

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION
Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
54th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 6 December 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

COLLECTION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 54th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 37: CONCLUSION OF A WORLD TREATY ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 50: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 127: DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DETENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

77-73321

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.54
7 December 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 50 and 127 (continued)

CONCLUSION OF A WORLD TREATY ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (A/32/94, 95, 97, 108, 112, 114, 119, 122, 123, 181 and Add.1) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (A/32/68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78, 89, 93, 117, 128, 140, 153, 154, 157, 164 and Add.1, 165 and Add.1-2; A/C.1/32/2, 8) DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DÉTENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (A/32/242; A/C.1/32/L.1, 2)

Mr. MUNIU (Kenya): We have before us a Soviet-proposed Draft Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente (A/C.1/32/L.1) and draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war (A/C.1/32/L.2). My delegation welcomes any initiative aimed at improving relations between and among nations and we hope that détente is intended to accomplish this. I hope also that détente will create a favourable environment for effective functioning of the United Nations as an instrument of international peace and security and a better international economic order.

We have always held that measures aimed at elimination of international tension should be carefully studied and supported if they are found to contribute to international peace and security. It is in this spirit that the Kenya delegation welcomes the item before this Committee on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war.

We are convinced that a serious exchange of views on the question of détente would be very useful to many members of this Committee. This is so in view of the fact that the meaning of the word "détente" is rather ambiguous and its usage appears to have been limited to relations between the super-Powers. So one of the tasks before us is to attempt to find an acceptable definition of détente which we hope will take into account the

(Mr. Muniu, Kenya)

requirements of the contemporary world and the reality of present international relations, particularly the views of the developing countries. In our view, détente should be much more than the present condition of relations between the super-Powers. It should be extended to all countries regardless of their size, geographical location, population, and level of their economic development.

We see that one of the elements of détente is to have a certain trust and the ability to take into consideration each other's legitimate interests. While my delegation does not have any quarrel with this, we feel that it would be useful to clarify what is meant by the "legitimate interests" of any one State. We do not believe that détente should be used to prescribe national legitimate interests where other Members of the United Nations should keep their hands off. In other words, we do not want this phraseology to be used, especially by the super-Powers, to delineate the world into areas of what they consider to be their legitimate interests.

Kenya, being a non-aligned country, does not encourage the development of, nor does it view with favour, international issues in bloc politics. My delegation is, therefore, opposed to any attempt to use détente to enhance the entrenchment of bloc politics or policies. In our view, détente means the maintenance of a favourable international environment in which States interact freely and can conduct their business independently of super-Power relations. To depart from this understanding would be to introduce some kind of divisive politics or even to encourage some spheres of influence in the world body.

We further observe that the same draft declaration, when adopted, will be expected to serve as a kind of compass to be used by States for setting their bearings in the stormy sea of current international policies. Furthermore, the General Assembly has been asked solemnly to urge all States "to measure their actions in relation to other States and in all parts of the globe against the requirements of détente". (A/C.1/32/L.1, p. 2)

(Mr. Muniu, Kenya)

We have always held the view that the Charter is the standard against which States' actions in relations to other States should be measured. Every Member State is committed to the provisions of the United Nations Charter, which sets the standard of obligations which governs the non-use of force in international relations. Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter calls upon all Members to settle international disputes by peaceful means, and Article 2, paragraph 4, sets out the obligations upon Member States to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

(Mr. Muniu, Kenya)

Furthermore, the principle of the non-use of force or threat of force is one of the primary objectives of the world Organization and of its Member States. This principle has already been reaffirmed on several occasions in texts adopted in the course of the work of the General Assembly of the United Nations, particularly in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (resolution 2625 (XXV)), the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the resolution on the definition of aggression (resolution 3314 (XXIX)). This principle has also been restated at the European regional level in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Kenya has always maintained that the maintenance of international peace and security is of paramount importance to mankind and has, therefore, lent its full support to the adoption of any specific measures as would be conducive to the realization of this principle. In lending our support, we have kept in mind that such measures should by no means be allowed to cast any doubt upon the authoritative character of the United Nations and the credibility of the relevant texts dealing with peace and security matters. My delegation, therefore, feels that strenuous efforts should be devoted to a thorough examination and analysis of the draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente with the hope of coming up with a document acceptable to the majority of the Member States.

I should like to stress here and now my Government's total opposition to any argument or suggestion from any quarters that the policy of apartheid is the internal affair of South Africa and should, therefore, be regarded as the sole interest of that country. The United Nations Charter allows Member States to take action aimed at ensuring that fundamental rights are enjoyed by all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. These rights are also laid down in international covenants on human rights as well as in other international treaties. It is in this context, therefore, that my Government does not consider this to be an interference in the internal affairs of South Africa when we condemn apartheid and indeed take action towards its elimination.

(Mr. Muniu, Kenya)

I should like to state that there can be no meaningful relaxation of international tension as long as there are some régimes which continue to deny people their fundamental rights. I am particularly concerned with the situation in Zimbabwe and the racist régime in South Africa, whose policy and practice of apartheid amount to a total negation of the very goals and objectives of this Organization.

The most serious of all the problems relating to peace and security in the world is the ever-escalating arms race. While everyone agrees that there is an urgent need to halt this dangerous escalation, progress towards arms limitation and reduction is not yet in sight. Kenya welcomes the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament which is scheduled to be held here in New York towards the middle of 1978. We feel that the special session will give Member States the opportunity to take a fresh approach to disarmament. We are hopeful that the special session will make concrete proposals and will pave the way for the convening of a world conference on disarmament at which agreement will be reached towards not only the reduction in development, manufacture and sale of arms but also their eventual elimination. It is only when this has been achieved that nations will be free from the fear of war. This in itself will develop an environment conducive to mutual trust that will result in the deepening of international détente.

Finally, my delegation is of the opinion that the aim of strengthening détente should not be limited to the prevention of nuclear war. The international community founded this Organization in order to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war - any type of war. We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of the draft declaration and related draft resolutions will find it possible to amend those documents so as to accommodate these sentiments which are shared by other delegations that spoke before mine.

Mr. ABBA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The strengthening of international security and the consolidation of détente are indisputably numbered among the most profound and legitimate aspirations of peoples. Praiseworthy efforts have been made in Europe to give concrete form to those aspirations, resulting in the conclusion of the Helsinki agreements on security and co-operation. We must applaud those efforts and welcome their successful outcome. In our view they constitute a far from negligible contribution to the cause of international peace and security, which are the fundamental purposes of our Organization. However, we must assess them at their true worth, avoid indulging in sterile and dangerous vainglory and analyse the situation lucidly and objectively.

That analysis, unfortunately, will lead us to conclude that rarely since the period of the cold war has the international situation given rise to such concern, for rarely since that time have peace and security been so threatened. It should not be thought that this is pessimistic or alarmist thinking, or indeed any desire to underestimate the efforts to achieve peace. It is enough to consider the facts.

In the Middle East the various attempts to eliminate the Palestinian people and its spearhead, the Palestine Liberation Organization, have only aggravated the situation and taken us further away from a just and equitable solution of the problem. Once again it must be stressed that any attempt to settle the Middle East question which disregards the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination will inevitably be doomed to failure.

In Africa, the bloody practices of Vorster and Ian Smith, the occupation of Namibia by force, the violation of the most fundamental rights of the black majority in South Africa and in Zimbabwe remain a challenge to the international community and a serious impediment to peace and security in that part of the world.

Nor are the thinly veiled attempts at the colonial reconquest of Africa likely to promote détente in that part of the world.

(Mr. Abba, Algeria)

Thus we can only denounce the activities of the former colonial Powers which, for the sake of what are, to say the least, dubious interests, do not hesitate to do things to cause trouble in Africa and to erode the independence and sovereignty which had been bought so dearly by the peoples of the region.

The question of Cyprus, the solution of which, in our view, should be based on the independence territorial integrity and non-alignment of the island, represents, at the same time as the situation in the Middle East, a serious threat to this especially sensitive area of the Mediterranean, owing in particular to the movements of foreign fleets.

These few brief observations concerning the international situation lead us to approach the concept of détente with more caution and objectivity. This concept must be stripped of any outmoded European centrism. Whatever its economic importance, Europe is not the world. More broadly, détente should not be the concern only of the great Powers or even exclusively the concern of the developed countries. These countries in any event must not constitute an oasis of peace and prosperity and transfer to other latitudes the scourge of war and aggression in all its forms. Thus there can be no détente, unless it is to be rendered meaningless, while there exist these hotbeds of tension, which are the direct consequence of the policy of hegemony, spheres of influence and balance of power. It must necessarily be based on respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, whatever their power or social, economic and political systems. Thus détente seems to us to be incompatible with the existence of military bases, the unbridled arms race or the development of new weapons of mass destruction.

Moreover, the iniquitous international economic relations that exist, relations characterized by the domination and exploitation of the developing countries, and the shameful and constantly widening gap between those countries and the industrialized countries, indisputably represent a serious threat to international peace and security. We are convinced that the establishment of a just and equitable new international economic order, economic co-operation and the awareness by peoples of their community of interests will furnish détente with the necessary material basis for its consolidation. Thus we are

(Mr. Abba, Algeria)

grateful to the Soviet delegation for having taken the initiative of putting the question of détente before our Committee. We are convinced that this initiative will lead to the adoption by the General Assembly of a document which, while reaffirming the need to work for the easing of tensions in the world, will point up the central universal dimension of détente, which must be extended to all parts of the world and cover all aspects of international relations. This is a difficult task but a noble one, to which Algeria, with the other non-aligned countries, will try to contribute as far as it is able.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The question of international security is one of the most important items on this year's agenda and, I would say, on any agenda, because upon international security and the ability of the United Nations to provide international security the whole structure of the Organization stands or falls. The Charter, in its Preamble and its first Article, provides that the main and paramount responsibility of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security. Of course, there can be no peace without international security, so the whole problem of the United Nations is international security. Therefore the item on the strengthening of international security is very vital and very realistic, because it shows where the fault lies for a faltering United Nations and for an endangered humanity in consequence. The fault is that there is hardly any international security, and the need to strengthen what there is of it is paramount.

All participants in the present debate have emphasized the importance of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The significance of the Declaration lies in the reaffirming and enhancing of the principles and purposes of the Charter and their effective implementation for the maintenance of international peace and security. I repeat: the effective implementation. That is where the crux of the matter is, because of declarations we have had many, of conventions we have had more, and we have, after all, the Charter, which is the most sanctified convention and treaty, but what we need is implementation of the Charter and all relevant declarations.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Therefore the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is a most valuable document, because it enters into the implementation of the Charter. It does not merely enunciate principles. It does not merely rehash principles and purposes, but proceeds to point out that they have to be implemented or otherwise the whole structure of the United Nations becomes meaningless.

Now let us see how the Declaration proceeds. It lays stress on the need for complying with the specific means required by the Charter for the effective implementation of Security Council decisions on matters of international peace and security. Therefore the Declaration goes into specifics and calls for implementation of the part of the Charter that deals with giving effect to the Security Council decisions, because upon them rests legal order and security.

Another significant aspect of the Declaration is that it was adopted with near unanimity of the General Assembly in 1970, thus establishing that the Declaration was felt to be necessary in our present times and, more significantly, that the provisions of the Charter for international security through the effective implementation of Security Council decisions - as spelled out in Chapter VII - are fully applicable today. It would seem to my delegation that, in the light of the Declaration and of the Charter and in the light of the present growing anarchy and insecurity in our world, there is no justification for not proceeding in accordance with the Charter to provide international peace and security in the world and legal order with it.

I should like now to take a look at the world of today and the world of yesterday. The world of yesterday - in past centuries, including the nineteenth century and the beginning of this century - was based on the concept of force and domination. There were no accepted principles to go by and no organizations to apply them. It was the right of might.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

We had thus pax Romana and then pax Britannica, and eventually we came to the balance of power in the nineteenth century. It was not one Power that ruled the world, but it was the balance of Powers that kept a reasonable degree of legal order. Maybe it was unjust, undemocratic, not acceptable on principle, but it was a kind of legal order. It crumbled with two world wars of the twentieth century.

And we came to a period when it was felt there could no longer be wars because of immensity of destruction as a result of the progress of technology. And then the United Nations based on the principles of the Charter was established.

Problems in the past were solved by force. Now problems can no longer be solved by force. Consequently they proliferate and fester. And there is confusion.

What can we do with all these problems that arise and are not solved? Can we turn back the clock and solve them by force? We cannot. We know very well that that is impossible because of the breakthrough in technology and the advent of the nuclear weapon, which now stands there as the "god of no wars". We are therefore forced to solve them by means other than war. And what other way is there but by applying the Charter for a legal order and international security through the United Nations? That is the logical, the rational, way of approaching today's problems.

The permanent value of the provisions of the Charter and of the Declaration, and the need to comply with them were brought into sharp focus in this debate. The statements of the participants in the debate have drawn attention to the necessity and urgency to proceed beyond redefining principles and declarations and to the need to concentrate on the realization of those principles through the concrete and effective application of the relevant provisions of the Charter, repeated in the Declaration on international security. To that end a positive initiative is needed for specific collective action in these respects. That is the only way out of the present confusion resulting from the negative, antagonistic

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

pursuit for arms superiority in a supposed balance of power which, in effect, is the cause of an escalating arms race and is inextricably linked with it in a vicious circle.

These are stark realities which no one can dispute and which point the way to international security through the United Nations.

I have spoken to a certain extent about international security. There are two other items connected with it: détente and non-use of force. They are very happily joined together because they are interconnected. Détente is a necessary prerequisite to collective action and co-operation in order to apply international security through the Charter. And non-use of force is the fundamental premise upon which international security can be based.

It was pointed out in this debate that, in spite of the fact that the principle of non-use of force has been enshrined in various international documents and, more importantly, in the Charter of the United Nations, it is persistently violated in many parts of the world - in the Middle East, in southern Africa by South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, and, similarly, in Cyprus. The seriousness of these three international problems has been emphasized in this year's report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization. Those situations pose serious threats to international peace and security, and the importance of the strict application of the principle of non-use of force was therefore stressed in the debate.

It is not enough, however, to repeat with increasing emphasis the principle of non-use of force, however useful such emphasis may be. The importance lies in giving effect to the principle, and to that end for measures of the Security Council to make the non-use of force a reality. It may be recalled in that respect that Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter prohibiting the threat or use of force in international relations is supplemented by the immediately following paragraph 5 which refers to enforcement action by the United Nations, obviously as necessary for the application of the principle of non-use of force. The effect of the

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

application therefore of those principles must take concrete form as provided in the Charter under Article 7 which establishes, inter alia, the Security Council, Article 25 which provides that the Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council, which means that all Members of the United Nations are committed to contribute to the implementation of the Security Council resolutions by this Article 25, and then Articles 39 through 49 which provide for the Security Council to decide upon a complaint of aggression and then provide for the implementation of its decisions by peaceful means and, if necessary, by enforcement action. That is the structure of the Charter for international peace and security, and that must be followed.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, in its paragraph 9, enters very completely on implementation. It recognizes the need for effective measures in accordance with the Charter to remove threats to peace and suppress actions of aggression, and recommends that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter in order fully to develop its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The item on international security with which we are dealing is entitled: "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". Therefore, our duty here is to proceed further than the Declaration and not to repeat whatever is contained therein, and seek to implement its provisions if we are really a progressive Organization moving forward in a logical sequence.

I am very happy to say that in this way last year's General Assembly resolution on this item - Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security - which I had the honour to introduce on behalf of the non-aligned group, in operative paragraph 7 provides as follows:

"Recommends that the Security Council should consider appropriate steps towards carrying out effectively, as provided in the Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." (Resolution 31/92)

Hence, I am gratified that that was a resolution moving forward towards implementation.

However, the Security Council did not react or respond to this recommendation. My delegation feels that this year's resolution should go one step further and remind the Security Council that it has to consider this aspect of the implementation of the Charter, which is in a sense the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which, as I said, was adopted unanimously.

We have before us a proposal for the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. My delegation would gladly support this draft treaty because we feel that anything which goes towards emphasizing the need of the non-use of force is important and should be promoted in any way. Therefore, such a treaty would be a very helpful move towards the realization of the need of the non-use of force.

In the meantime, however, I wish to point out that prompt and effective steps will have to be taken as provided in the Charter in order to give the required effect to the principle of the non-use of force through implementing Security Council decisions taken under Chapter VII of the Charter.

The two things - the draft treaty and this move forward - would then go hand in hand.

I should like now to say just a few words about the paramount and primary responsibility of the United Nations and the very purpose of its establishment in the maintenance of international security and a legal order.

We have seen that very little has been done in this respect, although the United Nations has been very effective, very useful and indispensable in every other respect in the world. Indeed, one can say that not one day has passed without the need of the United Nations on global problems - on all problems - which in our interdependent world cannot now be solved by force.

So we must realize that we are not in an age of force but in the age of the United Nations and, hence, in an age of reason. We must therefore follow the Charter in a cogent and rational way to provide this world with a legal order and security, without which, I must say, the future of humanity is very grim and the possibility of its survival very doubtful. We cannot wait for long, because developments now move very rapidly.

The time element is therefore critical, and I wish to emphasize the need of producing a new world through our present situation of détente.

The reason that the Charter was not implemented in its vital provisions for international peace and security, that is, through giving effect to Security Council resolutions, was because there could be no co-operation between the two sides during the cold war. Now we have détente, and we realize that there is a relaxation of tension and co-operation in many fields - the cold war has been overcome and there is communication and understanding for both sides.

My delegation would like to see this understanding and co-operation enter the important field of international security.

For how can the prestige and authority of the United Nations stand if the resolutions of its most important organ, the Security Council, remain wholly unimplemented and lose their meaningfulness along with the Organization itself? Never before has this been so manifested. Resolutions with regard to recent cases of small nations which have been victims of continued aggression have been adopted by the General Assembly unanimously and endorsed by the Security Council unanimously calling for the aggressor to desist, for the withdrawal of the occupying forces and for the return of hundreds of thousands of refugees to their homes and properties, and yet these resolutions have month after month and year after year remained unimplemented and treated with utter contempt for any concept of legal order in a civilized world.

That is a situation that should not be tolerated. It has become so manifest that the very fact that it has taken place in full view of the international community without any remedy, without any hindrance otherwise than by merely adopting ineffective resolutions in the General Assembly and the Security Council, is a tragedy not only for the countries concerned - and I might very well cite the tragedy of Cyprus - but also for the United Nations in a crumbling international security system and legal order.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The time has long been overdue for the United Nations effectively to solve problems which fester and proliferate in a confused world because of the absence of law and order and security, as a result of the non-implementation of the mandatory decisions of the Security Council. We express the hope that change will come; and there are now some glimpses of hope that there will eventually be recognition of those realities and of the necessity for appropriate action.

Mr. BENKFAYAL (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

In your statement to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, on the morning of 17 October last, at the outset of our deliberations on item 127, "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war", you mentioned that in recent years we had witnessed some improvements in international relations such as an easing of tensions. Nevertheless, we were still facing explosive crises in some regions of the world. My delegation shares your view that there are indeed international crises and problems which should be solved. The persistence of such crises continues to threaten world peace and security. Those problems require radical solution which should be attained with the support of all the Powers, including those directly or indirectly concerned with such issues.

There is no doubt that the existence of a world where peace and security prevail is the wish and the aim of all peace-loving people. Even more, the maintenance of world peace and security, the development of cordial relations between States and the realization of international co-operation to resolve all the political, social, economic, cultural and humanitarian issues is the goal of the United Nations Charter; it is one of the principal purposes enshrined in the Charter.

Convinced of those principles and ideals set forth in the Charter, we support any policy which aims at restoring peace and eradicating colonialism and racism, and the just and radical resolution of fundamental

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

problems. We do not wish to appear pessimistic; nevertheless, we should like to reaffirm that durable world peace and security will never prevail unless tangible progress is made in the efforts towards disarmament. Therefore, a verbal exchange of views on the policy of international détente, its importance and the call to deepen and consolidate it will not suffice unless it is accompanied in fact by tangible and positive results in the field of disarmament.

Our Committee recently concluded its discussion of the disarmament items submitted at this session of the General Assembly. It has adopted certain resolutions and recommendations, all of which aim at clearly defined action and initiatives in this field. Those decisions were adopted by a sweeping majority and in certain cases unanimously. Those recommendations and resolutions which will eventually be approved by the General Assembly will remain null and void unless a commitment to implement them is obtained from all Member States, along with recognition of the need for good faith and mutual trust. Otherwise, we shall lose sight of the hopes and aspirations of the people for the aim desired, that of general and complete disarmament.

If such good faith and sincere desire to work to that end were present so that an economy of a billion dollars disbursed daily on disarmament could be achieved, and if that sum could be directed to relieving the poverty, disease and ignorance which is afflicting many areas of the world, that would be an effective contribution to the establishment of a new economic order leading to the prosperity and welfare of all mankind.

In dealing with this issue on this occasion, we should like to say that in the current discussions between the super-Powers in the disarmament field we expect them to embark upon an historic endeavour which would be a source of hope and life for the coming generations. Those Powers must prove their good intentions and, to dispel our previous doubts and reservations on the policy of international détente, they must present something tangible and effective in this field.

(Mr. Penkhayal, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

Unless a just and equitable solution of current problems is found which goes to the root of the matter rather than the branches, especially in southern Africa and occupied Palestine, the reservations stemming from our fear and apprehension that such a policy would take place at the expense of small States and of the aspirations and hopes of the peoples of the third world to realize political and economic independence will remain, and world peace and security will not prevail.

To avoid a free hand being allowed to those who play havoc with the resources of people and the results of their sacrifices, struggles and efforts to attain their goals and legitimate rights, we should like to reaffirm that those who seek unilateral solutions of these problems, neglect to take into account the basic issues and their true dimensions and ignore the demands and sacrifices of the sincere leaders in their liberation struggle, are merely "sowing the wind" to no avail, and they will inevitably reap the whirlwind.

Our century has witnessed numerous popular uprisings in many parts of the world aimed at eliminating imperialism and colonialism as well as rectifying abnormal situations which had prevailed. Progressive régimes have emerged based on popular premises which express the will of the peoples. Those régimes have contributed effectively to the consolidation and development of international relations on a sound basis of sincere values and principles. Those régimes have carved their way in the international field and have contributed to the solution of world problems on a sound basis, seeking radical solutions in accord with the principles for which they have fought. Nevertheless, those régimes have been exposed to imperialist and colonialist attempts, because they constitute a menace to the aims and interests of colonialism, whose objective is to restore its domination of the potential and resources of people. What we have witnessed this year, especially in Africa, is ample proof of that. The system of mercenaries, to which imperialism and colonialism has repeatedly resorted, as it did against the People's Republic of Benin, is one of the base and abject means employed by imperialists and colonialists in their aim of restoring their hegemony over small States.

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

If the Security Council unfortunately fails to find the true aggressors against Benin, this will be attributable to the lack of response and co-operation from the parties concerned. The evidence is clear that there is an intention to use such a method once more. Nevertheless, our battles against imperialism and colonialism, whether they resort to new or old tactics, shall not cease.

The events in the People's Republic of Benin constituted an attempt to dominate its economy and resources, and to subject it to the sphere of foreign monopolies. They are the same kind of attempts that have been made in plots to invade my country, to dominate our resources and wealth and to subject us to the spheres of foreign influence. These are attempts that were reaffirmed by the former Ambassador of the United States to Saudi Arabia, Mr. James E. Akins, in the International Seminar on the Economies of Oil-Producing Countries that was held in Quebec, Canada from 3 to 5 November of this year.

Prior to that attempt, we had witnessed a concentrated propaganda campaign which aimed at preparing American public opinion to accept the notion of invasion. Today, we are also witnessing another propaganda campaign which calls for the invasion and occupation of Libya, on the basis of an argument which maintains that this will help restore security in the region and solve certain of its problems. In fact it is directed at the steadfast position of my country vis à vis the Middle East and Palestine questions. It leads us to believe that there are schemes and conspiracies hatched against the peace and security of my country.

We welcome any international effort which aims at protecting the independence of States and the maintenance of their sovereignty and territorial integrity, and preventing interference in their internal affairs. We also welcome any international effort to reaffirm the

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

proscription of the recourse to force in international relations. And based on this stand, my delegation approved resolution 31/9 adopted by the General Assembly on 12 November 1976 upon the initiative of the Soviet Union. That resolution contained a reaffirmation of these principles and calls for respect and adherence of all Members in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and for a convention to govern the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and the consolidation of the role of the United Nations in the field of the maintenance of peace and security, and especially in the field of disarmament.

We would like to reaffirm this principle as well as other principles stipulated in the Charter, and we must always bear in mind that there are countries which still suffer under the yoke of colonialism and racist régimes, and which have the absolute right to struggle in order to attain their freedom and their right to self-determination, and to realize their objectives in a world where peace and love prevail.

We must also bear in mind the natural right of the countries to defend themselves and the right to regain their territories and those parts of their territories which have been exposed to an international or an alien aggression or invasion.

Peace will not be realized and the implementation of the Declaration on the Consolidation of International Security will not take place so long as the Mediterranean remains the sphere ploughed by military fleets of non-littoral States, States which have no direct link with that sea. Their continued presence constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the region and a menace to its peoples, in addition to polluting its waters and transforming them, after extinguishing all forms of life therein, into a dead sea.

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

We demand that the sea become a lake of peace, a source of security and nutrition, in the service of the peoples of the region, removed from spheres of influence, foreign conflicts and tendencies. Peace will never prevail so long as the banner of the United Nations is exploited to cloak interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people, as a means to sow dissension and dismember the unity and territorial integrity. We also call for the evacuation of all foreign forces from Korea and the deployment of every effort to restore the unity of the Korean people so that they may live in peace and security safe from any foreign intervention.

My delegation views the Soviet initiative in proposing the inscription of a new item on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war, in the framework of genuine efforts for reducing international tension in the world, as being untainted by doubts and reservations which we previously expressed, and falling within the context of the search for radical and equitable solutions for international problems of the day.

Such a search must not take place at the expense of peoples suffering under the yoke of colonialism and racism, but rather in the context of preventing war in all its forms and facets, and with its multiform means and instruments, be they conventional or nuclear. These are the aims we should strive for and attain. We therefore can only pay a tribute to the initiative and reaffirm our positive stand thereon.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm that my country, both inside and outside the framework of the United Nations, strives to enhance and develop its international relations on the basis set forth in the United Nations Charter as well as in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The meetings which take place in my country, whether bilateral or multilateral, and our participation in regional and international gatherings, on the governmental and popular level, testify clearly to our genuine and sincere efforts to put into practice those values and principles to which we adhere and to the implementation of which we commit ourselves.

Mr. HUSSEIN (Sri Lanka): The Sri Lanka delegation has already made a statement on détente when it was under discussion in this Committee earlier as a separate item. I should now like to concentrate on just one aspect of the subject of the "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", namely, the question of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

It has seemed to Sri Lanka that the question of interference has special importance in the era of decolonization, contrary to the misleading view that as most of the former colonies have gained independence the problem of interference has now diminished. On the contrary, it appears that the problem of interference could assume more serious proportions in the post-colonial era. To understand why that could be so, we have to make a distinction between colonialism and imperialism. Under colonialism there is occupation and direct control of a country by a foreign Power, whereas imperialism might be broadly defined as the domination of one country by another without necessarily involving occupation and direct control. For the reason that we can have imperialism without direct control, it seems more than likely that interference could become more important than before in exercising undue influence and domination amounting to imperialism, possibly only through indirect control or possibly only through interference.

We are now approaching the last stages of conventional colonialism as only vestigial colonies are left - apart of course from the special situation prevailing in southern Africa - but the problem of unequal relations, the exercise of undue influence, subtle forms of control and the domination of one country by another can be expected to continue for the foreseeable future.

We have to take into account the fact that whatever might be the legal fictions that we find opportune to adopt, there are in fact wide differences in power between countries - in military, economic and political power - which could lead to unequal relations between States, sometimes amounting to domination. It can hardly be expected therefore that the mere process of decolonization will by itself lead to equal relations in any

(Mr. Hussain, Sri Lanka)

worth-while sense and eliminate the problem of imperialist domination. Instead of the blatant and direct control of colonialism we can have covert and subtle forms of domination in which interference in the internal affairs of States plays a crucial role.

In examining this problem of interference, it seems appropriate to refer briefly to certain widely current notions that appear to be based on assumptions that have to be regarded as imperialist. It is sometimes assumed, for instance, that certain countries are entitled to roles of leadership. But leadership involves unequal relations between the leader and the led which surely could give rise to interference in the attempt to exercise leadership. There is also the notion of "balance of power", which postulates an international order based on a balance between certain countries which are entitled to their "spheres of influence". It should be obvious enough that this notion of "balance of power" assumes a virtual right of interference by certain countries in their "spheres of influence". It certainly seems very strange that this notion of "balance of power", involving equal relations between some States and unequal relations between those States and others, a notion appropriate to the age of Metternich, should be so widely current today when the dynamic thrust in practically every human society is for equality. We thus find that while we are fast approaching the post-colonial era, certain notions that are basically imperialist are widely current, notions that imply a virtual right of interference in the internal affairs of States.

The problem of interference could become more important than ever before also for the reason that we are now living in a world which is becoming increasingly interdependent, so much so that the world of the future has been called the "global village". Human societies are today involved with each other to an extent never before known in history. Probably every State in the world today has an isolationist streak, a desire to be left alone to live at peace with itself, but we all know that isolationism is impossible in the world of today and of the future. It

(Mr. Hussain, Sri Lanka)

seems obvious that in an increasingly interdependent world the opportunities for interference in the internal affairs of States are greater than ever before. It seems possible that the "global village" of the future will become a claustrophobic place in which everyone treads on everyone else's toes, in which there is an increasing desire to fly at each other's throats, unless we are today prepared to confront the problem of unequal relations and imperialism and give due attention to the problem of interference in the internal affairs of States.

I have dealt with the reasons for which the problem of interference has to be regarded as important and why it could become increasingly important in the future. I should next like to suggest that we should take sufficient account of the complexity of this problem. Part of the problem is that interference could take devious and covert forms and therefore prove extremely difficult to control. It is also part of the problem that interference could take multifarious forms, political, economic and military, as well as through the information media, which makes us feel that we are confronted with a many-headed monster. It does not seem necessary to go into details regarding the forms that interference can take as they are only too well known and it seems sufficient therefore to mention only broad categories of interference.

I should like to suggest also that in taking account of the complexity of this problem we bear in mind the question of the distinction between the exercise of legitimate influence by one State on another and interference, as the dividing line between the two may not always be entirely clear. Perhaps we should also bear in mind that the more powerful States which exercise influence on others always regard their activities as legitimate and never amounting to interference. In that connexion we should recognize the fact that it is not only small and weak countries which feel insecure but also the great and powerful ones, a fact which people in the smaller countries find difficult to recognize. For years we have been dismayed by the spectacle of the two greatest Powers in the world today being engaged in an arms race which they are finding difficult if not

(Mr. Hussain, Sri Lanka)

impossible to control, a situation that arises because of their sense of insecurity. That sense of insecurity in their case as well as in other cases can lead to actions which are open to the interpretation that they amount to interference. I should not like to explore this question in any detail as it would take up too much of the Committee's time, but it seems necessary to emphasize that in dealing with the problem of interference in the internal affairs of States we take due account of the complexity of this problem.

Sri Lanka has a special interest in the problem of interference as Chairman of the non-aligned countries. The Colombo Summit Declaration of 1976 affirmed the non-aligned "commitment to the principle of the true independence of States, as distinct from merely formal sovereignty" (A/31/197, annex I, para. 142), and proceeded to state that that means that the non-aligned are opposed to any form of interference in the internal affairs of States. Reference was made to the fact that the Bandung Declaration of 1955 and the principles affirmed by the Non-Aligned Summit Conferences of Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka and Algiers had been emphatic that interference in the internal affairs of States is totally unacceptable. It was also stated in the Colombo Summit Declaration that such interference is inconsistent with the obligations assumed by United Nations Members under the Charter of the United Nations and that the principle of non-interference had been reaffirmed in the United Nations Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.

Consequently, action was initiated by the non-aligned countries leading to the adoption of a resolution on this question at the General Assembly session last year. The adoption of that resolution has historic importance as it was the first time that a General Assembly resolution dealt specifically with the question of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, whereas earlier that question had figured incidentally in resolutions and declarations, even though in an important manner.

(Mr. Hussain, Sri Lanka)

This year also a draft resolution is being introduced under the question of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and it is to be hoped that future sessions of the General Assembly will continue to adopt resolutions on this important subject - important for the reasons I have already given.

In conclusion I should like to emphasize that Sri Lanka has been fortunate enough to be able to cultivate excellent relations with other States, and Sri Lanka is not on this occasion complaining about interference in its internal affairs. However, others have not been so fortunate. In this situation it should be the concern of every Member State of the United Nations to do everything possible to bring about the elimination of interference in the internal affairs of States, as otherwise it is obvious enough that a satisfactory international order can never be established.

Mr. VUKOVIC (Yugoslavia): The question of the relaxation of international tensions has preoccupied the international community for a number of years. Actually, parallel with the start of the cold war and the acceleration of the arms race, particularly of the nuclear weapons race between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the establishment and strengthening of antagonistic military alliances, the idea of the need to overcome such a situation and to adopt a policy of relaxation of tensions as the only alternative to a general conflagration emerged among the non-aligned countries.

From their first meeting in Belgrade in 1961, the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries addressed an appeal to the President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, drawing attention both to the deep concern of the international community over the growing threat posed to international peace and security by the nuclear arms race and to the need for taking measures to eliminate the tensions caused by the cold war. The non-aligned countries demanded that direct negotiations should take place between the two most powerful nations in whose hands lies the key to peace and war and that, thereby, they should lead mankind, through constant negotiations, out of the blind alley in which it finds itself and enable it to live and create in peace and prosperity.

We may note, today, that this line of thinking of the non-aligned countries - which they have constantly supported at their summit conferences and other gatherings - has met with broad support and, in spite of periodic difficulties, constitutes the foundation of the policies of the vast majority of countries and of all progressive forces in the world. A concrete expression of this is also the fact that we are considering this question as a separate item of the agenda on the initiative of the Soviet Union. This should result in general agreement on adopting a declaration of the General Assembly on the deepening and consolidation of the process of relaxation of international tensions.

(Mr. Vukovic, Yugoslavia)

The very title of the agenda item we are now examining shows that the process of relaxation of international tensions is neither stable, nor has it encompassed all the regions of the world and all outstanding international issues. I am not saying anything new when I state that Yugoslavia, together with other non-aligned countries, has been drawing attention to this shortcoming for many years. We have followed with concern the unequal course and different interpretations and application of the policy of relaxation of tensions, its limitation to a narrow circle of countries and a small number of international problems which, although of broad interest, involved most directly the interests of the two leading nuclear Powers.

There is no need for any great amount of wisdom or special effort to notice the contradiction and discrepancies between declarations of attachment to the policy of détente and the practice of individual States, especially of certain great Powers. It is not our intention to analyse these contradictions. What is essential at the present moment, in the view of my delegation, is the fact that all peoples of the world and all States have clearly manifested their interest in, and their desire and need for, the continuation of the process of détente, the extension of this policy to all the regions of the world, and its transformation into a global policy encompassing all key international problems, in the solution of which all the members of the international community should participate on a footing of equality in order to reach solutions in the common interest of mankind. The process of relaxation of tensions, the process of negotiations on all outstanding international problems should thereby assert itself as a permanent practice of all States. Only such a process can result in all peoples and countries enjoying the benefits of détente.

At the Fifth Summit Conference in Colombo, the non-aligned countries devoted a special chapter to the question of relaxation of international tensions. The positions of non-aligned countries, including Yugoslavia, regarding this question were spelt out in the Political Declaration. These positions still reflect the views of my delegation. The Political Declaration of Colombo emphasized the support of non-aligned countries for the results achieved by the policy of the relaxation of tensions and pointed to the

(Mr. Vukovic, Yugoslavia)

shortcomings and limited scope of détente. Unfortunately, we must note this time also that the warnings of the non-aligned countries have not met with sufficient understanding on the part of some international factors and, as a consequence, the efforts exerted by the international community for the purpose of solving outstanding international problems are not yielding the results expected.

We must voice again our concern over the fact that - in spite of the efforts to solve them - crises and focal points of crises still remain unresolved and threaten international peace and security. It is absolutely necessary - and this is also the purport of many efforts of non-aligned and other developing countries whose proposals have been incorporated in a number of United Nations resolutions - to solve crises in a way consistent with the broadest interests of the international community and all the parties concerned. It is only possible to achieve this if such solutions are based on the principles adopted in the United Nations and if they are comprehensive in character.

The forces of imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and other forms of foreign domination, having recourse to various means, including threats and direct use of military force, are trying to prevent the emancipation of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, the Palestinians and other peoples, and to perpetuate the existing relations characterized by inequality and by the denial of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence. The non-aligned countries are still under pressure and exposed to various forms of threats and attempts at interference in their internal affairs. The right of every people to decide its own fate itself without outside interference and to choose its own ways and forms of economic, political and social system and development is not respected. The developing countries are under the constant pressure of unequal and unjust international economic relations, while their efforts to overcome such a situation are not producing the results expected. Particularly disquieting is the absence of substantive results in the field of the limitation of the arms race and disarmament,

particularly nuclear disarmament. In fact, in this sphere we find ourselves in a phase of further deep deterioration of the situation as a result of the sophistication of existing weapons and the development of new weapons and systems of mass destruction.

All this shows how timely and important it is to extend the process of genuine détente to all the regions of the world and to englobe all outstanding international problems, as has been constantly advocated by Yugoslavia and the other non-aligned countries.

(Mr. Vukovic, Yugoslavia)

My country has clearly defined the causes of such a situation. We see them primarily in accumulated contradictions between the great Powers; in various aspects, forms and manifestations of the policy based on the power of arms; in the division of the world into antagonistic military alliances; and in attempts at petrifying that division by consolidating and strengthening military structures along an ascending equilibrium of the forces of nuclear Powers and military alliances, and so forth. Such a policy inevitably leads to rivalry between the great Powers, to attempts at gaining new strongholds, at acquiring new spheres of influence, at suppressing or eliminating the established influence of the other side from a given region, and so forth. All these are causes that lead in a direction opposite to that of the relaxation of international tensions, towards the postponement of the solution of existing problems and the creation of new crises and towards new forms of subjugation and inequality. Herein lies also the cause of attempts to withdraw the solving of outstanding international issues from the United Nations, to conduct negotiations about them in a narrow group of countries and to impose solutions which suit the interests of such a policy.

There is no need to emphasize - and this has been confirmed by the practice of international relations in recent times - that the continuation of such a policy is not likely to result in the long-term stabilization of international relations and the consolidation of the process of détente. A selective approach to the policy of détente does not provide the right answer, nor does it ensure the results achieved so far. That is best illustrated by the situation in Europe where the process of détente has gone the farthest. The absence, for the time being, of new results in some fields of international relations in Europe, especially in the sphere of the limitation and reduction of armaments and armed forces and the resistance to expanding the process of détente in Europe to the region of the Mediterranean and the Middle East, as well as the resistance to the proposal of the non-aligned and neutral countries participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to the effect that the same policy should be applied to non-European countries, point to the weakness of this process.

(Mr. Vukovic, Yugoslavia)

This morning we had the opportunity to hear Mr. Hoveyda and to get acquainted with the new draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of détente. My delegation welcomes Mr. Hoveyda's effort. The first reading of this draft has left a favourable impression. It contains, of course, some views which do not correspond to the views of my delegation and that is, I believe, also the case of many other delegations. We shall study this new text with due care, endeavouring to contribute to its improvement and adoption by consensus.

Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago): The adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations gave renewed hope to millions the world over that greater efforts would be made in ensuing years to realize the universal goal of peace and security of all nations. That Declaration not only reaffirmed the continuing validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter as the political foundation of inter-State relations in the post Second World War era, but also recognized that failure by States to abide strictly by the purposes and principles of the Charter in international relations could lead to consequences far graver than mankind has previously experienced. We are of the firm view that peace and security can only be realized if all States renounce the use of force as an instrument of national policy, cease violating the territorial integrity or political independence of States and undertake to resolve differences which may arise between them through peaceful means; if they would conduct their relations on the basis of respect for the sovereign equality of States and desist from interfering in the internal affairs of other States in keeping with the prohibition recognized in Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. The conditioning by each State of its foreign policy on these norms would result in a safer and more secure world for each Member State.

Peace is not illusory. It can be made a reality in every part of the globe. Peace, as we had occasion to point out at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly during the elaboration of this Declaration,

(Mr. Abdullah, Trinidad and Tobago)

means to us the absence of tension, the existence of goodwill, the intention to promote the betterment of humanity in the long run as against short term, selfish advantages. It means that fear must depart and be replaced by hope. It means that the thousands of millions spent on armaments, can and should be directed towards economic, social and cultural development. It means the freedom to pursue one's particular way of life, without the fear of molestation or external aggression in any form. Such a climate in international affairs has become an imperative necessity if future generations are to avoid the enormous sacrifices in human life and material resources that open hostility engenders. Development of their mutual relations on the basis of the strict observance of the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations contained in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), as well as the early implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties, would go a long way towards the establishment of such a climate.

If peace is not illusory, neither is it divisible. While some progress has been achieved towards this goal, such as the relaxation of tensions in Europe, détente to be both effective as well as meaningful must be extended to all parts of the world, particularly to the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America where the infringement of national sovereignty, the commission of acts of aggression, violations of territorial integrity and interference in internal affairs are most persistent and widespread. The prompt and permanent elimination of these manifestations of a former political order would most certainly constitute a further strengthening of international peace and security.

Southern Africa and the Middle East continue to pose a serious threat to international peace and security. The recent military attack - a totally disproportionate act of retaliation - carried out in the past week by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia across the border in Mozambique resulted in the death of hundreds, including women and children. That provocative and ruthless act by the illegal minority régime, together with the continuing

BHS/kd

A/C.1/32/PV.54
49-50

(Mr. Abdulah, Trinidad and Tobago)

brutal violence and massive repression being carried out against the black peoples of South Africa and Namibia, violates the purposes and principles of the Charter and must be countered by effective international action which would ensure respect by those intransigent régimes for the fundamental human rights and freedoms of the individual as well as for the principle of the equal rights and self-determination of all peoples. In the Middle East, my delegation notes the efforts at present being undertaken towards reconvening the Geneva Peace Conference and the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

(Mr. Abdulah, Trinidad and Tobago)

In the attainment of international peace and security, the Security Council is called upon to play a central role, since it bears the primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. The generality of the membership does, however, possess some responsibility for these matters, as is indicated in Articles 10, 11, 12 and 14 of the Charter. The injudicious use of the veto in the Security Council has frequently minimized the effectiveness of that organ in the discharge of its weighty responsibilities, thereby lowering its esteem in the eyes of many. We remain concerned, moreover, that decisions of that body which were unanimously adopted have remained unimplemented, resulting in the prolongation of tension in several parts of the world. Only by the effective functioning of the Security Council, together with scrupulous respect for its decisions, can the international community hope to achieve a measure of order commensurate with the demands of peoples the world over for a peaceful existence.

We cannot afford to be complacent about international peace and security, since the consequences of insecurity and tension in an over-armed world are too ghastly to contemplate. The international community has devised a blueprint for building and maintaining a just and secure world, namely, the Charter of this Organization, and what is now required of us is the political will to breathe life into the inert purposes and principles of the Charter so as to transform them into a living reality.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In the past few days we have heard some statements from Mr. Young, the representative of the United States, one to the Harvard Club, another in a television broadcast, and one this morning in the Committee. In each of these statements Mr. Young has repeated attacks on Cuba based on falsehood and on fallacious

(Mr. Alarcon, Cuba)

and demagogic interpretations. He knows he is lying and he knows exactly why he must do so. Since he was appointed to his present post Mr. Young has done a great deal of talking. He has done so in the United Nations but mainly outside. Sometimes his words have gained him great headlines in the newspapers. Sometimes his words would appear to have scandalized the racists and colonialists, particularly when on more than one occasion he offered an interpretation of African events that varied notably from what he is now trying to present to us.

Every day what Mr. Young says now is less like what Mr. Young was saying the day before. Perhaps he knows the reason for all this, but lately the United States Administration and its spokesman seem far more concerned with satisfying the more reactionary sectors of United States opinion than with keeping a responsible and honest stance in international affairs, particularly with regard to Africa. His initial style, the one he adopted when he first came here, was more in keeping with his earlier attitude before he joined the Washington bureaucracy, an attitude which linked him to the struggle of the American blacks and to those people in this country who are concerned about world peace. That style coincided at the time with the interests of United States imperialism which wanted to create a new image for itself in the eyes of the African people. That imperialism wanted to make us forget that it was the financial, political and military support of Washington that had allowed colonialism, apartheid and racism to survive in Africa and elsewhere. However, facts are far more powerful than demagogy. Using sweet words and devious manoeuvres, the United States is concerned only with preserving the interests of the white settlers in Rhodesia and in South Africa. It is trying to confuse and divide the African people. It is endeavouring to perpetuate the insidious exploitation imposed by their monopolies over those people and thus continue to derive benefits from racial and colonial oppression.

(Mr. Alarcon, Cuba)

That is why Mr. Young today forgot to speak of injustice and of the repression suffered by the African people. That is why he omitted any reference to the brutal aggressions of the Salisbury régime against the people of Mozambique that have caused hundreds of deaths in recent days. That is why he said nothing about the terror imposed by the racists on the people of Namibia. He preferred to interfere in matters that are no concern of his. He preferred to insult certain African States, and he did so by distorting the facts, denying the truth and openly and knowingly telling lies. Unfortunately, however, by adopting that stance Mr. Young seems to be following an ancient tradition of United States diplomacy, a tradition that consists of two parts: one is to lie blatantly and the other is to talk too much. The first part had its deplorable manifestation in Adlai Stevenson, who saw his reputation as a serious and liberal intellectual shattered when his Government forced him to lie to this very Committee by having him deny Yankee responsibility for the aggression against Cuba in April 1961 which, nevertheless, had to be openly and publicly recognized a few hours later by the then President of the United States himself. Of the second part there was a more recent example. We still have fresh in our memories the impassioned defence of the South African régime with which we were regaled daily by Mr. Moynihan, when he was making use of the forum of the United Nations to seek unworthy electoral advantages for himself. Mr. Young obviously is free to choose his own destiny but he might not be wasting his time if he were to think a little more before speaking. It would be unfortunate if his dazzling political career were to end in debasing his name to that of a mere emulator of his notorious predecessors.

Mr. NABETA (Uganda): This morning we heard the representative of the United States make reference to Uganda as one of those turbulent societies which can cause an escalation of tension, the spread of conflict and which can lead to unnecessary loss of life. I would first like to state that the false and malicious allegations made by the representative of the United States against my country are totally irrelevant to the item under discussion, and those allegations which have been made out of context are in themselves testimony to the manner in which the United States has repeatedly interfered in the internal affairs of numerous developing and other countries around the world.

To put the record straight, I should like to advise the representative of the United States and the Committee that Uganda is a law-abiding, peace-loving nation which seeks military assistance for the sole purpose of defending its borders and territory against such wanton attacks as occurred in 1972 and 1976. It continues to seek economic and other assistance for nation-building purposes and has not at any time used the weapons at its disposal for an attack on another territory nor to interfere in other countries' internal affairs. Neither does it maintain bases and other things that are available to the United States abroad.

The United States has in the past interfered in several countries' internal affairs and continues to do so for the purpose of creating unrest and civil strife, elements which are not conducive to a peaceful world. At the same time it continues to manufacture and export large quantities of arms, not to mention the very high levels of sophistication of those weapons. It has therefore threatened the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of much of the world and cannot, accordingly, be true to its word of seeking genuine peace and disarmament. Accordingly, it cannot pose as the guardian or champion of peace and security throughout the world. At the same time it urges other countries to assist African and other countries in the task of nation-building rather than contributing to the escalation of death and destruction. And yet what has the world witnessed in recent years?

(Mr. Nabeta, Uganda)

Which country has disrupted and continues to disrupt the different social, economic and other systems so far established? What has the United States to offer in terms of helping to reduce tension and the spread of conflict? Is it in southern Africa? Is it in the Middle East - to name a few?

The statements by the representative of the United States that his country seeks genuine peace and security are therefore false and deceptive and lack sincerity in this and other forums. If the ultimate goal is world peace, security, love and understanding among peoples and nations of the world, the United States should justify itself by concrete actions and not deceive the world by paying mere lip service to the whole concept.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.