available for such development. Yet we know, through studies and statistics, that even a very small part of that \$300,000 million would be enough to do what is necessary for the development of the developing countries, and that all the problems that were discussed during that special session could be solved fundamentally by bridging the gulf between the rich and the poor countries, by overcoming the great problem that arises from that growing imbalance, the universal problem of the harmony and balance of the universe.

This is the situation in respect of international security, and this absence of international security is the fundamental cause for the wasting of that \$300,000 million at a time when millions of people are dying of hunger. Yet we have to spend more and more on armaments.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

If one looks at yesterday's issue of The New York Times it will be seen that further **expenditure** on nuclear weapons has been proposed because, it is said, means have been found by one big Power of so directing nuclear weapons as to cause the necessary destruction without directly hitting the population of a city, but in any case the loss to the United States had been calculated at about \$3 million, then this was changed to about \$10 million. Because of this latest invention, it was said there should be more expenditure by the other big Power, and this would involve hundreds of millions of dollars.

So that is the situation in the world today. We cannot be very hopeful. It cannot portend anything but a future that is fraught with danger, to say the least. Armament continues in a world in which we know there can be no nuclear war without total catastrophe. We know that the big Powers will try to avoid it, but the other day there were intimations that the use of nuclear weapons is not excluded and that even the first use of nuclear weapons is not excluded, if the situation requires it. In such a world, what international security is there? Is it not necessary to look more seriously at the subject of strengthening international security with a view to finding a way out for the whole of mankind, not for one nation as against another?

It should be realized that the enemy is not the people from the other side of the fence, whoever they are. It is not a case of Rome and Carthage, when Rome thought that the only danger was Carthage, therefore it must be destroyed, and it was. Here we have global problems affecting every nation, problems that must be met with responsibility comparable to and commensurate with the power that has been given to man by the nuclear weapon and the progress of technology.

We cannot deal with problems of international security and war in the light-hearted manner of the past, when peace was only an interval between two wars and the whole effort went to preparations for the next war, acquiring more weapons, more

perfect weapons, more effective weapons. Now that weapons have reached the summit of perfection, which means global destruction and, even more, the destruction of the very environment which sustains human life on this earth, the biosphere, in this situation there cannot be a United Nations, world without international security. I believe that the time has come when the gigantic progress of technology has so altered the conditions of life on our planet as to make drastic changes in human and international relations a compelling necessity for the further progress and indeed the very survival of mankind.

In a world that has grown utterly interdependent the concept of separate national security through armaments is an outworn relic of the past, now rendered obsolete. There can no longer be islands of safety in a world of international anarchy. Hence, the purpose of my intervention is to bring awareness -- which seems not to be complete in the United Nations -- of the danger we shall face unless we deal more effectively with international security. And we shall do this if we follow the Charter and particularly the Declaration which calls for the strengthening of international security; recommends its implementation and that all States contribute to efforts to ensure peace and security for all nations and to establish, in accordance with the Charter, an effective system of universal collective security without military alliances; and invites Member States to do their utmost to enhance by all possible means the authority and effectiveness of the Security Council and its decisions.

Where is the authority and the effectiveness of the Security Council? It is thrown to the winds when its resolutions remain wholly unimplemented, and are treated with contempt and complete disregard. Is that the United Nations that we want? Is that the Security Council that the world needs? Surely it is not. It is for the United Nations, then, and for this Committee dealing with the subject to see that an effective resolution is adopted -- not a resolution that is merely a paper like every other paper resolution, but one that goes to the heart of the problem; and to see that measures are

taken to ensure that the Security Council's mandatory decisions, unanimously adopted, are implemented, and, if they are not implemented, are enforced in accordance with the Charter.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Cyprus for his kind words and congratulations to me and to the other officers of the Committee.

His statement was the last in the general debate on this item.

Before we pass on to the vote, I shall call on a number of delegations which have asked to be allowed to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. NAJAR (Israel) (interpretation from French): Offensive comments directed against Israel were made by several delegations during this debate. As everyone in this Committee knows, the allegations of those delegations have been repeated at length during the discussion of the various items on the agenda of this Committee which refer to the Middle East conflict. It is inappropriate for those delegations to try to provoke fragmentary and disjointed debates in this Committee, and I deplore this. My delegation reserves its right to express its views on all these points at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum. I shall confine myself here to rejecting totally and firmly the unfounded, slanderous and impudent accusations made against Israel.

We cannot fail to observe with indignation that these attacks, which are now part of a kind of satanic and malicious ritual, are made by countries which ignore democratic liberty, practise the most outrageous and flagrant type of fanaticism and oppress the minorities in their own countries, and whose chosen policies are war, blackmail and intimidation.

(Mr. Najjar, Israel)

What shall we say about Qatar? If not to pass over it in silence. What can we say of Syria which hardly can conceal its expansionist aims in our region and which is notorious for the frightful way in which it tortures, mutilates and executes prisoners of war, and the way in which it persecutes without pity the remainder of the Jewish community that has not been able to leave that country?

What can we say of Iraq, which hangs Jews in public, which represses minorities and which is the country of coups d'état and political assassinations, Iraq which has despoiled and expelled a Jewish community of more than 130,000 people that had been living in that country for 10 centuries before the birth of Islam?

What can we say of Libya, a theocratic State, which strangely enough is the champion of a secular State in Palestine, at a time when the Lebanese Christians are struggling to defend themselves against their Moslem fellow citizens?

As to Mauritania, it would do well to concern itself with what is taking place along its frontiers and is at this moment being dealt with in the Security Council.

And what shall we say of the other slanderers of Israel, those countries whose aim is to sabotage peace in the region, which have the insolence to attack the open democracy in Israel, from which they have a great deal to learn and the benefits of which for the Middle East region and for its cultural and social development they will, I am sure, come to acknowledge later?

I must emphatically repeat that the Israeli-Arab conflict will be solved only by the peaceful means of negotiation, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) of the Security Council, and not by threats, falsehoods, defamatory statements or terrorism. This is the course set forth by the recent agreement between Israel and Egypt, and our hope, our great hope, is that this course will be confirmed and will triumph in the future.

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom): In his statement this morning the representative of Spain referred to Gibraltar. He described Gibraltar as a military base imposed and maintained on a colonial basis, and said that no doubt the problem of Gibraltar would be solved by the process of decolonization.

If the only concern of the United Kingdom Government had been to retain a base in that part of the world, we could have accepted Spanish proposals put forward in 1966 whereby Gibraltar would have passed under Spanish sovereignty and we would have been allowed to retain a military base in the peninsula. We did not accept those proposals because our prime concern has been to abide by the wishes of the people of Gibraltar themselves and because to do so would have been to ignore these.

My delegation was glad to note that in his statement in the general debate on 30 September, the Foreign Minister of Spain eloquently defended the rights of peoples to self-determination. My Government knows no better way of applying the principles of self-determination than that of consulting the wishes of the people concerned. The wishes of the people of Gibraltar, as the representative of Spain knows, are reflected in the preamble to the Act of Parliament, which brought Gibraltar's current Constitution into force.

The wishes of those people are of paramount consideration for us and we believe that in saying this we are acting in full accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. HUERTA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): I find myself in somewhat of a dilemma. I have been listed among those who wish to exercise their right of reply, and as you, Mr. Chairman, very aptly pointed out -- and I agree -- I have to reply to a lady who makes an excellent substitute for the Permanent Representative of her country. Furthermore, I have just taken part in this particular debate, stressing the provisions of the Charter and the terms of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and like many other representatives I have spoken of international co-operation, non-intervention and relaxation of tension. I could expatiate on the question of countries which have violated and continue to violate these principles -- and I have some irrefutable examples.

Nevertheless, I believe one of the best possible ways in which I can co-operate with this Committee would be for me simply to refer to a reply which, for similar reasons, I made at the end of the general debate. My country is acting with dignity in a spirit of independence and sovereignty. It does not accept impositions from without, no matter what their source may be. It sincerely hopes that the day will arrive in this Organization when we shall no longer have to listen to criticisms, injuries and slanders from Governments acting on instructions from others.

Mr. SIBAHI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): We have just heard the representative of Israel make some comments. We regret that he should have made those comments in this Committee. The remarks he is repeating have all been replied to by my colleagues who have sat in this Committee before me. However, the representative of Israel referred to something new when he mentioned peace and the positive steps taken by his Government to restore peace in that part of the Middle East.

If I am to reply to the insolence shown by the representative of Israel in speaking of my own country, allow me to answer the repeated comments made by the representative of Israel here on religious discrimination in Syria as applied to the Jewish community. We respect that community because, as

(Mr. Sibahi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Moslems, we honour and respect Judaism, but we will never accept zionism in any form. Syria and Damascus, which are more than 5,000 years old, have been known throughout their history for their tolerance. This area has always been the cradle of various civilizations of mankind. This region has been the birthplace of various religions -- the Jewish as well as the Christian and Moslem religions.

(Mr. Sibahi, Syrian Arab Republic)

We have evidence that this region has been open to all Jews who live there on an equal footing with Christians and Moslems. I say this in answer to the false accusations that have been repeatedly made against us. However, everyone is aware of this everywhere. Jews and Moslems lived in peace there, and if there had not been racist movements like fascism and nazism in the world Israel would not have become the cradle of that other movement that is now making this kind of accusation against us.

Since the representative of Israel is speaking of religious discrimination, we can say that such discrimination exists in Israel itself, discrimination directed against Jews who have been imported into Israel just as foreign products -- American products -- are imported into Israel. These Jews are subjected to discrimination in Israel.

There is also another form of religious discrimination: the discrimination that exists between white Oriental Jews and black Oriental Jews. Many of these black Oriental Jews came to Israel as tourists in 1968, 1969 and 1970. However, they were forced to return to their countries of origin on the same planes on which they came to Israel. The representative of Israel can refer to the statistics of tourism to check this matter and to prove the racism practised in Israel against Oriental Jews.

But the new comments made today by the representative of Israel referred to the problem of peace. I should like to say to all those who share his views that Syria will remain on the side of peace, on the side of strengthening international peace and security regardless of the allegations made by some who are trying to divert our attention from security. We are in favour of peace.

The first disengagement agreement concluded by my country with regard to the Syrian front was related to a solution of the Middle East conflict. We were motivated in this by our support of the Palestinian cause. I defy the representative of Israel and those who support him to show any text in the new Sinai Agreement of 1 July 1975 that mentions the problem of Palestine or the conflict between Syria and Israel on the Syrian front. There is only one cause involved: the cause of the Palestinian people and their rights. That cause, which was defended by Syria, is at the origin of the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries.

(Mr. Sibahi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The President of our Republic stated that we would not negotiate any new agreement on disengagement unless it deals with the Syrian front and with the Palestinian question. Any action regarding the Syrian front must be accompanied by action regarding the Palestinian front, and the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people should be involved in such an agreement. So there are no preconditions for negotiation on this matter, as you see.

We believe that peace has been only partially achieved and, this being so, it is an artificial peace. It is a threat to international life because the Sinai Agreement contained secret clauses, which were disclosed only after the Agreement was submitted to the United States Congress. And this Agreement was achieved only by the delivery of American arms to Israel. The Israeli Minister for Defence came to Washington to obtain those arms. How can peace be achieved in this region in the face of all these military preparations?

This partial peace referred to by the representative of Israel which was negotiated by means of those secret clauses in the agreement, can this be a solution to the Palestinian problem? Is this the peace called for by the Charter of the United Nations? I would say that the representative is behaving like an ostrich which buries its head in the sand. Indeed, I repeat this is a false peace, an artificial peace in the Middle East region.

The CHAIRMAN: May I appeal to members of the Committee to restrict the exercise of their right of reply both in extent and in frequency. I think that the positions of the various delegations have been very well stated in the general debate, and I feel that statements made in right of reply should be short and made once only.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My reply will be the last statement I shall make in this debate. As far as time is concerned I do not think that it will take more than a minute for me to make my statement.

With respect to the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative concerning Gibraltar, I should like to state for the record that my delegation

(Mr. Elias, Spain)

has taken due note of the fact that the United Kingdom is interested in maintaining a military base in Gibraltar only to the extent that that military base is covered by a colonial statute. With respect to the application of self-determination in the case of Gibraltar, the United Kingdom representative recalled the referendum that was conducted a few years ago in Gibraltar. However, he failed to mention that the United Nations, which represents the conscience of mankind in the area of decolonization, withheld authorization for that referendum inasmuch as it ran counter to resolutions which had been adopted by our Organization concerning the decolonization of Gibraltar.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I apologize for asking to speak again, Sir, but I do so merely for the purpose of indicating that my delegation speaks with one voice and that it speaks in accordance with the principles of the policy of the revolutionary Government of Cuba. I should like also to point out that the agreements reached at the Dakar Conference, in which the developing countries participated, as well as in the fifth meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries, condemned the policies followed by the fascist junta of Chile, because it handed over the wealth of the country to the imperialists and monopolists and flagrantly violated human rights.

Furthermore, in the debates of the current session of the General Assembly we have heard expressions of repudiation of the Chilean fascist régime. Not only the voice of Cuba but indeed the voices of a considerable number of countries have been raised to speak in unison condemning the policy at present followed by Chile.

Mr. ABOU-EZZEDDINE (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): I did not have the intention of replying to the representative of Israel, but this is the third time that a representative of Israel has referred to Lebanon during this session. The Foreign Minister of Israel referred to my country in the speech he made in the General Assembly, and we did not reply to him. Then the representative of Israel spoke of my country in the Third Committee. And here in this Committee the representative of Israel has again referred to Lebanon in his statement and therefore I am compelled to reply to him.

The representative of Israel stated that the Christians in Lebanon were defending themselves against the Moslems. I wish, Sir, that someone else had been sitting in the Chairman's seat so that you could have been at my side in order to reply to the representative of Israel by telling him the truth: that Moslems and Christians in Lebanon have always lived together in peace and harmony and will continue to live together in that way.

(Mr. Abou-Ezzeddine, Lebanon)

Although Lebanon is at present undergoing difficulties, we have always tried to determine the sources and causes of those difficulties. The causes are far from being in the very nature of the Lebanese people.

The representative of Israel has shown himself to be somewhat involved in all of this. I believe everyone knows that when a judge begins to investigate a crime he first asks who stands to benefit from that crime. The representative of Israel has himself replied to that question. Did he not thereby condemn himself? I say that I condemn Israel.

Lebanon, with its Moslem and Christian populations living in national unity, will always remain Lebanon. However, the reactionary State of Israel, which is the cause of all the trouble in that region, has no future.

Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, it is very easy for me to heed your appeal. My reply to the slanders of the representative of Israel will certainly not take more than two or three minutes, because they are certainly not worthy of any more time.

The very same lies that the representative of Israel saw fit to repeat in this Committee have often been repeated in the General Assembly, in this Committee, in the Special Political Committee and, most recently, in the Third Committee. They have been exposed in those forums for what they are -- mere slanders and lies. I wish to take only a minute to refer to one accusation, and that is that Iraq was responsible for expelling hundreds of thousands of Jews.

The facts are very clear regarding the agents provocateurs who were sent by the Zionists to burn synagogues, Jewish businesses and houses, to cause the Jews to emigrate to Israel, and they have been stated and proved by representatives of Iraq in various forums. This further repetition of that allegation by the representative of a country which has caused the expulsion of a whole nation and usurped its entire homeland is to me the height of impertinence.

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom): I apologize for asking to speak again, Mr. Chairman, and like my Spanish colleague I promise that this will be the last time I shall do so.

I regret I did not entirely understand the first half of the statement of the representative of Spain, so as far as that is concerned I can only reserve my delegation's position.

Regarding the second half, I listened with some surprise to the allegation that the United Kingdom had ignored General Assembly resolutions. The pledge we gave to the people of Gibraltar in the preamble to the 1969 Constitution was that my Government would never enter into arrangements under which the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another State against their freely and democratically expressed wishes. That pledge is wholly consistent with my Government's obligations under Chapter 11 of the Charter. There is nothing dishonourable --- indeed, the contrary --- about pledging oneself to respect the peoples' wishes.

We have always said, and I repeat today, that if the people of Gibraltar should ever decide, freely and democratically, that their future lay in becoming part of Spain we would not stand in their way. They have not so decided; and as long as they wish to remain under British sovereignty we shall regard it as our duty to support and sustain them in the face of the restrictions that have imposed on them.

Mr. AL-MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

First of all I should like to express my regret with regard to the new manner of speaking that we are beginning to hear within the halls of the United Nations, an offensive manner of speaking that we heard last Friday in the Third Committee. The State which is the cause of the crisis throughout the Middle East has through its representatives used language which is a source of shame for us listening to them here in the United Nations. Following the example of that great country of which he is a disciple, he is now permitting himself to address you, the Members of the United Nations, in a strange kind of language that we should all condemn.

Furthermore, I heard that my country was a theocratic State and fanatic from the religious standpoint. If in making that statement the Israeli representative meant to indicate that we adhere to our religion, that is a virtue, because Islam is against racism of any type. Islam, Mohammedanism, espouses the equality of all human beings. We make no difference between an Arab and a foreigner. Islam is the religion of fraternity and equality and there is no discrimination between white, black, red or yellow. There is no discrimination from the standpoint of race or religion. If we adhere to our religion it is a source of pride for us because Islam is the religion of tolerance and equality for all.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I should like to reply very briefly to Ambassador Rossides because in referring in his statement to the situation of Cyprus he mentioned the name of my country. Ambassador Rossides spoke of aggression and intervention in Cyprus. There has been aggression and intervention in Cyprus by the country which tried, by the use of force, to put an end to the independence of Cyprus and to annex it. Measures, of course, had to be taken in conformity with the Treaty guaranteeing the independence of Cyprus to prevent this attempt.

Ambassador Rossides spoke also about racial discrimination. He knows, of course, that since 1963 racial discrimination has been practised in Cyprus through a systematic policy of denying political, economic and human rights to the Turkish community and converting the State into an instrument of oppression of the Turkish community.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

He referred to people coming to Cyprus from Turkey. I did not understand very well what he meant. The Turkish community no doubt has the right to import seasonal workers and experts from any country in an effort to redress its economic situation.

The best way to strengthen international security is to contribute to a peaceful settlement of disputes as envisaged in the Charter and not to exacerbate them. The Turkish community in Cyprus is ready to undertake a major effort in the direction of a peaceful solution. Despite the discouragement one feels after listening to Ambassador Rossides, we hope that the Greek community will act in the same spirit as the Turkish community.

Mr. HUERTA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened with satisfaction to the statement you made indicating that you hoped that the replies would be short, appropriately worded and made once. I will comply chiefly because the allegations just made against my country concerning the ownership of natural resources and human rights actually are not within the purview of this Committee. Hence, we reserve our right to undertake the appropriate defence when such matters are dealt with in the proper committees.

Mr. NAJAR (Israel) (interpretation from French): I shall confine myself to just three comments to avoid misunderstanding. First, in answer to the representative of Iraq, I imagine he does not know exactly who I am. In 1950 a Jewish philanthropist lived in Iraq. He was well known to everyone and he was honoured by Jews and Moslems alike. That man was called Chafik Ades. He was my cousin. He was hanged in 1950. When the Iraqi-Jewish community saw that a good man like Chafik Ades was hanged in a public square, that was the signal for an exodus of the Jewish community which was then plundered by the Iraqi Government.

As regards the remarks of the representative of Libya, I spoke from a written text and I made no accusations whatsoever against Libya for having a theocratic régime. I respect the Moslem religion deeply. I know that religion. I simply said that it was strange for a State which had chosen a theocratic régime to be the champion of a secular régime in another country of the region; that is all.

In conclusion, I will simply say that regardless of the acrimony of this debate, I personally am convinced that in the future there will be fruitful Judaeo-Arabic collaboration in the Middle East. That collaboration can be achieved only through negotiation. It will not be attained by military action or threats. Negotiation means coming to the negotiating table with different viewpoints in order to achieve a compromise. I sincerely hope that peaceful means will triumph in the Middle East and thus our hopes will be fulfilled.

Mr. CHRYSANTHOPOULOS (Greece): I was hoping that the representative of Turkey would have resisted referring to my country. Unfortunately that was not so. In reply I wish to refer to the statement made by the Greek Permanent Representative to the General Assembly on the 8th of this month refuting the same accusation made by Ambassador Turkmen in the General Assembly.

I cannot resist the temptation to say a few words on the substance of the Turkish representative's statement. Cyprus modestly restricted its intervention to calling upon the United Nations to respect its own resolutions by executing them. We all have an interest in the United Nations resolutions being respected and executed. It is regrettable that Turkey does not see its own long-term interest in respecting the appeals of Cyprus made in the name of us all, or at least in remaining silent.

The CHAIRMAN: May I make an appeal again to the members of the Committee. The time is getting late and we still have some business to conclude.

Mr. CULD SID' AHMED (Mauritania) (interpretation from Arabic): I have gathered from the comments made by the representative of Israel a well-known fact, that truth is bitter. My delegation will reserve its right to reply to the comments made by Israel.

Mr. AL-MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Republic) (intrepretation from Arabic): I am sorry to take the floor once again, but it is merely for the purpose of making the following comments.

The representative of the Libyan Arab Republic is not alone in demanding that the Palestinian State be a secular State. This is the request of the Palestinians themselves who are the original inhabitants of that area; and, therefore, we could not fail to support their own request.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The representative of Turkey has replied to my statement. In the first place, I would like to make it clear that my reference to Cyprus was part and parcel of the whole international security problem and was given as an example as I went on with the theme that I was developing. So I do not see why he should be offended because I stated facts that are well-known all over the world.

There is no question about the invasion, no question about the aggression involved or the arms used, no question about the expulsion of the populations. But there is a problem in the United Nations about what we are to do with the 200,000 refugees. It was discussed today in the Special Committee of the FAO and others, and by the High Commissioner for Refugees. I said nothing but facts. I only relate those facts to the world situation as regards the need for international security.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

What the representative said about aggression by Greece, we know. That was an excuse that was offered. We do not want to enter into the why and how, but it was an excuse and it was seized upon promptly, of course. As we know, the preparations for the aggression in Cyprus, as reported in very reliable newspapers of this country, had already been made one month before the invasion on 20 July. So, therefore, it did not come as a result of that invasion under the junta. The junta was really acting as an instrument, not as representing Greece or the people of Greece. It was a dictatorship imposed upon the people of Greece and not in the interests of Greece.

The representative says that Turkey went there to save the situation and restore order. What a wonderful way of restoring order, to expel the indigenous population and to cause all that human suffering and crimes in restoring order.

First of all, what right did they have to enter Cyprus by force? The Treaty of Guarantee does not say that they are entitled to use force. It says that they are entitled to make representations. Representations are not armed force. If it had provided for armed force, it would have been, ipso facto, negated by Article 103 of the Charter which says that no treaty can prevail over the Charter of the United Nations: and the Charter, in Article 2, paragraph 4, says clearly that no State can use force against another State; it can only do so in defence of its own territory. And, therefore, this was clearly aggression and had nothing to do with rightful intervention.

The next point he raised was that discrimination was practised against the Turkish Cypriots by the Government for 10 years. This is really amusing, because he made that charge in the 2378th plenary meeting on 7 October only a couple of weeks ago. In my reply at the 2380th meeting I stated that it was a cliché, that Turkish representatives had been using it repeatedly and trying to spread it about for the purpose of blurring the issue of their aggression and invasion. As if this could blur a crime. It is a completely unsubstantiated charge.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I then said that it had been disproved by reference to the best and only authority on this subject over the 10-year period in question, namely the reports of the Secretary-General, which reference had been made in the Security Council on 30 August 1974 and in the Special Political Committee and which I repeated in the plenary meeting of the Assembly. Those reports show that the Turkish Cypriots suffered from the fact that their leadership was acting on directions from Ankara. They were secluded, mostly against their will, in enclaves, not allowed to go out, in order to create a climate of partition by separation.

All the reports of the Secretary-General show this. They were quoted, and the representative of Turkey was not able to answer them in the plenary meeting, and yet he is making his charges again here. May I be allowed a few minutes to quote one or two of those reports:

"The Turkish-Cypriot leaders have adhered to a rigid stand against any measures which might involve having members of the two communities live and work together, or which might place Turkish Cypriots in situations where they would have to acknowledge the authority of Government agents." (A/PV.2380, pp. 98-100)

The Secretary-General's report of 1965 (S/6426) after paragraph 106, goes on to say:

"Indeed, since the Turkish-Cypriot leadership is committed to physical and geographical separation of the communities as a political goal, it is not likely to encourage activities by Turkish Cypriots which may be interpreted as demonstrating the merits of an alternative policy."

(A/PV.2380, p. 98-100)

The alternative policy was one of understanding, co-operation and working together, which the Secretary-General recommended in his report.

The Turkish-Cypriot representative said something that was really hypocritical, when he said that he wanted a peaceful settlement through co-operation and working together, since he and his Government are against my kind of co-operation between the two communities. And this has been the cause of the trouble..

I give you another quotation from the Secretary-General's report:

"The hardships suffered by the Turkish-Cypriot population are the direct result on the leadership's self-isolation policy, imposed by force on the rank and file." (ibid.)

Another quotation:

"The result has been a seemingly deliberate policy of self-segregation by the Turkish Cypriots." (ibid.)

Now there are tons of other quotations, but the result is the same: the Turkish Cypriots lived together in harmony with the Greeks until they were forced, by an underground organization of officers sent from Turkey after independence or a little before independence to create partition, to divide the two communities. They issued lists of punishments for any Turkish Cypriots who were seen talking even in a friendly way with Greek Cypriots. I quote:

"Turkish Cypriots not in possession of a permit are forbidden to enter the Greek-Cypriot sector." (ibid., p. 101)

That refers to those Turkish Cypriots who were in the enclaves because 50 per cent of the others were living together with the Greeks. Those who were put in the enclaves, to create a separation, were not allowed out. And those who disobeyed

the order with a view to making trade connexions or even entering a Greek shop had to pay a fine of £25 -- an illegal fine. The order said a fine of £1 would be imposed on those who conversed with or entered any other relations with Greek Cypriots, those who came in contact with Greek Cypriots, those who appeared before the Greek-Cypriot courts -- that is, the courts of the Republic -- thus trying to disrupt the work of the State and to destroy the State and the Republic.

I do not think I need go any further, although, as I say, there are tons of other quotations. If this Committee or the General Assembly has the time, we can read the whole report to show that those who were discriminating, those who were forcing the Turkish Cypriots into enclaves and suffering belonged to their own leadership, an imposed leadership from Turkey that was acting on its own instructions and directions.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the speakers inscribed on my list, may I make another appeal to Members to restrict themselves to what they have heard in this meeting. We know that these other items will be discussed in other organs of the General Assembly. The time is getting late and we still have some business to transact tonight.

Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Since the representative of Israel has chosen to bring up the 1950 trial of Ades, allow me to state the facts in one sentence. The man was accused of spying, smuggling and channelling funds to an enemy country with which Iraq was and is in a state of war. He was defended by a team of lawyers headed by one of the most prominent lawyers of Iraq who was also a member of Parliament, and at the end of the trial he was convicted and executed.

Mr. HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Although he did not speak of my country, the representative of Israel uttered a great many lies in his attacks on the Arab world as a whole and we regret the method he used in exercising his right of reply. I do not want to reply to him in the same terms nor shall I imitate his efforts to beg sympathy or to jeopardize international peace.

The international community has assumed its responsibility and has taken decisions on several occasions calling attention to the danger of international

Zionism which has shown itself to be a fascist and racist movement aimed at increasing tension throughout the entire world. The Israeli delegate's way of trying to get sympathy will never conceal the truth which is now evident to the entire international community. Judaism like Christianity and the Moslem religion, is a religion calling for tolerance. However, Zionism is a movement which persecutes men.

We refute the words of the representative of Israel when he speaks of the treatment of Arab Jews. The Government of Israel is continually trying to deceive us, but these lies are rejected by countries which oppose the racism that is now practised by Israel not only against the Palestinian people but against the Jews themselves because of the countries they come from.

We hope that the representative of Israel will find no echo of his erroneous statements, because he can never deceive us. The truth about Zionism in Israel is now quite evident. I should like to ask the representative of Israel to give up telling lies because, in view of his age, there is a risk that if he continues he may endanger his health.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): The representative of Greece has pointed out that the attempt to put an end to the independence of Cyprus was made not by this Greek Government but by the preceding Greek Government which happened to be a Greek military dictatorship. We have no quarrel with him in this respect. I did not mention that in my intervention because I took care not to mention the name of Greece. But on this point I agree with him entirely. Where I could not follow the Greek representative was when he said that I should heed the constructive appeal of Ambassador Rossides. I am really sorry but I fail to see any constructive appeal in Ambassador Rossides' statement.

I come now to what Ambassador Rossides said once more. He said that the Turkish Government had advance notice of the coup in Cyprus, that the Turkish Government knew one month in advance that the junta was preparing something and that it took the necessary measures for an intervention at that time. Well, this is tantamount to saying that the Greek junta was an instrument in the hands of the Turkish Government. I am very much astonished by this claim because I thought that we had contributed to the demise and fall of the Greek junta.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Ambassador Rossides has repeated a familiar argument, that all those sufferings of the Turkish community were self-inflicted, that they were the result of their self-imposed isolation. Well, he remembers, of course, that only a few months ago some 10,000 Turkish Cypriots who lived in areas administered by the Greek Cypriots were asked whether they would like to stay where they were among the Greeks, or whether they would prefer to move into the areas administered by the Turkish-Cypriot community. I think that practically all went northward. If this was not the case, if their sufferings were the result of self-imposed isolation and if they were really enjoying living under the Greek-Cypriot administration, they would have stayed there.

The last point I want to make is the great difficulty I have with Ambassador Rossides, because each time I speak about the necessity of a peaceful settlement, he accuses me of being hypocritical. I do not know what kind of language I should use in order for him at last to consent to praise me.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to conclude this series of rights of reply, but I will call on Ambassador Rossides for two minutes, at his request.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): First of all, I want to correct a misunderstanding on the part of the representative of Turkey. I never said that Turkey had advance notice of the junta's action; I said that Turkey was preparing its own attack against Cyprus one month before. That was the report, not that they had had advance notice. If they had advance notice, I do not know, that is their affair. I never said that.

Now the hypocrisy I said he displayed in saying that the Turks wanted co-operation and a settlement does not lie in the words he says, but in what is happening, in the fact that no effort has been made by Turkey, as is well known. Turkey must make some sign that it wants some co-operation for a solution of the problem on the basis of understanding. But it does not budge from its position of holding more than one third of the territory of Cyprus, having expelled the population. They say they brought "experts" from Turkey. Fifteen to twenty thousand experts? Coming to do what? To manage the usurped properties of the expelled population? Is that a rightful claim? Really, it is astonishing that these things are stated in any Committee of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: With this we conclude the rights of reply.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1.

Mr. VINCI (Italy): On behalf of the States members of the European Community -- since Italy is the current Chairman of that Community -- I wish to explain why we will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1.

Let me first say that I do not need to emphasize the importance we attach to the strengthening of international security, which is one of the most important aims of the Charter of the United Nations, and to the Declaration of 1970 adopted by consensus. In particular, we attach importance to the aspects of that Declaration relating to the principles of international law and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter.

On the other hand, I cannot but stress once again our reservations about the annual repetition of the discussions on this item, which, to a large extent, only reiterate what our representatives have said a few days earlier during the general debate. Furthermore, as the representative of France said on behalf of the Nine in explanation of our joint abstention on last year's resolution, we believe that this exercise has led to the loss of that unanimity which had given force and value to the original Declaration. In our view, the Declaration is sufficient by itself and the subsequent debates have not helped in the implementation of the aims of the Declaration.

As for the draft before us, we consider that the selective approach adopted by the sponsoring delegations does not take into balanced account all the aspects of the Declaration.

The Declaration can only bring about peace and security if implemented strictly and in its entirety. Any other approach would only obscure the fundamental goal of strengthening international security.

It is clear from what I have said that our delegations do not consider detailed comment on the draft resolution before us useful. However, since it refers to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and since a number of delegations have referred to that Act at this session, I

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

should like, on behalf of the Nine, to put on record the Community's views on the Helsinki Conference as expressed in the Common Declaration adopted by the Heads of State and Government on 17 July 1975.

The Heads of State and Government, inter alia, noted with satisfaction that, after two years of negotiations, 35 countries of Europe and North America had succeeded in defining an approach for their future relations.

In the view of the Heads of State and Government of the Nine, the improvement in relations between States in Europe had allowed the Conference to take place. Although that improvement had not eliminated ideological differences nor those between political, economic and social systems, they considered it very important that there had been a detailed discussion on many aspects of relations between the participating States and that it had been possible, on each of these aspects, to confirm common principles of conduct and to express, in the most definite manner possible, the intention of the States to permit and to encourage the development, everywhere in Europe, of co-operation, exchanges and contacts in which an important place would be accorded to individuals.

The Heads of State and Government considered that the content of the Final Act marked a stage along the path of détente, the real importance of which could only be evaluated on the basis of the effective application by each of the participating States of all the principles which had been reaffirmed and of the measures which had been agreed on. For their part, the Nine had decided to conform to the principles stated at the Conference and to take every measure in their power to ensure that they put those conclusions into practice. That would make it possible to establish the climate of mutual confidence which would allow the barriers to be lowered so as to encourage greater mutual understanding between peoples.

Animated by the firm hope that the application of the conclusions of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe would lead to an effective improvement in relations between the States which had taken part in the Conference, the nine Heads of State and Government considered that, on such a basis, the continuation of the multilateral dialogue initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe could prove useful in the future.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

Let me say, in conclusion, that the nine members of the European Community are determined to co-operate in this dialogue in the positive spirit in which they contributed to the work of the Conference, and thereby also to further the continuation of the process of détente and of the constructive dialogue in Europe and in the world.

Mr. WHISTLER (United States of America): My delegation will vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1, primarily because of our strong objections to operative paragraph 4. We cannot accept operative paragraph 4 of this draft resolution since it would inhibit States from making any attempt to influence actions of other States in connexion with the disposition of their natural resources, even where permitted by international law. For example, a foreign country which had a joint venture with a host country on the basis of an agreement providing for outside arbitration of any disputes between the owners could not have resort to such a provision if its equity were confiscated. We cannot accept the conclusion that such completely legitimate actions are in any way a "flagrant violation of the right of self-determination of peoples and the principle of non-intervention", or that they would be a threat to the peace, as the language of operative paragraph 4 asserts.

While my statement has concentrated on operative paragraph 4, we also have objections to other provisions in the draft resolution.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As is well known, the Soviet Union was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.717. However, the Soviet delegation is ready to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1, since this latter document reproduces the basic provisions contained in the draft resolution of which the Soviet Union was a sponsor.

We are approaching the conclusion of our discussion concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. During this discussion, approximately 50 delegations have made their statements, which is many more than at last year's discussion during the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly. This is evidence of the increasing interest being shown by United Nations Member States in the problems of strengthening peace and international security. It also bears witness to the timeliness of the discussion of this problem. Many delegations which in past years did not participate in the discussion have indeed spoken this year. We note the

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

statement made on behalf of nine Western European countries by the Ambassador of Italy, Ambassador Vinci, who set forth the assessment made by the Nine of the results of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Unfortunately, in his statement he confined himself to those matters only. We should like to express the hope that next year, during the discussion of the item on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, an even greater number of countries will participate in the discussion, one that will include those countries that refrained from participating this year. We assume, in fact it is our firm conviction, that the principal task of our Organization is indeed the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. TANKOUA (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French):

The delegation of the United Republic of Cameroon will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1, which is before our Committee for consideration. None the less, we wish to avail ourselves of this solemn occasion to reiterate the wish we have expressed on several occasions before, namely that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted five years ago, will be genuinely implemented, for in our view, it has not yet been fully applied. As was pointed out by our Minister for Foreign Affairs on 30 September last, in his statement in the general debate,

"We must move towards détente, co-operation must be strengthened and made a reality -- a concrete reality for the well-being of the entire world." (A/PV.2368, p. 47)

Unfortunately, efforts towards détente and co-operation run the risk of being compromised. In point of fact, in Africa the minority régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury have rejected the appeals made by our Organization and go on keeping the black majority under the yoke of racism and apartheid, and have endeavoured to delay the process of decolonization that has been undertaken in neighbouring territories. We likewise call to mind their interferences in the case of Angola, at the time when that country is about to declare its independence. Furthermore, countries which provide various types of assistance to such abject régimes contribute, in their fashion, to endangering peace and security in that part of the world.

(Mr. Tankoua, United Republic
of Cameroon)

In the Middle East, the international community waits with impatience for the cannon to fall silent once and for all, and for the Israeli-Arab conflict to be resolved through just and lasting solutions based on the relevant resolutions adopted by our Organization respecting the fundamental national rights of the people of Palestine.

In Asia and elsewhere, the most ignominious injustices continue to afflict peoples. The major Powers continue to devote hundreds of millions of dollars to armaments, while the third world continues to flounder in its situation.

All of this constitutes a serious threat, an attempt against international peace and security. The vote of the United Republic of Cameroon for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1 is an appeal for a restoration to the world of the justice without which there will be neither peace nor security.

Mr. ADJIBADE (Dahomey) (interpretation from French): In the statement we made this morning, we set forth the view of our Government concerning the strengthening of international security, namely, that what is required is action and not statements of intention. Bearing in mind that point of view, we have reservations on the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which is before us, particularly with respect to the reference to the "successful outcome of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe". We should like the outcome to be successful, but we can evaluate its success only to the extent that the statements of intention and the principles that have been enunciated are followed by action. For the time being, there has been no follow-up on that Conference. For this reason we have strong reservations concerning the reference to the "successful outcome of the Conference".

We also have a reservation on operative paragraph 2, which refers to "the process of détente". We believe that, at present, détente involves only a few, that talking of détente is a second-rate solution and that the true solution lies in entente between the great Powers and particularly the super-Powers. Therefore, to call upon all States in this regard is simply to express a pious wish, as we see it, and for this reason we cannot associate ourselves with it.

However, we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution because its provisions, if accepted and applied by those whose primary responsibility is to strengthen international security, may well promote international security. Subject to the reservations we have made, therefore, Dahomey will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the explanation of votes before the vote.

We come now to the vote.

As was stated at this morning's meeting, there is only one draft resolution on which to vote, that is the one contained in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1. The United States delegation has requested that we vote on this draft resolution.

I have a request from the delegation of the United Kingdom for a roll-call vote. Does the United Kingdom representative insist on a roll-call vote?

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom): My request was misunderstood. I did not ask for a roll-call vote; I asked for a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, we do not have a machine here to record our votes. We have to vote by show of hands, standing or a roll-call.

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom): I certainly do not want the Committee to be put to the trouble of having a roll-call vote. I thought that the Secretariat was able to make a record of the vote, even though there is no mechanical means of voting. If I am wrong, then I certainly shall not insist if that means the necessity for a roll-call vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, that cannot be done; the only way is by a show of hands. But, in order to solve problems like this, in future when we come to the vote we shall meet in a room where there are mechanical means of voting -- if possible.

I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was adopted by 87 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. FORRESTER (Australia): The delegation of Australia has been happy to support the draft resolution just adopted. I should like, however, to take this opportunity to explain with regard to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution that the Australian delegation understands the reference to "the dismantling of foreign military bases" to mean the elimination of foreign military bases and of other manifestations of great-Power military presence in other countries conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry. This position of the Australian delegation has been made clear in particular in the context of the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, of which Australia is a member, and

(Mr. Forrester, Australia)

also by our support for General Assembly resolution 3259 A (XXIX), which made a similar reference in respect of the Indian Ocean region.

In this regard, the Australian delegation would also commend the view, expressed by several speakers in this Committee and earlier in the general debate, to the effect that the achievement of détente in Europe should not lead to the transfer of great-Power military rivalries to other areas where they have not previously existed.

Mr. LIND (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1. We support and sympathize with the draft, seen as a whole. The draft resolution contains some formulations to which my delegation cannot entirely subscribe. This does not detract from the fact that we consider the reflection of achievements and of remaining problems with regard to international security in the draft resolution just adopted to be well balanced.

Sweden was present as an invited guest at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries which took place in Lima earlier this year. We commend the non-aligned States for providing the Committee with the draft resolution which has served as a basis for the text just adopted.

Mr. da COSTA LOBO (Portugal) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Portugal considers that the wording of operative paragraph 6 of the resolution in document A/C.1/L.718/Rev.1, does not make the necessary distinctions clear. Since my delegation supports the objectives of the resolution as a whole, and also those of operative paragraph 6, we were able to vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, we should like to express our reservations on the wording of operative paragraph 6.

Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain very briefly the reason why the Turkish delegation abstained in the vote on this resolution which has been adopted. I should like to stress the fact that this abstention does not reflect a judgement or the adoption of a political position with respect to the substance of the draft resolution. However, in keeping with the line that we have followed in previous years, we feel that the multiplication of resolutions in this particular vein is likely to damage and sometimes to weaken the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session. And incidentally it is precisely because of this concern of ours that we have not taken part in the discussion of this item in the Committee.

Mr. BRUCE (Canada): I only wanted to say at this late hour that my Government is totally committed to any measures which will strengthen international security and contribute to peace keeping.

We were unable to support this resolution. We abstained on it for reasons which have been well expressed by previous speakers, and I need not repeat them here. I wish to assure the Committee that my delegation will take an active part in the discussion of the more than 20 items on our agenda dealing with disarmament and the control of weapons in the forthcoming weeks in this Committee, as we think that is the place where we can express our views on the various subjects which have been before us.

The CHAIRMAN: This concludes our consideration of agenda item 49 on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.