

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTIETH SESSION

*Official Records**



SIXTH COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 9 October 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 134: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC-2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.6/40/SR.10
14 October 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEM 134: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (continued) (A/40/41, A/40/224-S/17081, A/40/269, A/40/323, A/40/346, A/40/452)

1. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said it was clear from the report of the Special Committee (A/40/41) that the Committee had still made no tangible progress in its work, owing to differences between the majority of representatives, who supported the drafting of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, and those who opposed such a treaty. The latter had cited a basic flaw in the mandate of the Special Committee and its failure to make the fundamental choice expressly stated in that mandate as reasons for the lack of substantive progress. They had also stated that reiteration in a new treaty of the principle of non-use of force, as set forth in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, was a dangerous notion.
2. There was no need, in view of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 39/81, for delegations to repeat their positions of principle. There was no basic flaw in the mandate and the Special Committee should continue its work, as specified in paragraph 2 of that resolution.
3. It was unacceptable to argue that a world treaty was a dangerous notion, since there were already many treaties which elaborated the principles enunciated in the Charter, such as those concerning human rights. In any event, any work undertaken by the Special Committee would be subject to review, and could therefore be approved or rejected.
4. The past 40 years had demonstrated the need to enhance the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in international relations, particularly for small States subjected to the threat or use of force, including nuclear force. Since it was impossible for small States to confront those threats on their own, they had to appeal to the United Nations for help in maintaining international peace and security. The Special Committee should therefore continue its work to develop practical and effective measures to enhance the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force, by drafting a treaty that would be binding on all nations.
5. Mr. CICANOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the non-use of force in international relations was one of the basic principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. Member States had undertaken to do their utmost to enhance the effectiveness of that principle. Unfortunately, over the past 40 years there had been countless instances of the threat or use of force, foreign intervention, aggression and armed conflict. Moreover, the victims of the use of force had most often been small and, as a rule, developing and non-aligned countries.
6. At their recent conference at Luanda, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries had expressed the view that the global crisis could best be

(Mr. Cicanovic, Yugoslavia)

solved through dialogue, particularly through multilateral negotiations within the framework of the United Nations system. They had noted that policies of intervention and interference continued to be pursued against many countries, in particular non-aligned countries, with dangerous consequences for peace and security. They had expressed special concern at the military presence, activities and manoeuvres of the great Powers in the territories, airspace and territorial waters of non-aligned countries and in their vicinity.

7. The need for strict respect by all States for the principle of non-use of force in international relations must be stressed. Likewise, all countries must comply with the Charter of the United Nations and the many international instruments in which the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world had opted for peace and co-operation.

8. Yugoslavia attached great importance to the work on enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in international relations and had participated in all the sessions of the Special Committee. It had consistently voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions enabling the Special Committee to continue its work and had made a practical contribution to the struggle against the use of force as a way of solving international problems.

9. Since all multilateral negotiation channels were currently blocked and there was an increasing tendency towards bilateralism, the Special Committee must avoid adding further problems to the large number of unresolved issues before the General Assembly. At its most recent session, the Special Committee had missed an opportunity to make progress, despite the constructive contribution made by its Chairman. Certain delegations had again failed to show any willingness to embark upon serious consideration of substantive issues. Attempts to circumvent the United Nations and the Special Committee or to place consideration of the issue in the framework of ideological or political confrontation or in the context of the outcome of negotiations in other fields could prove detrimental to the work of the Special Committee.

10. In the current debate in the Sixth Committee, there were indications of a more flexible approach in the future, and the climate at the current session of the General Assembly was generally conducive to dialogue. His delegation believed that the Special Committee would therefore be able to make some progress and that it should be allowed to continue its work.

11. Mr. TREVES (Italy) said that the Special Committee had been in a state of deadlock right from the outset. Its mandate did not command sufficient support in the General Assembly, and it had therefore hardly ever been able to reach general agreement on substantive questions. The main flaw of the mandate was the goal of concluding a world treaty. There was no point in merely repeating Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, and elaboration of that Article would entail the risk of reducing its scope, casting doubts on its real meaning and purpose, and making it less universal.

(Mr. Treves, Italy)

12. The Chairman of the Sixth Committee was to be commended for the efforts he had made to have the question of changing the Special Committee's mandate considered informally. Italy believed that the principle of non-use of force should be reaffirmed not in a treaty but in conjunction with the adoption of appropriate practical measures. Confidence-building measures and measures designed to strengthen security were required in order to achieve that objective. The question was whether such action could be taken in a universal framework such as the United Nations, at the current stage of development of the international community, or whether it should be taken at the regional level or in the framework of discussions on relationships between neighbours.

13. His delegation noted with great interest that the German Democratic Republic took the view that the prohibition of the use of force was an element of good-neighbourliness and that the prohibition included the readiness to take confidence-building and security-building measures (A/40/450/Add.1, para.4). A further lesson learned over the years was that it might be useful to reaffirm the linkages between the principle of non-use of force and the alternatives to the use of force, particularly the peaceful settlement of disputes and the system of collective security under the Charter of the United Nations. Some of the linkages in question had emerged clearly during the most recent session of the Special Committee.

14. His delegation believed that the Special Committee did indeed need a new mandate. However, it would not be sufficient to decide that the Special Committee should aim to draft a resolution or a declaration. Before such a decision was adopted, such alternatives as the preparation of an objective study of the causes of the use of force and of the means of preventing the use of force must be considered. If a declaration was envisaged, general agreement must be reached on its scope, and that would be possible if it was decided to focus the proposed declaration on underscoring the connection between the principle of non-use of force and the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes, the collective security provisions laid down in the Charter and the adoption, on a regional basis and by neighbouring countries, of practical measures designed to promote confidence and security. Such a declaration could hardly be regarded as a step towards the conclusion of a treaty. It must be stressed that it would not be possible to reach general agreement on the basis of the proposal put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union in his statement.

15. Mr. KHALIK (Egypt) said that his delegation had been disappointed at the poor outcome of the most recent session of the Special Committee. Such an outcome had, however, been anticipated, since it had proved impossible at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly for the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to convince certain groups of delegations of the importance of agreeing on a mandate by consensus or without a vote, or even with a vote, but on the understanding that no negative votes would be cast. Unfortunately, the parties concerned had adopted an increasingly rigid position each year, which could not fail to have an adverse impact on the work of the Special Committee. His delegation had therefore decided not to participate in the general exchange of

(Mr. Khalik, Egypt)

views at the most recent session of the Special Committee and, in the Working Group, had seen no alternative to reviewing all seven headings once again. His delegation consequently supported the view expressed by the representative of Brazil that the Sixth Committee must spell out a clear-cut mandate for the Special Committee. At the current session of the General Assembly, every possible effort must be made to adopt a resolution by consensus or without a vote. In that connection, his delegation noted with great interest the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union, accepting the idea of drafting a declaration, as proposed by the non-aligned countries.

16. The reference to the threat or use of force in international relations in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations was not sufficient. There was a pressing need for an instrument interpreting in great detail the principle laid down in the Charter. There were, in fact, several declarations that touched on major principles laid down in the Charter, such as the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

17. The principle of non-use of force was the cardinal principle enshrined in the Charter. Its importance was highlighted by recent violations, the latest of which had been the Israeli bombardment of civilian targets in Tunisia.

18. Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland) said that his delegation shared the concern expressed by other members of the international community at the increasing number of violations of the principle of non-use of force in international relations and at the acceleration of the arms race.

19. As indicated by the Prime Minister of Poland in his address before the General Assembly on 27 September, Poland had been a steadfast advocate of the strengthening of the United Nations system, and the foremost ideal of the United Nations must remain respect for the equal rights of every people and every State and respect for obligations under treaties and agreements for constructive co-operation. Anyone who tried to rewrite history was in effect seeking to undo the achievements of San Francisco and was undermining the fabric of international confidence.

20. Poland had consistently advocated proposals seeking to mitigate international tensions, curb the arms race, reduce the level of military confrontation, and ban the development of anti-satellite weapon systems. There was an urgent need to ensure the development of international co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space. As the Polish Prime Minister had indicated, it would now be desirable for a study of the diverse consequences of the militarization of outer space to be prepared by eminent experts of different nationalities, under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

21. An important step towards improving the current international situation would be the drafting and subsequent acceptance by the international community of a document concretizing and further developing the principle of non-use of force. In

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

that connection, his delegation fully supported the suggestion put forward by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization (A/40/1), to the effect that the membership of the United Nations as a whole might reaffirm Charter obligations, especially those relating to the non-use of force or the threat of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, resort to the mechanism set out in the Charter for the settlement of disputes and respect for the decisions of the Security Council. The Special Committee remained an appropriate forum for the preparation of an instrument to enhance the principle of non-use of force.

22. At its most recent session, the Special Committee had narrowed down some differences and selected a number of concepts on which agreement might be reached in the future. Most delegations had shown a desire to enhance the fundamental principle set forth in Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter. The debate on certain headings had revealed points of convergence. The concept of respect for and fulfilment in good faith of international obligations was particularly important to his delegation, since in recent years Poland had been the victim of illegal sanctions, including a unilateral breach of valid international agreements. His delegation welcomed the Soviet proposal that the Special Committee should prepare a declaration reaffirming and developing the principle of non-use of force. Such a document would constitute an important step towards the preparation of a world treaty. The proposed document should aim at the complete elimination of the use of force and of non-peaceful means of settling international disputes. It should define the scope and implications of the principle in question. The concept of force must not be subject to different interpretations or be restricted to the use of weapons. An appropriate definition would cover the use of economic pressures for political purposes, interference in the internal affairs of States, hostile propaganda and the use of mercenaries. His delegation hoped that the Special Committee would be able to draft a useful document and was therefore in favour of renewing its mandate.

23. Mr. SOKOLOVSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that developments in international relations in the 40 years since the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition and the founding of the United Nations showed convincingly that the goal of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, was still relevant today. Although there had been no world war since that time, millions had died in local wars because the imperialist forces had attempted to solve problems by using force. The emergence of nuclear weapons had led to a radical change in the consequences military conflicts might have; the probability of nuclear confrontation had increased enormously. In the current tense world situation, when the arms race was escalating and certain circles were attempting to extend it to outer space and to undermine treaty and legal obligations between States, the strengthening of legal and political guarantees for the preservation of peace was urgently required.

24. The renunciation of the use of force had been affirmed as a primary principle in the Final Act of the 1975 Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. It was an important element in the search for détente. Consistently working towards the universal enhancement of that principle, the parties to the Warsaw Treaty, had

(Mr. Sokolovsky, Byelorussian SSR)

recently introduced at the Stockholm Conference a proposal for the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual renunciation of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations. At the current session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union, for its part, had proposed the introduction of a new agenda item, entitled "International co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization". Furthermore, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had proposed new Soviet peace initiatives during his recent visit to Paris.

25. Although it had not yet completed the task assigned to it, the Special Committee had promoted awareness among Member States of the importance of elaborating a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The debate in that Committee had shown that the majority of States, representing practically all the geographical regions of the world, wished to take steps to enhance the effectiveness of the principle. His delegation supported the proposal for the elaboration of a declaration on the non-use of force put forward by a number of States concerned to see progress in the work of the Special Committee. Such a declaration should reaffirm and develop the principle, taking into account the realities of the nuclear and space age and the need to ban all weapons, nuclear and conventional alike. The elaboration and adoption of the declaration would be a manifestation of the desire of the majority of States Members of the United Nations to draft in the near future a legal document that would enhance the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force, strengthen guarantees for international security and help improve the international climate.

26. In his delegation's opinion, the conditions were right for the Special Committee to begin work on the declaration. The designation of 1986 as the International Year of Peace should encourage that Committee and all Member States to enhance the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force and elaborate the declaration without delay. That would be a first step, for the ultimate goal of the Special Committee must be the conclusion of a world treaty on the subject.

27. Mr. MIKULKA (Czechoslovakia) said that, 40 years after the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations, there were still elements that did not hesitate to resort to the threat or use of force, as demonstrated by Israel's recent act of aggression against Tunisia and by South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola. The many hotbeds of tension in the world were a real threat to international peace and security. The escalation of the arms race meant that world peace was increasingly precarious. Moreover, the international community was facing a fundamental decision on the question of the arms race in outer space.

28. In view of that situation, it was understandable that the international community had welcomed the Soviet proposal concerning the preparation of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had put forward a whole series of specific proposals designed to enhance the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force, including the recent initiative concerning international co-operation in the peaceful exploration of outer space. Mention should also be made of the unilateral

(Mr. Mikulka, Czechoslovakia)

commitment made by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests.

29. At its most recent session, the Special Committee had made a certain amount of progress in its work, and there were signs that it might be possible to achieve concrete results in the future. His delegation shared the view that the proposal to prepare a declaration on the non-use of force, which had been accepted by the Soviet representative, could constitute a step towards the preparation of a world treaty on the subject.

30. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) said the fact that the important principle of non-use of force in international relations was too often violated was just cause for considering ways of enhancing its effectiveness. However, such consideration should not take place in an atmosphere of polemics. He therefore regretted that certain delegations had used the debate as a pretext to bring up topics that were out of place. His delegation was prepared to examine any specific proposal likely to contribute to enhancing the effectiveness of the principle. However, it believed that the proposal for a world treaty was likely to weaken the scope of the principle contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter.

31. His delegation considered that the principle was perfectly well expressed in the Charter itself, which, moreover, established a delicate balance between that principle and the other related principles, especially the peaceful settlement of disputes, and between those principles and the mechanisms for ensuring that they were respected. The best way of enhancing the principle of non-use of force was not to elaborate an international treaty, but to implement the provisions of the Charter.

32. For similar reasons, France was not a priori in favour of a declaration on the subject. It did not think that the accumulation of legal instruments or declarations would put an end to violations of the principles embodied in the Charter. However, it was prepared to accept that specific proposals meeting with general agreement and likely to enhance the effectiveness of the principle should be laid down in a declaration or resolution, if that was the wish of the other delegations. But it would seem difficult to prepare such a document in the framework of a Special Committee whose mandate was limited to the principle of non-use of force, in view of the close links between that principle, the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes and the system of collective security. In order to avoid upsetting the balance between the principles and mechanisms of the Charter and to avoid considering topics already being discussed elsewhere, that task should be allocated to the Committee on the Charter.

33. His delegation had noted with interest that the Soviet delegation, the principal partisan of a world treaty, had, for the first time, said it was prepared to discuss the elaboration of a declaration, thus seeming to have become aware of the sense of frustration felt by the great majority of delegations at the mediocre results obtained by the Special Committee. But he had also noted that, according to the Soviet delegation, a declaration would constitute only a first step towards

(Mr. Schricke, France)

a world treaty, which would remain the objective of the Committee's work. No real progress would be possible as long as certain delegations insisted on the elaboration of such a treaty and as long as there was no consensus on the mandate of the Special Committee. Only if consensus was achieved on its mandate and methods of work, would it be possible to arrive at conclusions acceptable to all which might, if appropriate, be included in a resolution or declaration. To that end, the resolution on the work of the Special Committee would have to be changed substantially. In the light of that resolution it would be possible to judge whether the framework and perspectives of the exercise had really been modified.

34. Mr. WOKALEK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the principle of non-use of force was of the utmost importance to his country. That fundamental principle of international law, laid down in Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, had been agreed to by all Member States. When States used force, they always had explanations, such as the right of self-defence, which they based on relevant Articles of the Charter. Such explanations showed that no State claimed a "jus ad bellum" for itself. It could therefore be concluded that the principle of non-use of force in international relations as such was accepted by the international community. What was needed, then, was not further principles and instruments, but the implementation of the international norms already in existence.

35. The most recent session of the Special Committee had shown that if it was to achieve anything at all, its work must be based on consensus as to the goal to be reached. General agreement on how to proceed was necessary. That would require a new definition of the Special Committee's mandate. After many years of frustrating discussion in the Special Committee, the major advocate of a world treaty, the Soviet Union, had made an interesting proposal, which his delegation welcomed as a step towards bringing the forces in the Special Committee closer together. That proposal would, of course, have to be discussed to see whether it met the goal of enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force. A declaration might be helpful, provided its content was appropriate and it did not affect the binding prohibition of the use of force enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter.

36. His delegation had hoped that it would have been possible to remove fully the obstacle that had until now stood in the way of substantive debate. But, unfortunately, the final objective of a treaty had not been given up, only postponed by the introduction of an intermediary step. However, his delegation commended any effort that enabled the Special Committee to proceed with its work.

37. Ms. MEDINA KRAUDIE (Nicaragua) said that there definitely was a need to elaborate a legal instrument regulating and reaffirming the principle of non-use of force in international relations as enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, in order to put an end to the arms race, acts of aggression, invasions and the threat of nuclear war, all of which seriously imperiled international peace and security. Such an instrument should be as binding as possible and should clearly enunciate the obligation of States to refrain in all circumstances from coercion or the threat or use of force. Moreover, in accordance with the Charter and the norms

(Ms. Medina Kraudie, Nicaragua)

of international law, the instrument should reaffirm the following principles: sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in internal affairs, self-determination of peoples, peaceful settlement of international disputes, and the right of individual or collective self-defence in case of armed attack.

38. The United States was pursuing a policy of aggression against her country with a view to overthrowing its legitimately established Government on the pretext that her country was a threat to the security of the United States. That policy had taken the form of criminal military actions by mercenaries and economic aggression, which had resulted in substantial financial loss to her country that was because of pressure by the United States Government on other Governments and multilateral agencies to deny her country funding and because of the trade embargo imposed in May 1985. A United States invasion of her country was a real possibility, for President Reagan and senior government officials had admitted that approval had been given to plans for an invasion in certain circumstances.

39. To counter that warlike stance, her country had resorted to mediation, good offices, bilateral talks and the United Nations machinery established for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In response, the United States had used its veto power in the Security Council to prevent condemnation of its criminal actions. Moreover, when her country had brought its case against the United States before the International Court of Justice, the Reagan Administration had claimed that the Court was not competent, alleging that the case was political in nature. The United States had recently announced that it no longer would recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in matters which it deemed political in nature, notwithstanding the fact that the Court had declared itself competent to hear the case, which it had characterized as legal in nature.

40. That decision by the United States Government reflected disdain for the international legal order, and should be a source of deep concern for all States, for it flouted the principle that international disputes should be settled by peaceful means, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter.

41. The message underlying Nicaragua's appearance before the Court and other international bodies was that relations between the two countries should be governed by the principles set out in the Charter and by the norms of international law.

42. The mandate of the Special Committee should be renewed and its members should strive to put an end to the continuing stalemate, in order to progress towards the goal of elaborating a multilateral treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

43. Mr. HERRON (Australia) said his delegation continued to believe that a treaty on the subject was unnecessary and would add no force to a principle which was already well established in international law and reinforced in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. Notwithstanding the conscientious efforts by the

(Mr. Herron, Australia)

Special Committee and its Working Group during the past year, the report before the Committee (A/40/41) sadly confirmed that members were still enmeshed in a sterile, circular argument.

44. It was one thing to talk about non-use of force and peaceful settlement of disputes; it was quite another to achieve progress in that area, particularly when power relationships prevailed, as had been shown by the abuses of power in the past 40 years in violation of the Charter.

45. So many positions of expediency had been taken concerning the provisions of the Charter during that period that there was sometimes a tendency to discount the Charter as just a political document. However, it was a treaty binding all Members of the United Nations under international law. Australia regarded the Charter prohibition of the use of force as clear and comprehensive. The relevant provisions of the Charter were paralleled by rules of customary international law, and if applied literally and in good faith, they were effective. Nothing would be added to the binding nature of those obligations by another treaty. An instrument of lesser status, such as a declaration, could only give an impression of uncertainty prejudicial to the effectiveness of the existing well-established rules.

46. To the extent that the Sixth Committee could make a legal contribution to the consideration of the item under discussion, it should do so under the items relating to the Committee on the Charter and the peaceful settlement of disputes between States.

47. Efforts could also be made, outside the United Nations framework, to increase the security of States and regions by guarantees of non-use of force and by institutionalizing resort to peaceful means of settling disputes. In that regard, he noted that the Treaty recently adopted by the South Pacific States was accompanied by a Protocol providing that nuclear-weapon States would undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against parties to the Treaty or against Territories of metropolitan States within the nuclear-free zone, established under the Treaty.

48. His country was a strong supporter of the International Court of Justice and regretted that very recently there had been indications of decreasing, rather than increasing, support for the Court and of decreasing willingness to have disputes adjudicated by it.

49. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the United Nations had determined, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The threat of nuclear war had increased considerably since 1945 as a result of the actions of imperialist circles. There was therefore a need for urgent and effective measures to ensure universal observance of the principle of non-use of force in international relations. The 1976 Soviet proposal for the drafting of a world treaty on the non-use of force had been designed to clarify that principle and to make the renunciation of the use of nuclear and conventional weapons mandatory for all States. Broad support had subsequently been shown for that initiative.

(Mr. Kachurenko, Ukrainian SSR)

50. The attitude of certain imperialist States, however, had been negative. They had spent huge sums on the development of their armed forces and had advanced various arguments to justify their use of force. Although Washington referred to its programme for the militarization of outer space as the "Strategic Defense Initiative", its real aims were clear.

51. Certain States were determined to guarantee for themselves positions of domination in the world. Examples could be seen in the undeclared war being waged by the United States against Nicaragua, in Israel's aggressive policy in the Middle East and recent attack on Tunis, and in South Africa's raids on front-line States.

52. His delegation was particularly interested in the work of the Special Committee. The Committee's report (A/40/41) showed that some agreement had been reached on provisions concerning the non-use of force which had been developed in other documents, such as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Definition of Aggression and the Final Act adopted at Helsinki. No objections had been raised in principle to the provisions concerning the obligation of States to settle disputes by peaceful means, and the activities of the Working Group would afford a good basis for further efforts to draft concrete formulas.

53. The attitude of those States which had used every means to direct the activities of the Working Group towards fruitless discussions could not be called constructive. Opponents of the drafting of a world treaty had long asserted that such a treaty might weaken the principle of non-use of force and be tantamount to a revision of the United Nations Charter. However, it was clear that such a treaty could only strengthen that principle.

54. A number of non-aligned States, together with certain Western countries, had expressed support for the drafting of a declaration on the non-use of force in international relations. The Ukrainian SSR would support the elaboration of such a document within the framework of the Special Committee, recognizing that such a declaration would constitute an important step towards the drafting of a world treaty.

55. Work on the conclusion of a world treaty should be accompanied by other specific political and material guarantees, including a commitment by all nuclear States, following the example of the USSR and China, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It was for that reason that the Soviet Union had imposed a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons, and the nuclear-arms race might be halted if other nuclear Powers followed suit. A joint declaration by the nuclear Powers concerning specific standards of behaviour in their mutual relations would represent an important contribution to international peace and security. Attention should also be given to the proposal of the socialist States concerning a treaty on the mutual renunciation of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations, as submitted at the Stockholm Conference in January 1985. It would be a positive step to implement the proposal made by the Soviet Union in 1985 concerning

(Mr. Kachurenko, Ukrainian SSR)

international co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization.

56. An important contribution towards conclusion of a treaty would be made by the implementation of General Assembly resolution 39/159 concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States. Renunciation of such a policy would strengthen the security of individual States and promote international security as a whole.

57. Enhancement of the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in international relations was a complex but necessary process, and the Ukrainian SSR shared the view of the majority of representatives that the mandate of the Special Committee should be renewed, so that the Committee might accomplish the task entrusted to it.

58. Miss CHOKRON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that some delegations, in particular, the Syrian delegation, had objected to what had been described as "aggression" by Israel against Tunisia. The world had just witnessed the hijacking of the Italian cruise liner Achille Lauro and the seizure of its passengers and crew, by a group of Palestinian terrorists. She viewed with scepticism the claim by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) that it bore no responsibility for that action. It was fitting to ask how a group of apparently isolated terrorists could have undertaken such an operation without the support of one or more States. There could be absolutely no justification for that act of terrorism against the citizens of several countries, an act which was in contravention of international law and the principle of non-use of force embodied in the Charter, and which was hardly conducive to promoting the cause of peace. The State or States which supported and encouraged terrorists and gave them asylum should be held responsible for the terrorists' actions.

59. She was pleased to note that the most recent reports available indicated that the siege aboard the Achille Lauro had come to an end with no harm to any of the hostages, a fact which must be welcomed. However, that should not obscure the fact that a State bore responsibility for the hijacking, as had been the case in many similar situations, and that it was not merely a group of isolated terrorists who were to blame.

60. In the Security Council debate on Tunisia's complaint against Israel, her country's Ambassador had warned that the adoption of a resolution condemning Israel - whose action had constituted a legitimate response to repeated terrorist attacks - would only encourage international terrorism. Her delegation had had no inkling that its warning would be borne out by reality so soon.

61. Mr. KAHALEH (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said it was not the first time that Israel had attempted to use the struggle against terrorism as a pretext for its aggression, which ran counter to the principle of non-use of force in international relations. He read out part of an

(Mr. Kahaleh, Syrian Arab Republic)

article by a United States commentator in a recent issue of The Christian Science Monitor condemning the logic behind Israel's justification of its attack on the friendly and peaceful State of Tunisia. The trite argument that the Israeli attack on Tunisia had been carried out in exercise of the legitimate right of self-defence deceived no one.

62. Ms. WILLSON (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that her delegation rejected Nicaragua's absurd allegation of an imminent invasion. The Nicaraguan representative had dwelt largely on topics which were not being considered by the Sixth Committee, and she would therefore not respond to the charges in detail.

63. Miss CHOKRON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, quoted excerpts from the press in response to those quoted by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. Senior PLO officials had stated that the Syrian régime was doing all it could to fragment Palestinian ranks and to take over the Palestinians' right to independent decision-making. They had also said that the régime was active in killings and evictions of Palestinians and that certain Arab forces were exploiting the situation for the purposes of terror and blackmail.

64. Ms. MEDINA KRAUDIE (Nicaragua), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that she was astounded at the amnesia demonstrated by United States Government officials in the various forums in which her country had denounced United States aggression within Nicaragua's borders. The situation in Nicaragua constituted a case of the use of force. Her country had endeavoured to resolve the situation through peaceful means, and the United States apparently had forgotten that it had accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in 1946.

65. Mr. KAHALEH (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the remarks by the representative of Israel bore no relation to the item before the Sixth Committee. The Israeli attack on Tunisia had been a flagrant violation of the principle of non-use of force in international relations.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.