

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**  
**THIRTY-FIFTH SESSION**  
**Official Records\***



LIBRARY  
DEC 9 1980  
UN/CA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE  
51st meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 3 December 1980  
at 11 a.m.  
New York

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 51ST MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

**CONTENTS**

**AGENDA ITEM 50 (continued)**

**REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF  
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES

Statements were made by:

Mr. Gauci (Malta)  
Mr. Handl (Czechoslovakia)  
Mr. Baleta (Albania)  
Mr. Mesharrafa (Egypt)  
Mr. Jamal (Qatar)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.1/35/PV.51**  
**4 December 1980**

**ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 50 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/35/505 and Add.1-3; A/35/542, 654, 661; A/C.1/35/L.48; A/C.1/35/L.4 and 15);
- (b) NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF STATES (A/C.1/35/L.62)

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): My colleagues and I belatedly compliment you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee, on your election and wish you well as you valiantly strive to conduct our work in the direction of the progress we all seek to achieve.

If we have not participated in the debate so far, it is not for lack of interest in the items before us. It is only because we are finding it increasingly difficult to resist the conclusion that no matter how hard we try, real progress continues to elude us.

The arms strategists scornfully prevail over the puny efforts of the so-called "do-gooders in international relations", as they have done consistently in the past. The tragedy is that these strategists have not produced any rational alternative, with the inevitable escalation of the arms race under one pretext or another, both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

An objective overview of the disarmament efforts over the past two decades cannot but reveal how far we have strayed, not only from practical achievement, but also from our stated commitments. It seems that eventually we can agree among ourselves, not without undue delay and difficulty, in gradually improving the representative nature of our bodies, in perhaps authorizing studies which are generally obsolete by the time they are published and in approving new theoretical concepts to hide our failures, but of real progress there is hardly a trace.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The truth, of course, is that the arms race continues, that each of the two opposing military alliances, irrespective of their internal checks and balances, irrespective of their systems of Government and irrespective of their ideological orientation, continues to devote a disproportionate but, on average, a roughly equal percentage of its national income to armaments. The principal constraints have come not from negotiations, but from obsolescence of weapons systems and from competition for other national, social and economic programmes which, however, continue to be subordinated to the elusive search for security.

And so even our theoretical commitments have become downgraded. From general and complete disarmament, we have regressed to arms control, from arms control to confidence-building measures and from confidence-building measures to crisis management. In the meantime, alarming new techniques and menacing new doctrines become more and more widespread, from miniaturized theatre nuclear weapons to concepts of limited nuclear war. So-called spheres of influence and definitions of national interest become more wide-ranging in scope, to the extent that the natural resources and the sovereignty of third world countries increasingly become the targets of these new concepts.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Concurrently we see evidence of malfunctioning in the most sophisticated weapons control systems, of which at least a few dozens have been reported, but no doubt others have occurred of which nothing has been revealed. Reports of the use of chemical weapons are vehemently denied, but any notion of impartial investigation is just as vehemently rejected.

The sad truth is that if the protagonists of this irrational performance are either unwilling or unable to see its dangerous futility, then no amount of exhortation from third parties can make alternative courses prevail, and the whole world will remain caught in the present vicious cycle whose main characteristics are waste, unpredictability, continuing insecurity, fear and instability.

This is having a pervasive influence on the conduct of international relations. We can no longer take for granted the assumptions of the doctrines of deterrence as defined in the past; at the very least, we have to re-examine our priorities for the future.

I therefore believe that, especially in the years ahead, the twin item that we are now discussing will assume even greater importance. The year 1980 has many of the characteristics of a watershed in international relations. It is often said that things have to turn very bad before they can change for the better. Certainly it would be difficult to imagine today a bleaker picture of the state of the world, particularly as regards lack of progress in disarmament and the evidence of actual or threatened intervention in the internal affairs of States, as the debate we have had has amply demonstrated and as news headlines continue to remind us every day. We also have a heavy legacy of unresolved acute problems and new ones demanding our urgent attention.

In the past many protagonists have tended to use the item on the strengthening of international security mainly as a convenient springboard for the delivery of ideological propaganda, with negative results which could easily have been foreseen. It is to be hoped that this lesson at least has sunk in and that in future we will be spared any similar unproductive exercises.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The non-aligned countries have managed in recent years to deviate from that unfortunate tendency and they have attempted to promote a genuine examination of the real political problems that the world faces, as seen from the perspective of the majority of nations. However, in the past the end result was based on the quick passage, under the pressure of time, of a sort of omnibus resolution which was not given sufficient time and attention for a detailed examination of its many important elements; in addition, two important items have now been lumped together.

Yet the resolutions before us contain so many crucial elements that we would do well in future to analyse in depth in an effort to identify sectors and modalities in the state of international relations where progress could be reached and where a responsible code of conduct lacking in the past is both necessary and feasible for the future.

My country welcomes the indications now being given that renewed efforts will be made to resume intensive negotiations on certain arms control measures which may lend themselves to positive results. There are also signs that the two super-Powers understand better the benefits of restraint in conflict situations between smaller Powers. And there is also a realization between smaller Powers that strenuous efforts should be made within their own ranks to defuse potentially dangerous situations, seeking at all costs to avoid the involvement of outside Powers. These and other trends where interests converge deserve our detailed attention.

Even apart from those developments permit me to recall that, against the bleak over-all global background, there have been several pockets of progress. Many nations are no longer prepared to admit the continuation of a constantly escalating level of confrontation as the answer to the world's problems. The hopes, the fears and the aspirations of men and women the world over desperately search for new avenues of co-operation in their daily lives, and they realize that co-operation cannot be achieved without resolute and constant efforts in small, progressive steps. These efforts need to be sustained and encouraged.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

That is why we in Malta have resolutely turned the clock of history away from our turbulent past. In a brief but intensive period we have done away with all the vestiges of military associations, which had been the accumulation of two centuries of our history. There is today not a single foreign soldier, aircraft or warship on Malta's soil, whereas before they were the major employment component of our national economy. All our energies are now devoted exclusively to peaceful activities in promoting indigenous national development and regional co-operation.

The attendant costly economic transformation has been squarely confronted. We have sought the understanding of our neighbours for our new status, and it has been welcomed by all. The agreement signed with the Italian Republic is a vivid example of the changed course of history. The practical interests of détente were attained through negotiations which culminated in Malta's neutral and non-aligned status and its future economic and security requirements being guaranteed by a country which itself is a member of a military alliance.

We achieved that through an agreement which respects and safeguards the national interests of both countries and is in line with the future requirements of regional peace and co-operation.

All our neighbouring countries and others farther removed have officially told us that they see in this arrangement a valid contribution to the construction of peace in the Mediterranean. We therefore consider that this contribution and status should be recognized formally at the current session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in Madrid.

We know that the road ahead is long and hard. We are painfully aware that there are still many national and regional problems to be overcome in our region. We hope that all neighbouring countries will readily live up to their publicly expressed undertakings and allow Malta to continue its search for peaceful economic viability, without which there can be no permanent security. We remain attached to the concept of the Mediterranean as a zone of peace and co-operation, and we trust therefore that all Mediterranean countries will make their contribution to the attainment of this objective.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

In particular, we are anxious to explore the prospects of energy self-sufficiency through the utilization of off-shore resources, and we trust that friendly neighbouring countries will not impede our search carried out in accordance with current international law and practice. Any attempt to do so would be inconsistent with undertakings given within the Non-Aligned Movement and in bilateral discussions. The exploration of off-shore resources is a new phenomenon of growing importance to all countries, but particularly to developing countries faced with scarcity of supply and constant increase in costs. It is essential, therefore, that these activities should not be disrupted or cause friction between neighbours, but rather that they should be protected by a responsible code of international conduct. We ourselves are prepared to submit to judicial process, and we have publicly announced in advance our readiness to comply fully with any eventual adjudication.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

At the current session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), in Madrid, we are advocating that there should be a full and equitable participation by all Mediterranean States and peoples in discussing questions of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean, because the many problems that plague the Mediterranean cannot be discussed adequately without genuine participation by all. We sensibly sought to bring Mediterranean countries together in advance of that important meeting and, to the extent that others were willing to co-operate, useful exchanges of views have already taken place. If détente is to prosper, the contribution of no party involved can be overlooked. And we must devise adequate mechanisms to ensure that grandiose plans and declarations do not remain a mere collection of words, but that they are translated into practical implementation.

We would therefore do well, in future, if we tried to concentrate in greater detail on some specific aspects of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Among the most promising areas, to my mind, we should seek, inter alia: to concentrate henceforth on practical achievements instead of merely adopting vague and repetitive declarations; to continue our efforts at reviewing the Charter of the United Nations, and particularly to elaborate a strict code on non-interference in the internal affairs of States; to strengthen the role of the Security Council in solving the major unresolved problems facing the United Nations; to finalize the new Convention on the Law of the Sea; to strive forcefully to achieve the objectives of the New International Economic Order; to utilize the United Nations and its specialized agencies much more efficiently, jealously to strive to safeguard the prestige of the international Organization; finally, to encourage indigenous regional initiatives.

If we embark in future on these and other approaches objectively and resolutely, we can transform the coming decade into one in which the declarations of the 1970s become the practical achievements of the 1980s. If we fail to do so in deeds rather than in words, we will only have ourselves to blame for the collapse of the system which remains our only hope for the future. We must have the will, and we must lay the plans, so as to have a chance to succeed.



Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): During the 10 years that have elapsed since the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the item under consideration has been among the most important issues in the day-to-day activities of the United Nations. During that time, the Declaration has repeatedly proved to be one of the most important instruments of the policy of peace and international détente. It has made a significant contribution to the development of friendly and mutually advantageous relations among countries with different socio-economic systems, on the basis of peaceful coexistence.

Currently, when as a result of the sharp turn in the policies of the most reactionary forces of imperialism peace and security are being exposed to a growing danger, the broadest circles of the international community are increasingly aware of the urgency of a comprehensive and consistent implementation of the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The course that has lately been chosen by the United States and some of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and elsewhere is diametrically opposed to the efforts by peace-loving countries and peoples to deepen and develop the positive results achieved in the process of détente and constitutes an outright negation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, as well as of many other notable international documents. It is a course heading unmistakably towards a perpetuation of the growth of international tension by reviving the spirit of the cold war, towards confrontation and hegemonism, violations of the independence and sovereignty of States and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, complicating old and creating new focal points of international tension and situations of conflict. The most dangerous manifestations of that course, however, are the growing efforts to launch a new hazardous round of the arms race, the attempts by the United States and some other NATO countries to disturb the approximate military-strategic balance of power between East and West and to gain unilateral military superiority that would enable them to act in international relations from a position of strength.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The manifestations and consequences of that course have on numerous occasions been graphically demonstrated to us, as indeed during the current session of the United Nations General Assembly. In dozens of statements by representatives of Member States we heard words of deep concern and justified apprehension in connexion with the recent development of international events. This concern, by the way, is also reflected in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/35/505 and its addenda, as well as in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.48.

At the same time, our session this year has also brought important and constructive proposals aimed at improving the international climate. Among them we should like once more to emphasize the initiative of the Soviet Union proposing the adoption of certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war, which has justifiably met with a broad positive response by the international community and has become a step forward in the current complicated situation. These initiatives also testify, among other things, to the sincere endeavours by the socialist, non-aligned and other peace-loving countries to maintain the policy of détente, to consolidate it and to contribute actively to the creation of a system of international relations in which all the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security would be fully implemented. We strongly advocate the widely shared view that détente has no reasonable and realistic alternative.

Consequently, in its reply to the Secretary-General of the United Nations with regard to resolution 34/100, adopted at last year's session of the General Assembly, Czechoslovakia emphasized that the possibilities of strengthening the system of security based on the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security had not so far been exhausted and that it was therefore necessary to initiate without delay the consideration and implementation of the numerous proposals that had been submitted in that respect and which remain valid. We are firmly convinced that this is the basis on which, while maintaining equal security, it is possible to reach political solutions even to the most complex political problems. As the Czechoslovak Minister for Foreign Affairs stated in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly:

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

"... only through patient, pragmatic negotiations, not through emotionalism and boycott, can we achieve positive results which will benefit the cause of peace and guide international life into calmer waters." (A/35/PV.18, p. 67)

Proceeding from this consistent peaceful foreign policy we, together with our allies, proposed at the Warsaw session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, a meeting of representatives of States at the highest level from all parts of the world, whose task it would be to eliminate focal points of international tension and to prevent war.

We hold that the first and most fundamental prerequisite for the safeguarding of firm international security is to denounce efforts to gain military superiority and to instigate a new round of the arms race. In keeping with valid United Nations resolutions, these efforts must be replaced by negotiations on effective measures for the halting of the continuing arms race and for disarmament. Last year, the General Assembly issued such a call in the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament adopted, on Czechoslovakia's initiative, by the overwhelming majority of Member States.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

In this respect Czechoslovakia attaches great importance to the set of peace initiatives and proposals contained in this year's memorandum of the Soviet Union entitled "Peace, disarmament, and international security guarantees" (A/35/482, Annex), which we fully support. We believe that it is constructive negotiations on these questions that would help to strengthen international peace and security, not the systematic raising of military budgets, groundless delays in the ratification of the SALT II Treaty, the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, and the proclamation of new strategic doctrines for waging a nuclear war and other similar steps taken recently by the United States and some other countries.

Of truly fundamental importance in this respect is the question of limiting strategic nuclear weapons, which without any doubt pose the greatest danger. It is the postponing by the United States of ratification of the Soviet-American SALT II Treaty, signed last year, that is, more than anything else, the underlying cause of the continuing uncertainty in this decisive field of the disarmament effort. It has a most unfavourable impact not only on negotiations on other disarmament issues but also on the over-all international climate. That is why we continue to maintain that the course of action pursued by the United States on the question - however it tries to justify it - is totally at variance with the most vital interests of international security. We fully share the concern that that position has produced among the Member States of our Organization.

A task of the utmost importance is the strengthening of security and stability on the European continent, in particular consistent and comprehensive implementation of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. That, however, can be achieved only if the relaxation of tension is much more markedly reflected also in the military sphere than has so far been the case. We are firmly resolved to continue to exert our utmost efforts to that end at the current Madrid meeting of the signatories of the Final Act.

As was stated quite unequivocally in the communiqué of the meeting of the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of States Members of the Warsaw Treaty held in Warsaw in October last, it is the endeavour of the socialist countries to see a positive climate prevail at the Madrid meeting.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

and practical agreements worked out on the substance of the questions considered there. In that context we attach particular importance to the adoption at the Madrid meeting of a decision on the convening of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe, in which we see great possibilities for the strengthening and deepening of both European and world-wide security.

With equal consistency, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries strive for the achievement of an agreement in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. It must be noted, however, that the course of action pursued by the NATO States is the cause of the deadlock out of which those talks have been unable to move for a number of years now. The more than constructive proposals of the socialist countries continue to be bypassed in silence. The withdrawal of 20,000 soldiers, 1,000 tanks and other military equipment from the envisaged area of reduction undertaken unilaterally by the Soviet Union remains practically without response from the Western countries.

Despite those difficulties we continue to believe that, however difficult they might be, negotiations still offer the only way out. That is why we also believe that the recently initiated Soviet-American talks on the question of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe will be continued and will result in an agreement which in our view should include also the question of United States forward-based nuclear systems. Such an agreement is indispensable not only for the European countries but also for security world-wide.

Furthermore, the question of the non-expansion of military groupings is no doubt also of basic importance for European security. The Warsaw Treaty countries have declared on many occasions that they are willing at any time to go even further and to agree on the immediate dissolution of the two European military-political groupings, beginning with the abolition of their military organizations, as soon as the NATO States show an interest in that. Those proposals of course continue to be timely, as was confirmed by our Committee's adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/L.36/Rev.1 a few days ago.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is firmly convinced that in order to safeguard international security it is necessary also to ensure full respect for the United Nations Charter and generally recognized principles of international law. We therefore support also the idea of drafting a declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and we are ready to participate in negotiations on that question, since we believe that that kind of elaboration of the basic norms governing relations among States undoubtedly contributes to the strengthening of the system of international security.

However, speaking of the need to prevent interference, how else but as interference could we describe the provoking of unnecessary and harmful discussions about the so-called Afghan question, against the inclusion of which in the General Assembly's agenda the Afghan Government itself protested? As we have repeatedly declared, Czechoslovakia fully supports the endeavour of the people and the Government of the People's Republic of Afghanistan to repel any attempts at armed aggression, and equally it supports the proposals submitted by the Afghan Government on 14 May of this year, which provide a realistic basis for a peaceful solution of all current problems.

We are deeply concerned also about other current hotbeds of international tension. We stand side by side with the heroic people of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea, who are facing Chinese intervention and hegemonism, as was borne out again this year by the discussion of the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia.

Czechoslovakia furthermore supports the efforts of the overwhelming majority of Arab States to reach a comprehensive and just settlement of the situation in the Middle East on the basis of the complete liquidation of the consequences of Israeli aggression and the safeguarding of the inalienable rights of the Arab Palestinian people represented by the PLO.

In little more than a few days we are going to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We consider it of utmost importance to the cause of strengthening international security to eradicate once and for all the last remnants

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

of colonialism. In particular we fully support the just struggle of the people of Namibia headed by the South West Africa People's Organization for their freedom and independence. No less we support the struggle of the South African people for the complete elimination of the abhorrent system of apartheid, which endangers world peace and international security.

The continuing efforts of the South African racist régime to create a nuclear potential of its own, thus posing an immediate danger to peace-loving African countries, is a matter for deep concern. We therefore support the steps that are being taken in the United Nations and elsewhere with a view to removing that threat.

We stand for a positive settlement of the question of Cyprus on the basis of the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus.

We welcome the convening of a conference on the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, and we advocate in the first place the liquidation of all foreign military bases that are endangering security in that sensitive part of the world. It is also necessary to achieve abolition of the United States military base in Guantanamo, a base located in Cuba against the will of the Cuban Government.

We again repeat our view that all foreign troops must be withdrawn from the territory of South Korea, and we support the endeavours of the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to bring about a peaceful reunification of the country without foreign interference.

Taking into account the universal nature of the problem of safeguarding international security, Czechoslovakia consistently holds the view that an extraordinarily important contribution to that end would be made by the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, and it believes that it is necessary substantially to accelerate the negotiations that are already being conducted on this question within the United Nations.

In conclusion I should like to express my delegation's conviction that our deliberations this year on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security will result in positive conclusions in respect of realization of the principles and provisions of that important international document in the forthcoming period.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): After two months of lengthy discussions on the question of disarmament and shortly before the end of the present session, our Committee is taking up the last item on its agenda, the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Ten years have elapsed since the adoption of that Declaration, and it is perhaps in the desire to mark that anniversary that it is held that that Declaration has played an important role in the consolidation of peace and security.

But, to our regret, we cannot share such a view. An analysis of events in the world and of the situation in general leads us to the conclusion that international peace and security have been seriously breached and constantly threatened in the last 10 years. Rather than congratulating ourselves the strengthening of co-operation among independent States, we are obliged to note the growing disagreements, divisions, conflicts - sometimes armed conflicts - among numerous States and the ever more frequent violations of the norms and principles of law. It is true that a world war has been avoided. But is that an indication of the strengthening of international security? We think not. Imperialism, socio-imperialism and the other reactionary forces have not ceased to unleash wars of aggression and the danger of a world war has been steadily growing.

In the report submitted by the Secretary-General, drawn up by a group of experts and contained in document A/35/505, one finds much evidence of the aggravation of the international situation in the past 10 years. The report refers to various facts which show that throughout that period tension has increased, threats have proliferated and the peace and independence of sovereign countries have been repeatedly trampled underfoot. The report rightly indicates that the General Assembly has repeatedly stressed, with profound concern, the emergence of a trend to divide the world into spheres of influence and domination and continual interference in the internal affairs of States. That is an observation which gives us food for thought if we are to determine the true causes and principal dangers that threaten peace and security.



(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The present process of historical development bears the imprint of confrontation between diametrically opposed forces: on the one hand, the peoples who aspire to and struggle for national and social liberation and, on the other, imperialism, socio-imperialism and world reaction.

Since the month of December last year, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 34/100, serious events have occurred in the international arena. During that period American imperialism has given greater scope and new dimensions to its aggressive actions. The United States has continued to assist Israeli Zionist aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab countries. They have brought to bear intense pressure and provocation and have attempted to intervene directly to crush the Iranian anti-imperialist revolution. They have also continued their war preparations and hysteria.

The same applies to the intentions and actions of the Soviet socio-imperialists, who, only a few days after the adoption of resolution 34/100, launched their barbarous aggression against Afghanistan to occupy that country by military means, thus creating a new breach of the peace and a new hotbed of war in the region of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. The Soviet Union too has drawn up ambitious plans in the field of armament and the subsequent militarization of the life of that country.

The Chinese socio-imperialists are actively engaged in provoking tensions in the world. They continue to threaten Viet Nam with new aggression, to teach that country, as they arrogantly put it, a second lesson.

The situation in the Middle East is aggravated after each act of annexation and violence by the Israeli Zionists in the occupied Arab territories and against Lebanon. In southern Africa tension grows after each act of violence, provocation or aggression undertaken by the South African racists. New conflicts are to be added to those already in existence in Africa, in Asia and elsewhere. The most recent of these is the armed and fratricidal struggle which has been engaged on a large scale in the Persian Gulf region for the last two months.

Those facts and many others show that the situation in the world at present is even more explosive than at the beginning of December last year, and that the imperialist super-Powers resort more and more to force,

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

blackmail and military means to achieve their goals, thus further jeopardizing the frail chances for the establishment and the preservation of true peace and stability.

To justify their aggressive actions, preparations for war and neo-colonialist designs, the American imperialists claim that the United States has vital interests to defend throughout the world and that it is therefore entitled to play a special role, which would be in effect that of an international policeman. Seeking to find excuses for their aggressive actions, they declare that the United States must remain a world Power without equal and be present everywhere with its military forces in order to contain the growing expansionism and aggressiveness of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet socio-imperialists follow the same logic and use the same kind of argument. They too claim that their national interests extend throughout the world and that, consequently, they must defend those interests by establishing their network of bases and political and military strong points in all continents. When they announce new weapons programmes, when they attack sovereign countries and tighten their grip on so-called allied countries, or when they seek to draw other States into the orbit of their policy, they justify themselves by invoking the need to oppose American imperialist aggression and the threat of growing Sino-American collusion.

In the meantime, the Chinese socio-imperialists have for the moment directed the brunt of their efforts towards the strengthening of their alliance with American imperialism, in the hope that they will thus more rapidly achieve the economic and military potential of an imperialist super-Power, which they do not at present enjoy. To camouflage their aggressive designs and dangerous political manoeuvres, they have selected the argument of their need to face Soviet expansionism and hegemonism, which they characterize as the primary danger to be contended with.

But all the imperialist super-Powers are pursuing the same objectives, are resorting to the same practices and are equally dangerous to the freedom and independence of sovereign peoples and States.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

Given the enormous economic and military potential of the United States and the Soviet Union and their aggressive policy, they represent the primary source of war and aggression in the international sphere. Those two super-Powers are engaged in a bitter rivalry and a multifaceted, incessant bargaining with the aim of consolidating their domination in their respective zones of influence and of penetrating the greatest possible number of countries economically, politically and militarily, especially in areas rich in oil or which have strategic importance, such as the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean and others.

The United States of America and the Soviet Union, separately or together, exert great efforts to monopolize all world affairs, to become at one and the same time the supreme arbitrator and the policeman in any conceivable problem and in all circumstances. They call themselves the defenders of principles, the champions of peace and disarmament, the guardians of stability and the protectors of the weak. And for that they of course do not hesitate to ask for compensation in the form of the recognition of the privileged position of the United States and the Soviet Union vis-à-vis all other countries.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

It is, however, well known that it is precisely the two super-Powers that cause the greatest problems in the world, in provoking tensions and conflicts and local wars as well as large-scale aggressive actions. It is they who are the main protagonists of the arms race. As the leader of the Albanian people, Enver Hoxha, emphasized in his book "Imperialism and Revolution",

"In their rivalry, which leads them directly into war, the imperialist super-Powers undoubtedly provoke many partial wars between various States of the third world, the non-aligned countries or the developing countries".

The imperialist Powers, and in particular the super-Powers, and all reactionary régimes speculate over the problems of peace and stability. We can see clearly this year that the increase in international tension was accompanied by an intensification of the demagogic campaign concerning détente, the need to preserve the precarious balance between the great Powers and opposing military blocs and measures to be taken to halt the dangerous course of events and improve the international climate. Skilful attempts have been made to create a psychosis of war and anxiety in order to deceive and intimidate sovereign States and peoples and compel them to accept any imperialist manoeuvre as an act of generosity and as evidence of the special responsibility which the super-Powers claim to assume.

The Soviet socio-imperialists have made a great fuss this year about the restoration of the process of détente and have particularly publicized its new variant, which they call military détente. They have feverishly embarked upon a campaign to make us all believe that the greatest evil and the greatest risk for the world today lies in any reverse that might be suffered by détente. They continue at all times and on any occasion to impose the fraud of the immediate and primordial task of the reactivation of détente and the assumption of steps to salvage it. The American imperialists, who maintain that they are supporters of détente, speculate about it also in their own manner.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

They insist on their concept of détente, refuse to accept the détente preferred by the Soviet Union and impose conditions before taking up business as usual.

In the light of the numerous facts and evidence presented to us by the development of events, we can say that no further proof is needed of the fact that there is no détente in the world, nor has there ever been. It is the two super-Powers that have created this mirage and invented the slogan of détente in order to sow confusion. So-called détente is no more than one aspect of American-Soviet relations, one of the trends in the development of those relations which are characterized at all levels by aggravations and periodic accommodations in the context of rivalry and bargaining between the two super-Powers. When the super-Powers decide to launch an act of aggression, as in the case of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, for example, they make a mockery of the word détente and then suddenly remember it later and, in order to cover up their crime, begin once again to preach the value and importance of détente.

It is truly cynical for the imperialistic super-Powers and other aggressors to embark upon acts of war and aggression and create conflicts and tensions and then to pretend that they are concerned over the search for a solution or to call for the cessation of hostilities, a cease-fire or negotiations in order to find so-called political solutions. And what can be said of the repeated manoeuvres of the imperialist Powers which after each new period of tension propose a new meeting or world conference or the elaboration of a political and legal instrument in order to appease the anger of the people?

Despite all that has been said and written about the importance of a conference on security in Europe and the documents it adopted, the truth is that that continent continues to live in a very complicated and tense atmosphere. We are witnessing at present the growing accumulation

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

of explosive elements and dangers. The two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are intensifying their efforts to consolidate their control in their spheres of influence in order to appease or eliminate centrifugal forces within their alliances and to defy yet again the positions of the rival party. Thus, while the Soviet socio-imperialists endeavour to exploit for their own interests the disagreements between the United States and Western Europe, American imperialism does everything in its power to weaken the ties of the countries of Eastern Europe with the Soviet Union and their dependence on it and to increase their own influence in the area. The two super-Powers and the aggressive military blocs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact continue to confront each other dangerously to increase their arsenals of war and to introduce in Europe new and deadly weapons, including new systems of nuclear weapons. The current meeting in Madrid is another failure of the so-called system of security and co-operation in Europe elaborated by the Helsinki Conference. That meeting reflects the failure of the illusions with which it was heralded and offers proof of the hegemonistic objectives which the super-Powers pursued and are pursuing in Europe.

A tense and dangerous situation persists in the Mediterranean because of the activities and the military and political presence of the super-Powers and the focal points of tension in that basin. We believe, as we always have, that in order to serve the cause of peace and stability in that region we must act to eliminate those elements and dangers and take specific measures to prevent the two super-Powers and the imperialist Powers from stationing their fleets and military bases in foreign territory and oppose their policy of interference in the region. The proclamation of so-called zones of peace does not, in the existing conditions, avert the danger of war.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

In the opinion of the Albanian delegation, the process of establishing and strengthening true peace and security in the world will be a long and difficult one. In order to achieve it we must redouble our efforts and our vigilance and firmly oppose the aggressive policy of imperialism, socio-imperialism and world reaction. The struggle waged today by peoples for their national rights and legitimate interests is the most important, decisive and encouraging factor in the development of history. It is through that struggle, waged with determination to the very end, that we can successfully establish, preserve and strengthen true peace and security throughout the world.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): In the course of my statement at the last session when we discussed questions of international security, I dealt in detail with the question of bilateral détente between the two super-Powers as a feature affecting international relations in the decade of the 1970s and I warned against the effects of any deterioration of that détente between two parties each of which has the capability of destroying the whole of mankind, which is a consideration that compels us all to be determined in requesting to be partners in setting up international policy, because there is no means of safeguarding bilateral détente without a change in the objectives of the two parties involved in that détente.

The negative development of international relations has shown that détente was no more than a fragile barrier used as a means to achieve specific objectives, a barrier which concealed behind it certain conflicts, designs and opportunism in order progressively to achieve those objectives. As a result of that, détente came up against the true conflict for the achievement of those objectives, and in fact it has reached an impasse because it lacked the strong basis necessary for transforming bilateral détente into international détente among all parties.

We witness today at all levels of the international community a situation of mistrust, loss of confidence, and deterioration of the international situation as a result of successive violations of adopted principles, including those of the Charter. A feeling prevailed during that session that most of what had been or might be achieved had lost or would lose momentum and that the objectives of general and complete disarmament had become more remote than ever before under the spectre of nuclear destruction.

Today we wonder whether we have embarked on a race to impose a new order in the situation in some regions through the use of force and the imposition of faits accomplis, without respect for the responsibility and mutual obligations of States in international relations or for the principles of the United Nations Charter. If we accept that, and if there is no positive action by the international community, that will be tantamount to our recognizing that we have entered an era of international chaos and regression to a state of colonialist plunder through nuclear blackmail.



(Mr. Mesharrafa, Egypt)

The Secretary-General, in his report to this session of the General Assembly repeated the prevailing international situation and the failure of the United Nations to find solutions to the major problems and to put an end to the vicious circle in which those problems evolve before they become aggravated and threaten international security. He also showed in the report the deterioration of the international situation following sudden evolutions which give valid reason for questioning the effectiveness of the United Nations. The report states:

(spoke in English)

"In this year, which has again witnessed alarming and unexpected international developments, it seems relevant to look once more at the concept of international peace and security which is the primary concern of the United Nations. Is this concept, as outlined in its Charter, still a valid aim to strive for? And if so, how do we proceed, in practical terms, to make the United Nations machinery more effective and more respected?". (A/35/1, p.3)  
(continued in Arabic)

The Secretary-General dealt bitterly with an important aspect when he questioned how the United Nations machinery could be made more respected and more effective and how far our understanding of its responsibilities went as laid down in the Charter.

It would be a mistake to conclude that there is a shortcoming in the general structure of the United Nations and its organs or a deficiency in the text or provisions of the Charter. The true shortcoming issues from the non-implementation of the obligations mentioned in the Charter, and precisely the refusal of the big Powers to abide by the principles already adopted, and from the way we respect the rules of the international code of conduct.

The deterioration in international relations, the effects of which have been felt in the work of the General Assembly at this session, should not prevent us from continuing our efforts to succeed in supplementing the elements of the new international order which is based on the replacement of current relations, among certain Powers by a broader comprehensive order which would be based on more equitable and better balanced relations among States and on stability and justice among them, an order in which the United Nations would have a stronger and more effective role.

(Mr. Mesharrafa, Egypt)

The international community today needs a new order for international relations which would lay down the rules governing collective participation in responsibilities and commitments and would guide relations between the great Powers and the other States of the world and the way in which we could deal with any dereliction on the part of a great Power and with situations resulting from actions undertaken by the great Powers or other Powers related to them involving the violation of the security and sovereignty of other States, and the way of facing that collectively and with commitment so as to deter those who departed from those principles. This collective participation in responsibilities will be effective only if we find a just and lasting solution to international political problems and if we succeed in eliminating all forms of racism and racial discrimination. These are problems regarding which my delegation has already expressed its attitude.

The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and respect for its provisions form the main axis around which international relations should be reordered. In this context, my delegation wishes to deal with specific subjects essentially related to the developments that we are witnessing in international relations today. One of the main questions relating to international security and recent developments is the phenomenon of the use of armed force - or what is known as the use of naked force - in international relations. This situation has become so exacerbated as to be typical of the relations even among small countries.

The United Nations was established and its Charter was conceived with the purpose of forbidding the use of force in international relations and providing effective organs to deter those who might be tempted to commit aggression against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of other States. Any State, when it formulates its strategy and ways of safeguarding its security and sovereignty, does so in the light of what is happening around it or in its region or in the world as a whole, because it usually develops those ways of safeguarding its security according to the variables resulting from the movements of great Powers or local Powers, actions which ultimately have the effect of increasing tension, destroying confidence and finally leading to armed struggle.

(Mr. Mesharrafa, Egypt)

The phenomenon of the use of armed force calls for us to review the present general situation. There is no doubt that we must promote international security and reorganize international relations so as to reaffirm the necessity of keeping to the non-use of force in international relations and of resolving disputes by peaceful means.

The Charter contains many Articles which reaffirm this, such as Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, and in Chapter VI, Article 33. Article 24, paragraph 1 states that the Members of the United Nations

"confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf".

Similarly, Chapter VII gives the Security Council authority to deter those who do not implement its decisions.

In spite of this, we are witnessing an escalation of the use of armed force in international relations, and the Security Council has failed in many cases to contain crises and to shoulder its responsibilities because certain Powers have used the veto, putting their own interests above their international responsibilities.

The major Powers have a responsibility to encourage the settling of conflicts between States by peaceful means, and also the responsibility not to impede efforts at the solution of problems with a view to using those problems as foci of tension and a means of expanding their influence. It is important to mention here what was said by the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Egypt in the General Assembly on 30 September:

"After 35 years of a unique international experiment, the time is ripe to undertake an objective appraisal of the existing political order and, in particular, of the role of the existing international machinery. Accordingly, the Government of Egypt will in the near future propose the convening of a special session of the General Assembly to take up this whole matter." (A/35/PV.16, p. 18)

(Mr. Mesharrafa, Egypt)

The report (A/35/505), of the Group of Experts on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas, who played an important role in the success of the work of the Group, in which we had the honour of participating, makes clear the importance of strengthening the role of the United Nations and the Security Council, because such strengthening would be the principal bulwark of a new international order. In this context, we should review the possibility of reactivating organs depending from the Security Council and the General Assembly and created by resolutions of the General Assembly, organs whose work bears on the solution of conflicts by peaceful means.

In the report of the Secretary-General in document A/10289 of 20 October 1975 these organs are mentioned. They include the Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation, which so far has not been used, the United Nations Panel of Field Observers, which was never actually formed in spite of the fact that in 1949 the General Assembly adopted resolution 297 (IV) on the subject, and the Peace Observation Commission, which has not played an important role so far. Furthermore, there was the arbitration procedure for the settlement of disputes which was not actually set up, in spite of resolution 1262 (XXII) of the General Assembly. It is important to consider how we can reactivate these organs or strengthen those already functioning to help the Security Council in shouldering its responsibilities.

One of the other most important principles which should be stressed is that of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. This principle in fact deals with an important link which has not been completed in the system of international relations by putting an end to unequal relations between great Powers. Such relations in many cases reached the point of imposing puppet régimes through the use of armed force to consecrate a *fait accompli*, the occupation of some countries with a view to bringing about a change in their political, economic and social systems contrary to the will of the people, and an attempt to polarize certain States so as to obtain new spheres of influence while using methods of ideological, political, and economic hegemony and denying the sovereign rights of States and the freedom of their peoples to exercise self-determination.

(Mr. Mesharrafa, Egypt)

The most recent developments have demonstrated that it is urgent and necessary to establish the wording of the declaration on non-intervention in internal affairs in its final form, and we hope that all parties will demonstrate their sincere intention to concert all their efforts in order to complete the formulation of that declaration. The violation of the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs cannot be justified in any instance. Furthermore, no situation created by the use of force can be recognized and no military intervention can be considered as a legitimate basis for a Government, whatever authority it imposes, which depends for its survival on the presence of foreign troops.

Consequently it is important to relate the responsibility of each of us for approving the text of the declaration to our commitment to implement it. The non-aligned group, whose Movement is based on a noble philosophy and noble objectives, has succeeded at various times in preserving the existing international balance and safeguarding the peace and security of most countries. It has succeeded in remaining neutral in the rivalries between major Powers. However, the non-aligned countries have become one of the major victims of hegemonistic methods and intervention in the internal affairs of States. They have had to suffer from every kind of direct and indirect pressure because there have been attempts to polarize certain non-aligned States, to disrupt their unity and create two different axes within the Movement. What we are calling for in the present circumstances is for these pressures on and interventions in the Non-Aligned Movement to cease, so that the non-aligned countries may continue to play their balancing role, which will certainly contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Mr. JAMAL (Qatar)(interpretation from Arabic): This year, in commemorating the thirty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the United Nations, we commemorate a historic date which marked the victory of the international community with regard to the peaceful coexistence of peoples and its entering onto the path of strengthening international peace and security. One of the fundamental premises upon which the Organization was based and which underlies the Charter of the United Nations is that of a sound system of international peace and security. The destructive effects of the Second World War and the world's conviction that it was imperative to prevent the recurrence of war strengthened the concept upon which the Organization was created, that of the peaceful settlement of international disputes and of averting the danger of a new war.

The achievements of the United Nations in that field are well known. The adoption in 1970 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security by the General Assembly in resolution 2734 (XXV) was an important milestone in the life of the United Nations and in its efforts to serve the cause of peaceful coexistence among peoples.

Today, thirty-five years after the creation of the United Nations and a decade after the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, we note that, more than ever in the past, the world needs to comply with the Charter of the United Nations and to respect the principles and provisions contained in the Declaration. While we cannot deny the Declaration's positive effects, neither can we deny the regrettable truth that certain of its principles have been totally ignored. This is made clear in the Secretary-General's report contained in document A/35/505, in which he presents the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security with regard to the question of armaments and the need to implement the Programme of Action adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

My delegation stated its views on this question during our discussion of the previous agenda item. We noted with regret that some of the parties that had approved the Programme of Action in 1978 had then proceeded to act as though the special session had never taken place. We should like to state once again that in today's world the arms race is not in keeping with the principle of the strengthening of international security and that, furthermore, it has a negative effect upon, and constitutes a threat to, that principle. As regards the United Nations and its role in the peaceful settlement of disputes, we have noted with regret the existence of attitudes and positions that are not in keeping with the principles contained in the Declaration that are aimed at strengthening the role of the United Nations. Indeed, some of those attitudes and positions affect the prestige and effectiveness of the Organization itself. The threat represented by those negative attitudes towards the United Nations, even before the Organization takes measures against a Member that has violated the Charter, is one that cannot be accepted by those who wish to preserve the prestige of the United Nations and its effectiveness.

The permanent members of the Security Council have the right of veto, but the use of that right to defend an aggressor merely serves to paralyse the Council's work and to render it powerless to act, whereas what is required is for it to act with vigour and effectiveness when considering problems that affect world security. Certain parties - and I am referring specifically to world zionism - use all the means at their disposal to launch defamatory campaigns against the Organization in an attempt to weaken it because its principles run counter to their expansionist and racist régimes that have been denounced by the international community. The international community must counter these tendentious and slanderous campaigns, since any attempt to harm the United Nations is an attempt to harm the noble objectives that are pursued by all the peoples of the world, and weakens the role of the United Nations with regard to the strengthening of international security.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

After the historic developments it has witnessed, the world today is marked on the one hand by the aspirations of peoples for progress and prosperity and, on the other hand, by conflicts and fundamental contradictions. There is a fundamental contradiction between the two great Power blocs that arises from the existing differences in their social and political systems. There is another fundamental contradiction between the developed and developing countries that has grown up in the decade following the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. It has been clearly demonstrated that such contradictions cannot be eliminated by force or by the threat of the use of force. It has also been shown that the rivalry between the two great Powers in capturing new zones of influence and in exploiting the riches of those areas cannot halt the continuing struggle of the developing countries to achieve their right to freedom, independence and control of their natural resources in order to bring prosperity to their societies. The developing countries, which have embraced the principle of non-alignment, have shown that peaceful coexistence is fundamental to their peoples and to the peoples of the entire world.

Tension between the great Powers in international relations has effects that go beyond relations between the two States. Those consequences and effects also extend to the developing countries, which are their victims. International détente and peaceful coexistence are essential to all peoples, and especially to peoples struggling against exploitation and domination for national independence and fighting to obtain their rights over their natural resources. The enormous gap that separates the economies of the developed and developing countries runs counter to the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The hunger afflicting millions of human beings cannot help to establish international peace and security. On the contrary, that hunger represents a danger to international peace and security. The adoption of the Declaration on the New International Economic Order is as important as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and those two Declarations would be shorn of all meaning unless they are made to



(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

supplement each other. The competition between the developed industrialized countries to obtain raw materials and riches - raw materials that the world is discovering are limited - and the increasing economic crisis in the developing countries could lead to terrible disasters that will spare neither rich nor poor.

For all those reasons all parties concerned, and especially the developing countries, should pursue the goal of strengthening international security during the forthcoming global round of negotiations on international economic co-operation, and they must all take into account the pressing need for those negotiations to succeed.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

There are still peoples deprived of freedom, independence and the right to self-determination. The policy of Zionist occupation and expansionism which prevents the Palestinian people from exercising its legitimate rights and pursues a war of extermination against them and the occupation of Arab territories has once again placed the world on the brink of the abyss. This situation continues to threaten international peace and security. It is for that reason that the end of Israeli occupation and the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the question of Palestine are a pressing need if we are to avoid further wars in the Middle East which would have disastrous effects for the entire international community.

My delegation strongly affirms that a just and equitable solution of the Palestinian question based on national self-determination, independence, the right to return and sovereignty will remove one of the most important and dangerous hotbeds of tension in the world which threaten world peace and security.

The continuation by the South African racist régime of its illegal occupation of Namibia and the pursuit of its policies of apartheid in South Africa, as well as its continued acts of aggression against independent African States, are a flagrant violation of the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and represent a threat to the peace and security of Africa and of the whole world. Co-operation between the two racist régimes in South Africa and Palestine and the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons by them are a violent blow against United Nations efforts to strengthen international security.

The policies of South Africa and the Zionist entity aimed at perpetuating their occupation, their expansionism and their oppression of peoples are a danger to international peace and security. The attempts of those two régimes to impose a fait accompli through nuclear blackmail can only serve to aggravate an already dangerous situation in Africa and the Middle East. The States which continue to give their support to those two aggressive régimes by providing them with weapons and technology are directly

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

helping them to aggravate that dangerous situation. In addition, together with those two régimes, they bear full responsibility for the dangerous acts which affect peace and security.

Despite the hopes placed by the international community in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security during the last decade, the meagre progress achieved thus far, in particular the considerable difficulties which to date have hindered the implementation of the SALT II accords, and the failure of the eleventh special session of the General Assembly devoted to the international economic situation as it affects the solution of pressing international problems, and especially the establishment of a new international economic order, have killed those hopes.

We trust that the alarming international tensions that affected international relations in the decade of the 1970s will disappear so that the second decade of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security may achieve further progress leading to a world throughout which peace, security and prosperity will reign.

In conclusion, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to thank the intergovernmental Group of Experts for its important report and constructive recommendations, which have the full support of my delegation.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.