



LIBRARY

DEC 15 1984

FIRST COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Thursday, 6 December 1984
at 10 a.m.
New York

LIBRARY

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTIETH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 67: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 68: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 69: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 143: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF STATE TERRORISM AND ANY ACTIONS BY STATES AIMED AT UNDERMINING THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM IN OTHER SOVEREIGN STATES (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 DC2-250, 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.1/39/PV.60
10 December 1984
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 67 TO 69 and 143 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. GROOT (Denmark): My delegation can of course fully subscribe to the statement by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the Ten. Not least, I wish to associate myself with his remarks concerning the vital role of the Security Council. As a member of the Council in the near future, Denmark will do its utmost to contribute to strengthening its authority in maintaining international peace and security. In this context may I express my Government's gratitude for the overwhelming support of Member States in electing us to the Council. We are fully aware that this support puts heavy obligations and responsibilities upon us. No effort will be spared to honour them.

The First Committee has for several weeks discussed arms control and disarmament, and we have adopted a considerable number of draft resolutions on those questions. It is the earnest hope of my Government that our work will contribute to progress towards our ultimate goal: general and complete disarmament.

In all our endeavours to achieve this goal we must not overlook the fact that the arms race - though in itself causing international tension - is to an even higher degree a symptom of conflicting international policies and lack of mutual trust among nations. We must unite in endeavouring to remove misunderstandings, prejudices, mistrust and misinformation and, in spite of differing ideologies, find ways and means to live peacefully on our globe. Only then will progress towards disarmament become a reality.

In this respect, an overwhelming responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Soviet Union and the United States. They have the capacity to destroy each other many times over and the rest of the world as well. The consequences of a conflict between them would be so serious that there is no room whatsoever for miscalculations, human errors or technological faults. Security for us all can be achieved only through comprehensive and patient international co-operation. We must build up mutual trust among ourselves.

My Government is grateful to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union for having agreed to meet in January 1985 to start talks on a number of issues of vital importance to us all. We recognize that they have a long way to

(Mr. Groot, Denmark)

go and that there will be many stumbling blocks, but we urge them to overcome such obstacles. We pray that patience and the will to mutual understanding will prevail in their talks.

As a sponsor of the amendments in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1, concerning the concept of so-called State terrorism, for which there is no legal definition, my delegation hopes that those proposals will command wide support in the Committee.

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly has entered its final stage in this year's deliberations. We can expect many positive results serving to reduce the danger of nuclear war and safeguard international security. The work of this Committee - the comprehensive discussions, the consideration of manifold problems and the constant consultations and talks between representatives - has contributed decisively to those results.

All those forces in the world that honestly seek peace and are guided by common sense and realism are encouraged by this approach in their endeavours to implement the most fundamental human right of peoples, the right to peace.

There is growing anticipation by the peoples of an important historic event - the fortieth anniversary of the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition, the end of the Second World War and, closely linked with it, the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. As one reflects on that forthcoming event, especially in view of the present tense international situation, there come to mind those purposes and principles on which the United Nations is based: the joint struggle of the peoples against war and fascism and the resulting readiness to unite all efforts for the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international security.

An essential lesson of the Second World War - that basic contradictions in the world do not exclude a joint interest of States in seeking peace and that war must be combated before weapons are used - is today more important and topical than ever before for the future of mankind.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The international situation has been considerably aggravated by the attitude of the most aggressive imperialist circles, above all the United States, and the danger of war has increased. With the deployment of Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe they have ushered in a new and particularly perilous phase of the arms race and exposed peace to the most serious threat since the end of the Second World War.

Regrettably, a situation has developed that was predicted and warned of a year ago: Although there are more missiles in Europe now, there is less security there. The tensions in the international arena have not diminished, but have increased.

In view of this dangerous development the German Democratic Republic considers it most important, now more than ever before, to do everything to avert the danger of a nuclear inferno, to achieve a return to détente, to engage in a political dialogue in this spirit and to reach agreement on concrete measures to limit and diminish armaments in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, as was recently outlined by the Head of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker. It is along those lines that the German Democratic Republic will continue to advocate a world-wide coalition of common sense and realism in order effectively to oppose the insane policy of nuclear-arms build-up threatening all mankind.

On the occasion of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of my country, I would like to reaffirm that the peace policy of the German Democratic Republic has always been marked by continuity and determination. It has always been and will continue to be predictable and reliable. In view of the dangerously aggravated international situation, the foreign and defence policy of the German Democratic Republic is determined, today more than ever before, by the principle that everything must be done in order that never again can war start from German soil.

The main contents of the constructive programme of the socialist community of States for the maintenance of peace do not lie in confrontation and arms build-up but in equitable co-operation among States, the cessation of the arms race and disarmament and the solution of international conflicts by peaceful negotiations. This position was once again reaffirmed at the meeting of the Committee of Foreign

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty held in Berlin a few days ago, on 3 and 4 December. The communiqué of that meeting, which will be circulated as an official document of the United Nations, states, inter alia:

"What is required is serious dialogue on an equal footing between States having different social systems; what is needed is negotiations in which the parties involved will be aware of their high responsibility and will seek positive results. The Warsaw Treaty States are ready for such negotiations, and they urge that these be held with a view to reaching agreements that are based on the principle of equality and equal security. Their proposals on ways of halting the arms race and preventing a war remain on the table."

The socialist States are consistent advocates of an enhanced role for the United Nations in safeguarding peace and strengthening international security. In co-operation with the majority of States, they have made their contribution in a business-like and constructive manner at the thirty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly to solving the key issues in present-day international relations.

The socialist States have submitted proposals aimed at curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field, eliminating hotbeds of crisis or conflicts in various regions of the world through negotiations and establishing a new international economic order. They are directed against the policy of interference in the internal affairs of States and against all actions designed to undermine the socio-political system in other States.

Nothing would better serve lasting international peace and security than the drastic reduction of the means of warfare, in particular in the nuclear field, with strict observance of military and strategic parity. Over the last few decades such parity has preserved peace for mankind. Together with its friends, the German Democratic Republic cannot allow it to be destroyed. We have never been supporters of a balance of deterrence and never will be in the future. In the age of nuclear weapons international security cannot be guaranteed on a national scale and, above all, not at another's cost. What is imperative is to respect the security interests of all sides.

At the most recent meeting of their Foreign Ministers the Warsaw Treaty States, the German Democratic Republic among them, welcomed the decision of the Soviet Union and the United States to enter into new negotiations with a view to

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

reaching mutually acceptable agreements on the entire complex of questions concerning nuclear and space weapons. In the words of their communiqué, they favour:

"the identification, from the very outset and in unmistakable terms, of the subject and aims of these negotiations, which are called upon to enhance strategic stability, avert the militarization of outer space and lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe and the world at large through the reduction of nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range, until they are completely eliminated."

The course being pursued by the most aggressive circles of imperialism is, as they themselves admit, aimed at military superiority and world domination directed at the elimination of socialism and the liquidation of the national and social liberation movement of the peoples.

The intensification of the politics of force and diktat by the imperialist circles creates new tensions in all regions of the world. Such circles arrogate to themselves the role of world policeman and will attempt anything to prevent peoples from embarking on their own path to development. Thus, that policy casts a shadow over all regions of the world. It complicates the peaceful solution of problems, whether in southern Africa or in the Middle East, in South-East Asia or in Central America and the Caribbean.

The present military demonstrations of power against Nicaragua have aroused alarm and indignation among the peoples of the world because they are directed against the sovereignty and independence of that State and against the right to self-determination of the people of Nicaragua. As was revealed in the General Assembly and the Security Council, the plans of aggression against Nicaragua, modelled on the heinous invasion of Grenada, have already been set up, and their implementation has been begun.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The Sandinist Front of National Liberation, which a few weeks ago won an overwhelming victory in free and democratic elections, and the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua are to be forcibly overthrown by intervention and the Sandinist revolution is to be stifled. That course undermines the peace process in the region and constitutes in addition a serious threat to international peace and security. The German Democratic Republic supports the constructive proposals made by Nicaragua as well as the activities of the States of the Contadora Group which are aimed at the peaceful settlement of the conflicts in the region by way of negotiations.

The development of the situation in the Middle East illustrates ever more clearly that a solution of the conflict in accordance with United Nations resolutions can be reached only by way of negotiations, with the participation of all sides concerned. The German Democratic Republic therefore emphatically advocates the speedy convening of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole and legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. Such a conference would also give tangible impetus to strengthening international peace and security. The German Democratic Republic urges the immediate implementation of the relevant United Nations decisions for normalizing the situation in southern Africa, in particular the granting of independence to Namibia under resolution 435 (1978).

In our epoch, with the existence of States having different social systems, peace and international security can be guaranteed only by peaceful coexistence. That is the only reasonable alternative to confrontation and a nuclear inferno. For us, peaceful coexistence means - contrary to the Pentagon concept, where peace is designated as a permanent pre-hostility situation - peacefully working together and joint efforts by all States to solve the key issues of our time in the interest of securing a peaceful future for mankind. It should be emphasized here once again that for the socialist States this is not a question of tactics but rather the constant socialist peace strategy.

The forthcoming tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Final Act of Helsinki and the positive experience gained in applying its principles in the 1970s should strengthen our confidence that States having different social orders are able to establish relations which are characterized by normalcy, trust and understanding and by mutual advantage. Concepts that call in question the frontiers existing

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

between the European States and their socio-political systems, as well as other political and territorial realities that came into existence after the Second World War, are not in keeping with such relations.

Today more than ever before it takes political will to acknowledge the realities in Europe and in the world and to co-operate in the interest of peace and security by dialogue. To banish the danger of war, to eliminate existing hotbeds of tension and to prevent new ones - in short to make the international situation healthy again - requires today that States undertake increased efforts to give substance to the political and legal foundations of peaceful coexistence. The Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace are directed towards those objectives. Other relevant documents in this connection are the proposal of the Soviet Union on the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force and the conclusion of a treaty on the renunciation of the use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the Member States of the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The conclusion of such treaties would constitute an important step towards bringing about a turn for the better in international relations. That would be a weighty contribution in the year of the fortieth anniversaries of the victory of the peoples of the United Nations over Hitlerite fascism and of the founding of the United Nations, to restore in international relations a climate of confidence, mutual respect and understanding. Especially in the fortieth year of the victory over fascism it is the obligation of peoples and Governments to make increased efforts for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express thanks and appreciation to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. de Souza e Silva, for his active, fruitful and dedicated work. We greatly value his personal contribution to achieving positive results in our Committee. Our thanks go to all the officers of the Committee and to all staff members of the Secretariat for their comprehensive work.

Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): I should like to address the issue of the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. We feel that this is a very important issue and note that it is being considered for the second time as a separate item on the agenda of the General Assembly. Consideration of numerous questions relating to that region in the United Nations

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

can only contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the problems and to their solution in the interests of all.

Throughout the centuries the Mediterranean Sea has been viewed as one of the most important areas in the world. On the shores of the Mediterranean have sprung up some of the richest civilizations mankind has ever known. The strategic significance of the region has been recognized by many nations. We therefore feel that the United Nations should be constantly engaged in the search for new forms of regional and international co-operation to bring stability and peace and, above all, to improve equitable co-operation in all fields. That certainly cannot be achieved overnight. However, recently there have been important events indicating that genuine strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region can be brought about only by unswerving commitment to those goals.

The Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries met at the level of foreign ministers at the beginning of September at Valletta, in Malta. They adopted the Valletta Declaration, which we feel contains a significant contribution to that commitment, and expressed their determination to continue with their efforts aimed at promoting co-operation and strengthening security in the Mediterranean region.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The meeting at Valletta was the result of a non-aligned action that lasted over a decade. From the Ministerial Conference in Georgetown, Guyana, in 1972 to the Seventh Conference in New Delhi last year, the non-aligned countries have been calling attention to the situation in the Mediterranean, proposing initiatives and actions aimed at overcoming and removing tensions and seeking just solutions to crises.

The non-aligned countries have also endeavoured to foster co-operation among Mediterranean countries.

The neutral and non-aligned States participating in the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, proceeding from the close interdependence that exists between the security of Europe and that of the Mediterranean, have succeeded in including the Mediterranean dimension in the complex of European security.

The Valletta Declaration highlights the concept of overall Mediterranean co-operation. It is aimed at overcoming divisions which are the result of extra-Mediterranean factors, of historic controversies and of complex heritage and is in full accordance with the principles and goals of the policy of non-alignment.

The principles of the policy of non-alignment are an indispensable basis for the peace, security and equitable co-operation of the peoples and countries in the region. There can be no peace without self-determination, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of others and without respect for sovereignty, integrity and independence. There can be no peace either without the rejection of outside pressures and resistance to attempts to impose dependence, neo-colonialism and foreign domination.

The Mediterranean is not only one very important component of the exacerbated global situation, but it also reflects all the dangerous developments in the world. Points of crises are flaring up and conflicts are going on with serious consequences for the Middle East, for Europe and for the world at large.

It is a region burdened by the stockpiling of military weapons, the presence of foreign forces and recently ever more nuclear weapons. The non-aligned countries are exposed to neo-colonialist pressures, foreign interference, military intervention and occupation, as well as attacks on their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The exacerbation of the existing crises and the continued eruption of new conflicts pose a direct threat to peace and security in the region. Foremost among these is the crisis in the Middle East, which - owing to the expansionist policy of Israel - constitutes the major source of tension not only in the immediate area but well beyond.

Without a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Middle East crisis and of the Palestinian question there can be neither peace nor security in the Mediterranean.

Such a solution can be reached only on the basis of the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967 and after; realization of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to a State of their own; and the right of all countries and peoples in the region to peace and security within internationally recognized borders. Full support to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, should be expressed as well as unreserved solidarity with the aspirations of the Palestinian people towards preserving and strengthening the unity and independence of the PLO.

The case of Lebanon is an inseparable part of the Middle East crisis and a glaring example of the use of force and occupation. There can be no peace without an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from this country and without full support for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of Lebanon.

There can be no peace in Cyprus without the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned status of the Republic of Cyprus, based on the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the decisions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

We feel it is necessary to undertake the broadest international action in order to find a just solution for these crises.

The interdependence of the security of the Mediterranean and that of Europe is evident. It is therefore necessary to continue the efforts towards implementing the decisions of Helsinki and Madrid in their entirety - that is, in the security, economic and humanitarian fields - in the Mediterranean region as well. Our goal is that the confidence- and security-building measures currently being discussed at the Stockholm Conference will also encompass the Mediterranean.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The focus of the action for strengthening security in the Mediterranean should be the creation of conditions for the maintenance of peace, confidence-building and strengthening of co-operation among the Mediterranean countries and, above all, the settlement of the instances of crisis in that area.

It is evident that stability in the Mediterranean and the security of the countries on its shores cannot be maintained on the basis of bloc division or by solutions imposed from outside. Therefore, it is necessary that the Mediterranean countries become active in seeking solutions which can be based only on respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and the policy of non-alignment.

At the same time, it should be remembered that there are results and examples in this region which prove that the Mediterranean is an area where it is not only possible, but also indispensable, to build relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and mutual trust.

The all-round co-operation of the Mediterranean countries, above all in the economic sphere but also in science, technology, human environment, culture and art, tourism, sport and so forth, would be an essential component for the establishment of new relations in the Mediterranean and an important element for détente on a broader basis.

It is important to bear in mind the mutual dependence and complementarity of the economic life and development of all countries of the Mediterranean region with the countries of Europe, the Middle East, North Africa and Asia. In that sense co-operation among all these countries should be intensified not only through the existing institutions but also through new initiatives and forms of co-operation of an all-Mediterranean character. One such form is the example of the recent seminar held in Venice, Italy.

Thus, in the long-term perspective, the differences in the development of European and littoral Mediterranean countries would be lessened, the principle of equality of nations affirmed to a greater extent, mutual trust and understanding strengthened and the inequity in the relations between those countries substantially narrowed.

These trends leading to a situation in which the Mediterranean peoples themselves would decide on Mediterranean issues should be further encouraged. This would be an outstanding contribution to world peace. The United Nations offers an irreplaceable framework for the achievement of that goal.

Mr. NATORF (Poland): The phenomenon of State terrorism is certainly, if regrettably, not a very recent discovery. We have been witnessing for years now numerous regional and local conflicts in which besides resorting - occasionally or quite often, as the case may be - to regular full-scale warfare the policy of State terrorism has been frequently applied, in particular by the more powerful States against their weaker adversaries. This has been especially evident in southern Africa, the Middle East and Central America. What has made this even more alarming is the fact that those instances usually involved attacks against developing countries with the aim of preventing them from exercising their inalienable right freely to determine and develop their political, social and economic systems or were linked to the implementation of racist and neo-colonialist policies.

The situation is obviously serious enough to warrant close examination by the General Assembly in order to arrive at effective preventive measures, in particular since we have been confronted of late by a dramatic increase in the number of acts of State terrorism in virtually all parts of the world.

Addressing the General Assembly on 28 September, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Andrei Gromyko, stated, inter alia:

"We propose that the United Nations resolutely condemn the policy and practice of State terrorism as a method of dealing with other countries and peoples. It is necessary to renounce any action aimed at changing or undermining by force the social systems of sovereign States, destabilizing and overthrowing their legitimate Governments, or initiating military action to that end on any pretext whatsoever, and to halt any such action already in progress." (A/39/PV.15, p. 3-5)

One cannot but fully subscribe to that position, in particular when only a few months earlier persons either belonging or being close to the Government of a very powerful State expressed opinions that in some cases it was moral to attempt to destroy a sovereign State, their Government could not practise "unilateral compliance" with rules of international law and the provisions of the United Nations Charter forbidding the use of military force were not a "suicide pact".

The belief that State terrorism is an important problem of the contemporary world and that it constitutes, in addition to individual and group terrorism, a specific kind of international terrorism, has been reflected in the United Nations in the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

The validity of this approach has likewise been confirmed by scholars representing different political and ideological schools of legal thought. For instance, in 1974 the American Society of International Law expressed the opinion that a future convention on terrorism should condemn, at least in its preamble, State terrorism, referring to appropriate international legal documents in this field.

Numerous otherwise extremely important United Nations 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 Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, to name but a few - have either referred to the phenomenon of State terrorism in a very general manner by merely condemning it or approached it in a narrow and selective way, banning expressis verbis only some of its specific forms and manifestations, such as organizing or assisting in the organization and sending by or on behalf of a State of armed bands, groups, irregulars or mercenaries; organizing, instigating, assisting and participation by a State in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State; organizing, instigating, assisting, financing or tolerating subversive, terrorist or armed activities aimed at overthrowing the Government or interfering in a civil war in another State; as well as carrying out any defamatory campaign, vilification or hostile propaganda for the purpose of intervening or interfering in the internal affairs of other States. A good case in point would likewise be General Assembly resolution 38/130, in particular paragraphs 3 and 4. The fullest listing of acts of State terrorism is contained in the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, prepared by the International Law Commission and submitted to the General Assembly in 1954.

The unique value of the Soviet proposal contained in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 lies in the fact that it approaches the issue of State terrorism in a very comprehensive manner, points out both the causes and effects of this phenomenon on the plane of international relations and undertakes to define the notion of State terrorism. Its operative provisions are a detailed elaboration of the statement in the fourth preambular paragraph that:

"... the interests of maintaining peace require that relations between States, regardless of ideological differences, should be based on strict observance of the Charter of the United Nations as well as generally recognized principles and norms of international relations..."

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

That is a very simple and succinct restatement of the most fundamental tenet of contemporary international intercourse.

Operative paragraph 2 shows that the aim of State terrorism is a forcible change in or the undermining of the socio-political system of sovereign States and the destabilization and overthrow of their legitimate Governments. Operative paragraph 3 states in an implicit way that another aim of State terrorism could also be preventing peoples from freely choosing their socio-political system and pursuing independent political, economic, social and cultural development. The catalogue of means that could be used for the attainment of those aims is quite broad and encompasses all outside actions, including military ones, and all forms of external interference.

Such a broad and yet very precise definition of State terrorism enables us to note that it is incompatible with the following principles of international law.

First, the principle of the non-use of force, and in particular the prohibition of the use of military force and other forms of coercion, as well the prohibition of the threat of the use of force - Article 2 (4) of the Charter.

Secondly, the principle of sovereign equality, which means that: (a) States are equal before the law; (b) each State enjoys rights inherent in the notion of full sovereignty; (c) the personality of each State should be respected with regard to both its territorial integrity and its political independence; (d) States should discharge in good faith their international duties and obligations; (e) each State has the right freely to choose and develop its political, social and economic system; and (f) all States are equal members of the international community, regardless of differences of a political, economic, social or other nature - Article 2 (1) of the Charter.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

Third is the principle of non-interference in internal affairs of States. The prohibition of such interference stems from the above-mentioned principle of sovereign equality, that is, from Article 2, paragraph 1, and also from paragraph 7 of the same Article in so far as the relations between the United Nations and its Member States are concerned, and it simply means that no State or group of States has the right to interfere directly or indirectly in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference constitute a violation of international law.

Fourthly, the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, stemming from Articles 1, paragraph 2, and 55 of the Charter, which today is a statutory norm of international law. Under the provisions of article 1, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the analogous provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, all peoples have the right to self-determination and by virtue of that right determine their own political status and freely shape and pursue their economic, social and cultural life.

In the light of the above, it is crystal clear that, dangerous as it already is in political terms, the policy of State terrorism also constitutes a flagrant and gross violation of international law.

The increasingly more frequent instances of State terrorism I mentioned at the beginning, including military actions which pose a particularly serious threat to world peace, and its elevation to the rank of State policy make its unequivocal condemnation fully justified and timely. The Soviet initiative is therefore an important step towards counteracting dangerous concepts based on use of force and blackmail in international relations and aiming at protecting actual and potential victims of State terrorism, that is, a great number of small and medium-sized States, most of them developing countries. If implemented, it could prevent a further worsening of the international situation and contribute to the strengthening of international peace, security and legal order.

We therefore unreservedly support the Soviet proposal on the inadmissibility of State terrorism and consequently will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. MUTZELBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation would like to discuss agenda item 143 entitled, according to the wish of its sponsor, "Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States".

We have very carefully examined draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 submitted on this item. The seriousness both of the subject matter under consideration and of the sponsor of the draft resolution do not allow of superficial treatment. In the course of this examination a rather considerable number of questions arose, questions which we believe require further in-depth consideration.

Yesterday, the representative of Singapore speaking also for a number of non-aligned delegations, raised very many of the questions which troubled our minds. He outlined in particular the problems which the central notions contained in A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 create for the fundamental principle of self-determination. It is hardly possible to add to his comprehensive and compelling analysis in this regard. I should like to add - in an exemplary manner - to his questions just one more, to elucidate the doubtfulness of the notion of "State terrorism" as defined by the concept of "actions aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other States" against the background of the principle of self-determination. My question is: are actions of States aimed at the abolishment of apartheid not actions "aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other States"? Do they, therefore, per se, constitute State terrorism?

Since previous speakers, notably the representative of Singapore, have said all there is to say with respect to the relationship between the principle of self-determination and the present draft resolution, may I be allowed to take a more thorough look at the relationship between another fundamental principle of international law, namely, the principle of non-intervention and this draft resolution. If we understand the intentions of the sponsor of this item correctly, document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 focuses on one specific sub-case prohibited by, in particular, the principle of non-intervention. Let me underline, should there be any doubts, that we do indeed condemn all actions contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the friendly relations Declaration, including those undermining the socio-political system of other States. We are, however, concerned that out of the very wide range of application of the principle of non-intervention only one particular sub-case is singled out, whereas other sub-cases, some of which

(Mr. Mutzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

might be of an even more serious nature, are left out. Let me underline the comprehensive nature of the principle of non-intervention by quoting its definition in the friendly relations Declaration:

"No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference" - I stress, all other forms of interference - "or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are in violation of international law.

"No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind. Also, no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist" - and I stress again, terrorist - "or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State.

"The use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity constitutes a violation of their inalienable rights and of the principle of non-intervention.

"Every State has an inalienable right to choose its political, economic, social and cultural systems, without interference" - again the notion of interference - "in any form by another State.

"Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs shall be construed as affecting the relevant provisions of the Charter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security." (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex)

In view of this very comprehensive definition, we fail, in all frankness, and contrary to the view just expressed by the representative of Poland, to see one single case alluded to in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 which would not be covered by this comprehensive definition.

Focusing on only one or a few aspects of this comprehensive principle can in our view only encourage the neglect of other aspects and will thus tend to cast doubt on the comprehensive nature of the principle itself.

(Mr. Mutzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

This concern is compounded by the notion central to the definition of the so-called phenomenon of State terrorism contained in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1, namely, the notion of "actions undertaken with a view to undermining the socio-political system of other States".

This notion cannot be found in the Charter or in the friendly relations Declaration, which, in internationally agreed upon language, define so clearly the principle of non-intervention. Is the concept of "undermining the socio-political system" meant to replace or to re-interpret the contents, totally or partly, of the principle of non-intervention? What does undermining mean? Revolutionary activities? Counter-revolutionary activities? Activities directed against a Government? Activities directed against a people exercising its right to self-determination? Is "undermining" only possible with respect to States having a different ideology, but not, however, in relations between States of a similar ideology, as the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution seems to suggest?

(Mr. Mutzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In sum, we are concerned that selective interpretations of generally accepted principles of international law, combined with vague notions open to subjective interpretations, jeopardize the comprehensive nature of vital principles of international law as well as the balance existing between them. In doing so, they tend to erode the rule of law in international relations, which will, of course, have detrimental effects on the security of all States, and in particular of small States.

As the representative of Singapore has pointed out, the problems posed by this resolution cannot be deemed to constitute an issue between East and West or North and South. Indeed, they concern all those who insist on the rule of law and the integrity of fundamental principles of the Charter.

Allow me now, on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 - Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland - briefly to comment on the amendments. Their aim - more precisely, their sole intention - is to reintroduce into the text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 the agreed language of both the Charter and the friendly relations Declaration in order to safeguard the integrity of those instruments.

The purpose of the amendment in paragraph 1 of document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 is to reaffirm all the obligations of States that are relevant in the context of the draft resolution before us.

The suggestion in paragraph 2, to delete in the first preambular paragraph of resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 the part which reads:

"particularly with a view to undermining the socio-political system of States" has been amply explained.

As to the two amendments contained in paragraph 3, the first suggestion, to replace the words "ideological differences" in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution by the word "ideologies" is intended to ensure that the principles and norms of international relations apply not only to States of different ideologies, but also between States sharing the same or similar ideologies.

(Mr. Mutzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The second suggestion attempts, again, to avoid the selection of only some of the principles that deserve mention. As the reissued version of resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 indicates, by inserting the words "inter alia" the sponsor of the resolution, too, seems to agree with the assessment that the principles mentioned there are but some of the more important ones. Obviously, other principles have been omitted, such as the principle of sovereign equality of States and that of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The amendment in paragraph 4 reflects a consequential change.

The change suggested in paragraph 5 aims at replacing the controversial notion of "State terrorism" by an implicit reference to the friendly relations Declaration, which, in defining its principle of non-intervention, calls on States not to organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate terrorist activities.

The amendments suggested in paragraphs 6 and 7 aim at replacing vague or controversial concepts by reference to the notion of "intervention".

In concluding, may I express the hope that all those who share with us concern for the integrity of the fundamental principles of the Charter and their mutual balance will join us in our endeavours to prevent their selective interpretation and application.

Mr. FONSECA (Angola) (interpretation from French): In our statement on 12 November we said that, bearing in mind the seriousness of State terrorism as a means of carrying out the foreign policy of certain Member States, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola supported the proposal to include in the Committee's agenda item 143, 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.

State terrorism as a method of carrying out the foreign policy of certain Member States towards other States and peoples is not a new phenomenon. Before the creation of the United Nations, State terrorism was, as it continues to be today, the illegal, criminal practice of colonial, imperialist and racist States, in disregard of international law and to the detriment of mankind and international peace and security, aiming at undermining the political and social system of other sovereign States. Today, as in the past, such a policy constitutes a real and permanent threat to the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Mitzelburg, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The People's Republic of Angola has been, and today continues to be, the main target in southern Africa of the policy of State terrorism practised by the criminal, aggressor apartheid régime and its allies. The Pretoria racists, together with the imperialist Powers, their allies, have been trying to undermine the political and social system of Angola ever since our State was established. That is no secret to anyone.

To help them in applying that policy of State terrorism against Angola, the Pretoria racists are given many types of support by certain Western States, including some members of the Security Council, which refuse to adopt economic sanctions against that terrorist régime and which co-operate in South Africa's nuclear and military programme, in violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977 on the arms embargo. They do so under the pretext of constructive engagement, so-called reforms or peaceful changes, thus encouraging the racist régime to consolidate apartheid, step up repression and increase its acts of sabotage, destabilization, aggression and terrorism against our State and people and other States and peoples of southern Africa.

In 1975 the Security Council described as an act of aggression - that is, as a crime against international peace and security - racist South Africa's invasion of Angola and its war against my country, waged with the secret support of the Central Intelligence Agency and the intervention of other foreign forces.

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

Since 1975 to date, racist South Africa has continued, with the direct support of the militarist circles of the West and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to pursue its terrorist policy in the form of permanent aggression aimed at undermining the political and social system of non-aligned, independent and sovereign Angola. Abetted in particular by the political, economic, military and nuclear support of the West and by warmongering and anti-Angolan statements by the leaders of certain Western countries and NATO members, in January 1981 the Pretoria racists, in perfect concert with their masters, began to implement a sinister plan that, on 23 August 1981, culminated in the largest-scale aggression committed against Angolan territory since 1975 and in the occupation - still going on today - of a large part of the south of our country.

That unprovoked aggression and occupation of part of the territory of a sovereign State escaped condemnation because of the veto cast by the United States of America against a draft resolution to that effect. It was not until two years later, in December 1983, that the Security Council, faced with a new, large-scale offensive by the South African army in our territory, finally condemned that persistent occupation and the new evidence of South African aggression on 20 December 1983 - once again without any sanction against the terrorist aggressor being adopted because of the refusal of the same States.

Although the Security Council demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and that South Africa cease all violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, racist South Africa has continued to escalate and intensify its aggression. Thus, on 6 January 1984 the Security Council, in resolution 546 (1984), once again condemned South Africa and again demanded the unconditional withdrawal of all racist troops from Angola.

This criminal policy of aggression and terrorism directed against our young State has led to considerable material destruction, thousands of casualties and the exodus of hundreds of thousands of people fleeing the combat zones; it has deeply affected the lives of all our people. The attacks of the South African army, which includes mercenaries, most of them from Western countries, are deliberately being directed against civilian targets and are most frequently aimed at the civilian population, both Angolans and Namibian refugees in our country.

As an example we might mention the massacre at Kassinga, which was committed by South African troops on our territory on 4 May 1978. In one fell swoop those

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

troops murdered more than 600 people, most of them women and children refugees from Namibia. That massacre of Namibian civilians on Angolan territory was deliberately organized under the responsibility of the Government led by Botha on the pretext of annihilating the so-called terrorists of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). However, the fallacious arguments of the Pretoria racists directed against the alleged SWAPO terrorists are clearly groundless, because South Africa is illegally occupying Namibia and violating the right of the Namibian people freely to exercise their right to self-determination, which is in itself an act of aggression.

In keeping with the norms and principles of contemporary international law, acts of resistance by national liberation movements against the illegal occupying authority are totally legitimate and can in no way be equated in law with acts of so-called terrorism, as is maintained by the Pretoria régime, certain Western countries and others. In December 1973, General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII) recognized SWAPO as the authentic representative of the Namibian people and, later, in General Assembly resolution 31/146, it was recognized as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, a recognition that was subsequently to be reiterated in various resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and many international organizations.

In southern Africa the terrorists are the Pretoria racists and their masters and allies from the West. It is precisely against the policy and practice of State terrorism by the racist South African State that we are fighting and continue to fight with all our might and right.

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

In Kassinga, representatives of the joint mission of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the World Health Organization, which went there from 24 to 28 May 1978, were able to see first-hand evidence of the extreme savagery and acts of extermination and systematic destruction carried out against the refugees who had been placed under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and who received assistance from United Nations specialized agencies. The fact that it was a group of civilians was confirmed by all the conclusions of that mission. That, furthermore, had already been noted by a UNICEF mission which was there prior to the attack, from 10 to 14 April.

In its war of aggression conducted against our State, a war which constitutes a crime against international peace and security, the terrorist régime of apartheid also uses, as I have said, irregular mercenary forces organized, equipped, trained and financed by that régime and its allies, with staging grounds found in illegally occupied Namibia. Those terrorists operate within the framework of the strategy of destabilization and destruction pursued by South Africa and its allies against Angola.

Their terrorist acts are mainly directed against the civilian population and at socio-economic targets which are essential to the functioning of the country and they are aimed at paralysing normal life in vast regions in the south of Angola. As I have just said, those terrorist acts are directed mainly against the civilian population and socio-economic targets which are essential to the operation of the country and they are aimed at bringing to a halt any normal activity in vast regions in the south of Angola.

In aid of that policy of State terrorism waged by the Pretoria racists, a certain Western country uses its right of veto in the Security Council, under the pretext of the vital interests of the West. There are even representatives of certain Western countries who cynically assert that their States collaborate with South Africa in the nuclear field exclusively for peaceful purposes. Such collaboration undoubtedly represents a serious threat to international peace and security. This nuclear collaboration by certain Western countries with racist régimes could lead to nuclear terrorism. The Western countries which develop such collaboration will thus be responsible for that possible form of State terrorism.

The South African racist army, in its constant aggression against Angola, resorts to terrorist methods which constitute a flagrant violation of the laws and customs of war as codified in the Hague Convention of 1907, the Geneva Convention

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

of 1949 and the Additional Protocol I of 1977, to which Angola and South Africa are parties. Obviously, international humanitarian law expressly prohibits attacks against purely civilian targets, the destruction and damage in cities and villages, which are totally unwarranted by military needs and the ill-treatment and other unnecessary suffering deliberately inflicted by South African racist troops.

All these terrorist acts constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity as defined by the principles of Nuremberg which were recognized in the General Assembly resolution of 11 December 1946 as being principles of international law. Consequently, racist South Africa as an aggressor terrorist State is responsible for all these crimes committed against the States and peoples of southern Africa. I repeat, it is responsible for all those crimes. Under international law, individuals who commit such crimes also bear international criminal responsibility and should be punished for their crimes. Under the principles of Nuremberg, the fact that the person who commits an international crime acted as Head of State or as an official does not release him from responsibility under international law. The fact that someone acted under the orders of his Government or his hierarchical superior does not free him from responsibility under international law, since he would have had the moral possibility of choice. In that context we call for the condemnation and punishment of the Pretoria terrorists.

The terrorist behaviour of the racist South African State and its leaders and agents towards Angola and the other neighbouring sovereign States, the occupation and domination of Namibia and the oppression and subjugation of the South African people under apartheid are illegal and criminal and violate the most elementary norms and principles of international law.

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

Once again we recall South Africa's obligation to make reparation for the material damage caused in Angola, which amounts to more than \$US 10 billion, given that the right of a State victim of aggression to demand and receive assistance, including military assistance, has been reaffirmed by the Security Council.

To put an end to the barbarous acts and the criminal frenzy of the Pretoria terrorists, the Security Council, in its mission of maintaining international peace and security, must immediately impose on the Pretoria régime the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

The People's Republic of Angola, and all peace-loving States, strongly condemn the policy and practice of State terrorism as a mode of conduct practised by the colonialist, imperialist and racist Powers in their relations with other States and peoples and wishes also to appeal urgently to all States to respect and observe strictly the right of peoples freely and without foreign interference to choose their own political and social systems and to carry out their own independent political, economic, social and cultural development.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): An important issue before us this year is the question of terrorism. In fact, this scourge has almost reached a stage where it is fast becoming one of the main destabilizing factors of international peace and security, not only by taking a high toll of innocent human lives and challenging the domestic peace and stability of States, but also by exacerbating international relations and disrupting the proper conduct of diplomatic and consular activities.

Political terrorism, as practised in our time, can be defined as those illegal acts of use of force that are not acts of war but are committed with the aim and intention of changing the territorial status, the régimes or the policies of States.

National liberation movements that are recognized as such by the related regional international organizations cannot be considered in this context when their armed struggle is conducted in conformity with the Geneva Conventions.

The Charter of the United Nations forbids Member States to resort to the threats 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.

Member States are also under the obligation not to interfere in the internal affairs of other States. Consequently, States cannot support, tolerate or sympathize with groups that have resorted to terror in order to achieve their political objectives. The consequences of policies contrary to these basic

(Mr. Sibay, Turkey)

principles would be gross violations of the human rights of the majority and would be nothing less than the denial of the rule of law.

Certain States, during recent decades, have increasingly not only resorted to supporting acts of terror secretly and sometimes even publicly, but also have provided terrorist groups with money, arms, training facilities and safe havens in their territory. At this point we wish to make a reference to an even more dangerous tendency, that of States entering into agreements with terrorists, either with the aim of gaining temporary respite in establishing law and order, or buying security, or to further some obscure point of political expediency. Still other States, hiding behind the sacred principles of freedom of expression and of the press and the right of asylum, have, if not openly and consciously, but objectively been supporting, propagating and praising the political aims of such terrorist organizations, at least by allowing and tolerating propaganda to this effect, thus enabling them to justify their dastardly and inhuman acts.

They also fail to realize that granting the full range of political rights to terrorists would possibly result in the total denial and loss of the basic human and political rights of their own countrymen if the aims of the terrorists were realized.

International terrorism, as sponsored or tolerated by States, has become such a dangerous phenomenon, because some countries have come to see terror as just another political tool, an extension of policy, by other means, short of armed conflict, which can be used in furthering political aims.

My country, which prior to 12 September 1980 was affected by such a wave of terror extracting a toll of thousands of innocent lives and permanently maiming even greater numbers both physically and psychologically, has successfully overcome this attack against its national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. In the process, it was also discovered that terror had foreign ramifications, as well as strong and well-established links to arms smuggling and drug-trafficking operations.

Although we were able to deal with and eradicate within the span of a few years the last vestiges of this kind of lawlessness within our borders, terrorism abroad against Turkish targets - even when they are international civil servants - and the lives of Turkish diplomats and consular agents continues. During recent years, more than 40 of my colleagues and their family members have lost their lives as a result of these heinous crimes.

(Mr. Sibay, Turkey)

It is most significant and unfortunate that these crimes have been executed mostly in countries with democratically elected Governments which have yet to devise means of effective international co-operation against murder.

One of the most perverse types of terrorism in our time takes place in the form of indiscriminate acts of violence against innocent civilians or diplomatic and consular agents who are legitimate representatives of democratically elected Governments based on the principle of the rule of law. Even in earlier times and throughout recorded history such acts were always considered to be not only against the very essence of the basic principles of international law but also expressions of ultimate immorality. International or State-sponsored or tolerated terrorism as practised today constitutes perhaps the most perverse example of the dictum that the end justifies the means.

At this point we note, more with sadness than anger, that some of these very States have now fallen prey to the consequences of terror and terrorism conducted against their own national interests, while struggling to cope with the contradictions of their own misguided policies.

The Turkish Government is of the opinion that the time has come - if not already passed - for the United Nations General Assembly unequivocally to condemn all forms of terrorism. We are convinced that this problem, the solution of which takes on added urgency with each dastardly act, has now reached a stage that makes it imperative that it be resolutely dealt with through international co-operation.

Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): At the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly in 1970 the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR sincerely welcomed the adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security as an important step in United Nations actions to perform its central task, which is enshrined in the very first lines of the United Nations Charter - "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war...".

The years which have passed have amply borne out the relevance and significance of this. The Declaration has been one of the most effective instruments in struggling for peace; it has become a broad programme for initiatives and practical actions embodied in a variety of declarations drawn up and adopted by the General Assembly, as well as resolutions aimed at averting the threat of war, primarily nuclear war, and improving the international situation, so

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

that genuine steps can be taken towards disarmament and to eradicate from international life policies of hegemonism, intervention in internal affairs, colonialism, racism, apartheid, exploitation and diktat in international economic relations.

Those politically important documents - and among them I would like to single out in particular the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament, the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, the General Assembly resolution condemning nuclear war - are all closely interrelated, because they are all aimed at one single goal, that is, to ensure universal peace and international security.

A worthy place among them is occupied by the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, adopted in 1978 at the initiative of the Polish People's Republic. That Declaration, essentially based on confirming the right of peoples to peace, preserving and consolidating international peace and security, won wide support from the overwhelming majority of States and many international organizations.

In the Byelorussian SSR's reply to the United Nations Secretary-General's letter in connection with resolution 36/104 on the implementation of that Declaration, which is cited in document A/39/143, it is indicated, inter alia, that it is the constitutionally enshrined duty of citizens of the Republic "to further the development of friendship and co-operation with peoples of other countries, and the maintenance and strengthening of world peace". That is found in article 67 of the Constitution. Spreading war propaganda in the Byelorussian SSR is prohibited by law, in accordance with article 28 of its constitution.

The reply also gives facts indicating how specifically the Byelorussian SSR fully implements the provisions of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace and indicates the broad and mass nature of the participation of the population in anti-military actions and the peace movement; it also emphasizes the essential need for the full and thorough implementation of the tasks set forth in the Declaration. For that reason we are very pleased to be able to support the draft resolution on this item, which is contained in document A/C.1/39/L.89.

It is most fitting that the General Assembly carefully examine the process of the implementation of the principles and provisions of the Declaration on the

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Strengthening of International Security. The annual consideration of this entire range of issues at the General Assembly session in the light of the specific international situation of the time makes it possible not only for attention to be focused by all States on the paramount issues of securing general peace and security but also makes it possible to gauge the genuine attitude of individual countries and groups of States to the implementation of this, one of the most important United Nations documents drawn up in this Organization and based entirely on the fundamental principles of its Charter, as well as at the same time to assess the real consequences that it has on the international arena.

In recent years, at every stage of the struggle for peace, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is occupying a more important place and the implementation of its provisions is particularly relevant at a time when the threat of war has increased and the foundations of peace have become even more precarious. Never before has the spiralling arms race leapt so sharply upwards, approaching that fateful point beyond which it will be much more difficult to halt it than now. Furthermore, this danger affects not only the States directly involved in the nuclear missile confrontation but also all countries and peoples - one might even say human civilization and life on earth.

Considerable damage is being done to international security, trust in inter-State relations has been broken off, there is disarray in talks on the most important issues of curbing the arms race, agreements already in force are being broken and so on.

One may legitimately ask why these events have occurred and where are their roots to be found. Let us look at the facts squarely. What is the origin of aggressive concepts preaching the admissibility of nuclear war in one form or another - generalized, protracted or limited?

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

"The attainment of the objective of security, which is an inseparable element of peace, has always been one of the most profound aspirations of humanity. States have for a long time sought to maintain their security through the possession of arms. Admittedly, their survival has, in certain cases, effectively depended on whether they could count on appropriate means of defence. Yet the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament ..." (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 1)

That is why all who cherish universal peace and who are sincerely desirous of strengthening international security welcomed the adoption in the First Committee a few days ago of the resolutions which appealed for a start to be made as a matter of priority on talks on practical, tangible means of preventing nuclear warfare and on the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, on nuclear disarmament, on the cessation and banning of nuclear-weapons tests and also on imposing a freeze on nuclear weapons.

An important factor has been the adoption of resolutions providing for talks regarding the prevention of the spread of the arms race to outer space, intensified efforts to prohibit chemical weapons, radiological weapons and new forms of weapons of mass destruction, and also resolutions in other important areas relating to the curbing of the arms race and disarmament. All this has been required by the resolutions adopted.

We should like to hope that the necessary political will will be forthcoming and that these resolutions will genuinely help to promote the elaboration and implementation of practical disarmament measures. The need to take immediate and speedy measures to curb the arms race is also dictated by the fact that, as a result of the militaristic policies stubbornly pursued by warlike circles of imperialism, the situation has deteriorated considerably in Asia, Africa, Central America and the Pacific. In the Near East, in the Indian Ocean, in the Persian Gulf, in the Far East, there is growing tension in areas which are already marked by conflict. There are continuing armed provocations on the borders of Laos, Kampuchea and Viet Nam. An undeclared war is being waged against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Threats are still made against socialist Cuba in an

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

attempt to deflect it from the policies to which it is devoted. Scorning the elementary norms of international law and morality, the United States has carried out an attack on the diminutive territory of Grenada, which had embarked on a course of independent development. The steel-tipped boots of American marines crushed its independence.

The dubious laurels of an easy victory over defenceless Grenada have obviously not been enough for Washington. With unflagging and obstinate insistence, the machinery of the present undeclared war against Nicaragua and its people is grinding on although their only crime, as it were, is their desire to take their destiny in their own hands and to protect the achievements of the Sandinista revolution. A sovereign State has been high-handedly asked to change its economic pattern, its political structure and its foreign policy.

With the direct patronage of the United States, Israel is pursuing its own annexationist policy and is sowing stark terror and violence in the Arab lands it has seized.

The "constructive engagement" between Washington and Pretoria has helped to pile up obstacles to the granting of independence to Namibia and has virtually amounted to encouraging the racists to acts of aggression against neighbouring States, as was just very cogently mentioned in his statement by the representative of the People's Republic of Angola.

In a number of parts of the world the network of American military bases is reaching out. Attempts are being made to expand old military blocs and to devise new ones. Many young States are the victims of overt pressure. They are promised military aid, they are goaded into competing in the arms race and they are threatened with economic sanctions for pursuing an independent foreign policy.

Extremely unfavourable consequences for the security of the peoples result from the implementation in international affairs of policies and actions which can only be termed State terrorism. The desire to lay down the law, grossly to intervene in the internal affairs of other States and peoples and to terrorize the populations of whole countries and regions under various excuses and pretexts are all manifestations of the dangerous policy of State terrorism.

All this is being done to undermine the social and political structure of non-compliant States to halt social progress and to paralyse the liberation movements. At the same time, all methods of pressure are brought into play, and if

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

they do not work then they do not shrink even from using weapons. A characteristic feature of this policy of terrorism in international affairs is the policy of intimidation. We can see manifestations of this in the threat to international navigation as a result of mining ports and territorial waters and the broad use made of methods of waging war, destroying Lebanese towns and villages in an attempt to force the Lebanese and Palestinians to give up defending their independence and in support of bloody and inhuman régimes which are trying to preserve their hold on power with the help of terrorism and violence.

In other words, all a people has to do is to make a free choice of its development path in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law and the numerous resolutions of the United Nations - which, it should be stressed, emphasize the right of peoples to defend their liberty and independence and confirm the principle of non-interference in internal affairs - and all this is challenged by the cynical and hegemonistic desire to practise despotism and illegality in international affairs.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

It has become urgently necessary to end those policies and actions that are particularly dangerous in the conditions of the nuclear era, when they may have harmful consequences not only for the freedom of peoples but for their very existence. That is precisely the purpose of the draft resolution put forward by the Soviet delegation on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States. As the representative of the Polish People's Republic emphasized this morning, this is very clearly set out in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic fully supports that draft resolution.

In introducing his epoch-making report to the Second All-Russian Congress of Councils of Workers and Soldiers Deputies on 8 November 1917, the founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilich Lenin said:

"The question of peace is a burning one. It is a painful one for the present day."

Even today the question remains the same - a burning and painful issue for millions and millions of people, because today the danger of nuclear war has taken on menacing dimensions, and in these difficult and complicated conditions the entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union has been aimed at implementing the legacy of Lenin, who said:

"We promise the workers and peasants that we will do everything for peace and we will do so."

Since the days of the great October Revolution the policy of the Soviet Union has been one of peaceful coexistence between States having different social systems. Our ideology and values, which stem from the nature of the socialist structure, we have never attempted to foist on others, but we shall continue resolutely to rebuff any attempts to foist on us systems and attitudes alien to our society and to introduce ideological dissent into inter-State relations.

It is time people grasped that socialism is not seeking a place in history; it is history itself. If some are not yet aware of that, we can simply express our regret.

A mental survey of the initiatives taken by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community during the year since the discussion at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security will show that those proposals have touched on all the most fundamental problems, whose solution will determine the main point at issue - the prevention of nuclear war and the strengthening of universal peace and security.

There were, first and foremost, the comprehensive proposal on the elaboration of norms for relations between the nuclear Powers, aimed at ruling out policies leading towards war and aggravating the arms race; the proposal on the qualitative and quantitative freeze of nuclear arsenals on a global basis; and the proposal to prohibit the militarization of outer space.

The proposals also included the banning of chemical weapons and the elimination of arsenals of such weapons under strict international control; an initiative to take a new step in considering the proposals on the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of military force and maintaining peaceful relations between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the holding of multilateral consultations; and a reduction in naval activities. Proposals have also been made for talks to begin on the mutual non-increase of military expenditure and its subsequent reduction. There have been a number of proposals aimed at curbing the arms race in some of its most dangerous areas.

Initiatives have been taken aimed at untangling the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, and there have been proposals to ensure that the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building and Disarmament in Europe should also make its contribution to improving the situation on the European continent, which would lead to the adoption of far-reaching military and political steps aimed at an overall reduction in the level of tension and the creation of political, legal and material guarantees for peace and security.

A number of initiatives have been taken with a view to eliminating existing sources of war and tension, primarily in the Middle East. The socialist countries have also put forward a number of ideas on the General Assembly's agenda item concerning the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. The position of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on that question is clearly elucidated in its reply to the Secretary-General (A/39/517). Once again we would like to make it abundantly clear that, as before, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic favours the establishment of a zone of

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

stable peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region and is prepared to join in any efforts to achieve that end.

It should be noted that at the recent meeting in the capital of the German Democratic Republic, Berlin, of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty there was a reaffirmation of the need for a realistic policy of business-like co-operation in order to solve the problems of disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security, and reference was also made to the role that should be played by the United Nations in this regard.

It is essential to realize that there is only one way to untie the difficult knots of world politics in a responsible, serious and well-considered manner - through genuinely serious negotiations. As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. K.U. Chernenko, has said:

"We favour the peaceful resolution of international disputes, through serious, equal and constructive talks. The Soviet Union intends fully to co-operate with all those States that are prepared through practical deeds to help to reduce international tension and to create an atmosphere of trust in the world - in other words, with those whose actions will really not lead to preparations for war but, rather, to strengthening the foundations of peace." In the Middle East, for example, that would mean convening an international conference, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the problems of Palestine and the Middle East as a whole. In Asia it would mean an end to any intervention and subversive activity against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea. It would also mean removing those obstacles placed in the way of the reunification of Korea on a peaceful and democratic basis, with no outside interference.

The peoples of the world expect the United Nations more actively and purposefully to promote the final elimination of colonialism; the achievement of Namibia's genuine independence, with the transfer of full authority to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people; the eradication of the cankers of racism and apartheid; and

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

the resolution of the current problems connected with restructuring international economic relations on a democratic and fair basis.

The almost 40 years of the history of the United Nations contain a number of pages showing its substantial contribution to defending the freedom and independence of peoples and the strengthening of universal peace. Certain guidelines have been established for United Nations activities in this area. The Organization is a forum to concert political will and give opportunities to all States to uphold international peace and security, as was clearly evidenced by the overwhelming majority of votes cast at this session of the General Assembly in favour of the initiative of the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic on the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace.

The United Nations, born out of the resolve of all peoples not to allow another world tragedy to occur should measure up to the lofty and noble tasks proclaimed in its Charter.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

As one of the founder Members of the United Nations and deeply wedded to the Organization's principles and goals, the Byelorussian SSR will continue to bring every effort to bear in the building of lasting peace and international security.

Mr. MAZARI (Pakistan): My delegation is speaking today to express its views on the subject of international security under agenda items 67 to 69 and 143.

The world today is faced with a serious situation because of the exacerbation of international tensions against the background of the escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race. The danger of a nuclear holocaust hangs over mankind like the sword of Damocles. The case for disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, can therefore hardly be overemphasized. At the same time it needs to be stressed that focus on disarmament alone is not likely to provide a solution to the serious problems which confront us. Indeed, the arms race is in many ways a consequence of the climate of distrust and fear and of the feeling of insecurity that prevails among nations, leading them to undertake programmes to strengthen their military capabilities with a view to safeguarding their security.

We believe, therefore, that international security and disarmament are two sides of the same coin. We cannot have one without the other. Disarmament is no doubt an essential element of any programme for international security. Conversely, the strengthening of international security is necessary to create a climate conducive to disarmament. In view of this close and integral link between international security and disarmament it would be logical to assert that disarmament without measures to preserve the security of nations would be almost impossible to realize.

It is a matter of grave concern to my delegation that in recent years we have witnessed a marked deterioration of the international situation reflected in the aggravation of tensions in relations between the major Powers, the exacerbation of various conflicts and disputes in the Middle East, Africa and South-East Asia, the continued military intervention in Afghanistan and the lack of any significant progress in disarmament negotiations.

The serious international situation facing us calls for concerted action by the world community to strengthen international security. In our considered view any programme of action aimed at achieving that objective must have a number of essential elements in addition to realization of the goal of disarmament, on which my delegation has already expressed its views in this Committee.

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

First and foremost among those essential elements is the need to rededicate ourselves to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly those enjoining respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of States, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, refraining from the use of force or threat of use of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes. My delegation attaches particular importance to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States in view of the serious set-back which the cause of international security has suffered in recent years as a result of the violations of that principle. Those interventions in the affairs of other States must therefore be terminated forthwith and the international community must reaffirm its commitment to the faithful observance of the aforementioned principles of inter-State behaviour.

The second essential element in any programme of international security should in our view be the enforcement of the collective security provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is self-evident that because of their privileged position in that body the permanent members of the Security Council bear a special responsibility in this regard. The existing situation with regard to the enforcement of the collective security provisions of the Charter was accurately reflected in the observations of the United Nations Secretary-General in his report to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly on the work of the Organization, which states:

"Certainly we have strayed far from the Charter in recent years.

Governments that believe they can win an international objective by force are often quite ready to do so, and domestic opinion not infrequently applauds such a course. The Security Council, the primary organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, all too often finds itself unable to take decisive action to resolve international conflicts and its resolutions are increasingly defied or ignored by those that feel themselves strong enough to do so. Too frequently the Council seems powerless to generate the support and influence to ensure that its decisions are respected, even when they are taken unanimously. Thus the process of peaceful settlement of disputes prescribed in the Charter is often brushed aside. Sterner measures for world peace were envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter,

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

which was conceived as a key element of the United Nations system of collective security, but the prospect of realizing such measures is now deemed almost impossible in our divided international community. We are perilously near to a new international anarchy." (A/37/1, p. 1)

A major cause of the current state of international insecurity and aggravation of international tensions is the inability of the world community, acting through the United Nations, to prevent violations of the principles on which the United Nations Charter is based and to take steps for the rectification of the resulting situations. It is therefore imperative that the international community should take all appropriate steps for the enforcement of the collective security system enshrined in the United Nations Charter. We firmly believe that a stable and effective system of collective international security is the best guarantee for the preservation and promotion of the long-term security of nations, big and small.

We also have the conviction that the establishment of a just, equitable and democratic world order is another essential element for the preservation and promotion of international peace and security. Any system of international relations which freezes an unjust status quo cannot succeed for long in safeguarding international peace and security. It is necessary therefore that all suitable steps be taken to bring about a new world order which is responsive to the aspirations and hopes of mankind and which is aimed at the promotion of peace, security, justice, development and progress among all peoples of the world.

Pakistan has on a number of occasions reiterated its abiding commitment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and to the principles of peaceful coexistence which guide us in the conduct of our relations with other nations. It has constantly supported all international or regional initiatives aimed at strengthening the United Nations, at encouraging the peaceful solution of international disputes and at the creation of other conditions necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security. It has also put forward a number of proposals for achieving these objectives. I would like to draw attention particularly to Pakistan's proposals for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and for the extension of negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, which have again been endorsed by this Committee this year. We have also reiterated on a number of occasions our continuing support for the establishment of

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean so that the States of the region may devote their energies to the urgent task of economic development free from threats to their security from sources within or without the region.

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

In conclusion, we would like to reiterate the essential conditions for strengthening international peace and security. Foremost among those conditions is a rededication by all States to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, combined with the implementation of its collective security provisions and progress towards disarmament. At the same time it is vital that the international community should come to grips with and resolve the serious political and economic problems with which it is faced.

In addition, we should not make the mistake of equating peace and security with the maintenance of an unjust status quo; therefore, necessary readjustments should be made, particularly in the political and economic fields, to bring about a new and equitable world order which would promote security, justice, development, peace and progress among all nations.

Before concluding we would like to comment briefly on the important draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1, which was introduced by the delegation of the Soviet Union and which, in our view, deserves careful consideration by this Committee. We are offering these comments in all sincerity, in the hope that the delegation of the Soviet Union will take them into account as it considers the matter further. In order to save the time of this Committee, we would touch upon only two important points concerning the draft resolution at this stage.

It is our feeling, after a careful study of the draft resolution, that whereas it deals adequately with the problem of foreign interference in the internal affairs of states it fails to pay any attention to the serious problem of foreign intervention, particularly foreign military intervention, in the internal affairs of States. The serious consequences of recent acts of foreign military intervention in various parts of the world are all too obvious to need mentioning here. In our considered view, therefore, both acts of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States need to be condemned. Further, such acts of intervention and/or interference deserve equal condemnation whether they are undertaken in States with different socio-political systems with a view to undermining these socio-political systems or in States with similar socio-political systems.

We have looked at the two sets of amendments in documents A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 and L.92 in the light of the considerations I have mentioned. We agree with the general thrust of those amendments, which we feel will help to overcome the present

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

lacunae and shortcomings in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. It is our hope that all concerned will show the necessary flexibility of approach in the further consideration of the matter, so that the draft resolution may be adopted in a form in which it is widely acceptable to the delegations in this Committee.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): My remarks this morning will be brief and will be concerned exclusively with agenda item 103, "Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States". The Committee has before it a draft resolution on this item (A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1) submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union. My delegation is one of those which has proposed certain amendments to that draft resolution. Those amendments are set out in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1 and were introduced this morning by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Why does my delegation consider that the Soviet draft resolution requires amendment?

I must first make clear that my delegation does not believe that a draft resolution on the subject of State terrorism can contribute to the strengthening of international security. That was our view when the item was introduced by Mr. Gromyko in his speech in the general debate in a plenary meeting and that is our view now. The term "State terrorism" is new to the vocabulary of international law and diplomacy and there is no generally accepted definition of it. Whatever precise definition might be worked out, State terrorism can only signify the use, as a matter of policy, of force or the threat of force in relations between States and, as we all know, the use and the threat of force in international relations, other than by the United Nations itself or in exercise of the inherent right of self-defence, are already outlawed by the United Nations Charter and other international instruments. One could say that this is in fact the main purpose of the United Nations Charter.

However, it is the general policy of my delegation not to oppose the inscription of new items on the agenda of the General Assembly and we therefore did not object to the Soviet delegation's proposal for the inscription of item 103 on State terrorism. We did so despite our conviction that consideration of the item would not contribute to a strengthening of international security, but once the item was inscribed it became our concern to help to ensure that it was given

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

thorough and serious consideration and to see to it that, while it could do no good, it should do no harm. That is the purpose of the amendments in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1, of which my delegation is a sponsor. Those amendments are put forward in a wholly constructive spirit.

The amendments were originally drawn up in relation to the first Soviet draft in document A/C.1/39/L.2. However, they are applicable, with no essential change, to the second version of the draft resolution (A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1). This confirms the conclusion, which I am sure many members of the Committee will have reached, that there is no substantial difference between documents A/C.1/39/L.2 and L.2/Rev.1.

Why then - to go back to my original question - does my delegation consider that the Soviet draft resolution requires amendment?

The answer is that, by putting forward this undefined concept of State terrorism and then giving its own slanted construction to the concept, the Soviet draft resolution appears to condone the use or threat of force in certain circumstances which fall outside the definition and which indeed are not compatible with the United Nations Charter.

The whole essence of the draft resolution is to have us condemn "actions aimed at a forcible change in or the undermining of the socio-political system of States". I am sure we all agree that any attempt by one State or group of States to change the political and social system of another State by force is unacceptable and calls for strong condemnation; and no doubt, too, we would agree that such situations are more likely to arise than situations where a State or group of States uses force to preserve a particular régime or system in another State. But post-war history provides a number of instances of the application of armed force from outside to preserve political systems as well as to change them, and such events could occur in the future.

There is one obvious example of the use of armed intervention to preserve a political system. Last month, in plenary meetings, the Assembly debated the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the continued Soviet occupation of that country. The Assembly once again adopted, by an overwhelming majority, a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all foreign - that is to say Soviet - forces.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

The purpose of the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan was and is to prevent the Afghan people from changing their régime in exercise of the right of self-determination. I am not asking this Committee to reaffirm the General Assembly's conclusion on the Afghanistan situation, nor do I wish to cause contention. I mention the Afghanistan tragedy only because it provides an important lesson for us all. As the representative of Singapore pointed out in his statement yesterday, the draft resolution before us is essentially about the right of self-determination and attempts to interfere with that right; but the right of self-determination is not exercised once in the life of a nation. It is there to be exercised at any time. A nation has the right to choose its political and social system and it has the right to change it. No State should be permitted to impose a system on another, nor to prevent it from changing its system.

The amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1, which my delegation and others have submitted in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev.1, may look a little complicated at first sight but they are quite simple in purpose. Their effect would merely be to enlarge the scope of the draft resolution so that it condemns all unlawful threat or use of force. As amended, the draft resolution would condemn the threat or use of force from outside to preserve political and social systems and the threat or use of force to undermine such systems. The principles set out in the existing draft resolution can be of value only if it is balanced in this way. If it is not so balanced it could damage our collective interests.

These are important issues which could touch on the fate of any of our countries at one time or another. This is not an area in which anyone should try to win political points or gain propaganda victories. The fact that we are seeking changes in the draft resolution before us has nothing whatever to do with its authorship. This is not an East-West matter. As the representative of Singapore neatly put it yesterday, this is neither an East-West issue nor a North-South issue. It is an issue that affects the interests of all States equally. He was also kind enough to say that the Western amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.91/Rev. 1 were complementary to the non-aligned amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92 and that his delegation supported both. I am happy to reciprocate. If the draft resolution were amended by the two sets of proposed amendments, it would become a draft resolution which all of us in this Committee could support and recommend in good conscience to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

It is our responsibility, when dealing with issues of this gravity, to work together to find solutions which will advance, or at least not damage, the common interests of the world community. It is in this spirit that my delegation and others are seeking changes in the Soviet draft resolution.

Mr. SHEIKH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (intepretation from Arabic):

Mr. Chairman, since my delegation is speaking for the first time, permit me to express to you our congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee, and also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their unanimous election.

The preservation and consolidation of international peace and security are considered to be among the most urgent and important questions at the present time, when the peoples of the world feel increasingly that peace is absent because of the arms race, and forces hostile to peace pursuing policies of intervention, in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and international law. The arms race, and in particular the nuclear-arms race, and the fearful dimensions it has acquired, are among the most dangerous threats to mankind, jeopardizing not only international peace and security, but also the very survival of man and civilization.

The stockpiling of weapons and the concepts upon which it is based, such as nuclear deterrence and collective security, have formed a vicious circle whereby today we see an arms race based on all these concepts giving rise to a lack of security, a weakening in international relations and an increased risk of nuclear war. They have also hindered efforts to consolidate international peace.

There is no doubt that security based on nuclear deterrence is merely selfish security and should be condemned, because security must be on an equal footing for all States. It is not logical for international peace to be based on the interests of those States which resort to the arms race.

For these reasons, the most urgent task of our time is to achieve nuclear disarmament. This question should be considered, in the first place, taking into account the interests of all States and their right to live. The consideration of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security gives us an opportunity to examine everything which has given rise to a deterioration in the world situation and to adopt measures to meet the situation.

(Mr. Sheikh, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Despite insistence that measures be taken to alleviate international tension and to develop positive relations among States, regardless of their political and socio-economic systems, we can only assert that even though the discussions which have taken place and the resolutions which have been adopted have been aimed at implementing the objectives of that Declaration, we still witness flagrant violations of the provisions of the Charter and a deterioration in international relations. A quick glance at developments since the closure of the General Assembly last year shows that the international situation has not improved. It continues to be typified by a growing deterioration in international relations, pressures at the military, economic and political levels, threats against the independence of States, their sovereignty and territorial integrity and the fact that differences between rich and poor continue to increase while the arms race is intensified. All those expenditures should be devoted to peace and development. Military interventions have occurred in various regions of the world.

The main reasons for such negative developments reside with the aggressive policy of the imperialist forces, in particular that of the American Administration, which is based on aggression, threat or use of force, military intervention, interference in the internal affairs of other States, political and economic pressures to impose their domination and hegemony on the world and to unleash slander against those peoples and countries which refuse to submit to their policy, including the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which has been one of the targets of a series of American military acts of aggression carried out by American planes in Libyan airspace and the American fleet in Libyan territorial waters, economic blockades and information campaigns waged against Libyan leaders.

(Mr. Sheikh, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The aggressive policy of United States imperialism has led to a destabilization of peace in the world and tension. All hotbeds of tension are due to the United States of America.

In Central America and the Caribbean the situation has become worse, because of United States aggression against peoples of the region which are struggling for freedom, independence and an end to American domination. The United States has stepped up its intervention and interference in the region. Recently we witnessed a deliberate self-serving campaign against the people of Nicaragua, in order to create a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of that country.

In the Arab region, the Zionist racists pursue their occupation of the land of Palestine, dispersing its people - thanks to the unstinting support of the United States - and shamelessly execute a policy based on occupation and annexation of Arab territories.

The racist régime of Pretoria pursues its policy of racial discrimination, apartheid and murder against the people of South Africa; and that perfidious régime pursues its illegal occupation of Namibia, depriving its people of independence.

In Asia, the Korean people continues to fight for its unity, but obstacles are placed in its way.

The situation in the Mediterranean continues to be a source of concern and disquiet and threatens international peace as a result of the presence of foreign fleets and the spread of foreign military bases used as bridgeheads for military manoeuvres and to make threats against countries of the region, in particular non-aligned countries. The spread of nuclear weapons and the increase in tension hamper all peace efforts in the region.

My country, convinced that the consolidation of peace and security in the Mediterranean region would also lead to the consolidation of international peace, joins other countries in the region in consolidating peace and putting an end to the foreign military presence in our area.

International peace can be consolidated only through a total commitment to the principles of the Charter, mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, the non-use of force, renunciation of foreign interference, respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, rejection of

(Mr. Sheikh, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

racist policies and elimination of all social and economic inequalities. That can be guaranteed only through a system of collective security based on a commitment to resolve international conflicts through negotiation and peaceful means.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.