

United Nations

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records \*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
47th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 29 November 1977  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 47th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

### CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/32/PV.47  
30 November 1977  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 50 AND 127

CONCLUSION OF A WORLD TREATY ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (A/32/94, 95, 97, 108, 112, 114, 119, 122, 123, 181 and Add.1)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (A/32/63, 69, 70, 71, 71<sup>1</sup>, 75, 77, 78, 89, 93, 117, 128, 140, 153, 154, 157, 164 and Add.1, 165; A/C.1/32/2, 8)

DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DETENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (A/32/242; A/C.1/32/L.1, L.2) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the decision taken by the Committee during its preliminary consideration of item 127, entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war", the Committee will now return to its consideration of that item in conjunction with item 37, entitled "Conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations", and item 50, entitled "Implementation of the declaration on the strengthening of international peace and security".

At our 4th meeting this year, I made some introductory remarks on the item concerning the deepening and consolidation of international détente, which has been included in the agenda of the General Assembly for the first time this year on the initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as an important and urgent item. Those remarks are equally applicable to items 37 and 50, which are closely related to the question of the deepening and consolidation of détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which is the subject of item 50, was adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, seven years ago. The Declaration solemnly reaffirmed the validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations in the 25 years of its existence. It is worth noting that the Declaration also affirmed a close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and economic development, and stated that progress towards the realization of any one of these objectives would in effect constitute progress towards all of them. Those statements have retained their validity.

(The Chairman)

Since the adoption of the Declaration we have convened annually to assess the progress made by the world community in strengthening international security. Certainly progress has been made, but in many respects international security remains in jeopardy.

Last year, two resolutions were adopted relevant to the Declaration. The traditional resolution summing up the results of the work done and defining future objectives was complemented by the resolution on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, proposed by the developing countries. In this way the field of discussion has been broadened, which makes it of even greater importance to define priorities and identify the most urgent issues.

The third item before us, dealing with the question of the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, came before the General Assembly for the first time last year, again at the request of the USSR. In introducing its proposal and draft treaty, the USSR pointed out that the conclusion of such a treaty was necessary in order to diminish the risk of a new world war and ultimately to eliminate it completely. The General Assembly, in the resolution it adopted on the question (resolution 31/9), invited Member States to examine further the draft treaty submitted by the USSR, as well as other proposals and statements made during the consideration of the item, and to communicate their views and suggestions on the subject to the Secretary-General. The Committee has before it the report of the Secretary-General (A/32/181 and Add.1), containing the views and suggestions communicated by 41 States in response to that invitation.

We shall devote 17 meetings to the aforementioned three items - that is, for discussion and for taking decisions on them. May I suggest in this connexion that in the general debate which we begin today delegations may refer to all these items or to any one of them. Subsequently, we shall consider the proposals or draft resolutions in the order in which they are submitted on each particular item, unless the Committee decides otherwise. As we come to each item, delegations will of course have an opportunity to speak on it.

If I hear no objection to the method I have outlined, I shall take it that the Committee decides to follow it.

It was so decided.

Mr. CHEN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): In our statement during the general debate at this Committee, the Chinese delegation pointed out that the Soviet new item entitled "Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente and Prevention of the Danger of Nuclear War" was a downright fraud of sham détente and sham disarmament. The plain truth is: as the Soviet Union has recently met with repeated setbacks in its wanton aggression and expansion in the Middle East, Africa and the Red Sea area and as its social-imperialist features have been further exposed, it has to rack its brain to produce this clumsy fraud for the purpose of deceiving the people of the world and camouflaging its intensified arms expansion, preparations for war and rivalry for world hegemony.

In order to peddle their new item, the Soviet representatives have been advertising tediously that in the present world "there has been a turn away from explosive confrontation towards mutually beneficial co-operation", that "the process of détente has become the core of international development", that "steps taken on the question of disarmament have made a useful contribution to solving the problem of preventing another war", and that "the danger of another world war has receded". In a word, they are doing their utmost to depict the world today as a world without "confrontation", without "danger of war" and a world in which peace and "mutual assistance and co-operation" prevail. But what is the evidence that may testify to the existence of such a "peaceful world"? According to the Soviet representatives, first of all it is because "the assets of détente accumulated in recent years" in the form of various "multilateral and bilateral treaties and agreements" have been "quite impressive". True, the "accumulated" treaties and agreements concluded in recent years by the two super-Powers have been "quite impressive". However, as is known to all, these treaties and agreements are but a means each of them uses to bind the other for a time and to beguile the world public. Take SALT for instance, each new round of talks and each new agreement between the two hegemonistic Powers brings a new escalation of strife between them for nuclear supremacy. The greater the "accumulation" of these talks and agreements, the quicker the development of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union and the United States started the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks eight years ago and have since concluded agreements of one kind or another. But what are the

(Mr. Chen, China)

results? Even the United States President had to admit himself that the Soviet Union and the United States had accumulated thousands of strategic nuclear weapons and that the nuclear warheads in the possession of the two countries were almost five times the amount eight years ago. A five-fold increase in eight years - that is the result of their talks and agreements. And the Soviet Union, in particular, has done a remarkable job in using talks and agreements as a camouflage for gaining superiority over its opponent. Eight years ago, the number of strategic weapons possessed by the United States exceeded that of the Soviet Union. Today not only has the Soviet Union exceeded the United States in the number of strategic weapons, but Soviet conventional arms have reached the total amount of the United States and Western Europe put together. At present, the Soviet Union is trying by every conceivable means to gain over-all military superiority over the United States, and its military expenditures are being "accumulated" at a "quite impressive" rate of 4 per cent to 5 per cent annually. Under these circumstances, the talks and agreements between the super-Powers are records of arms expansion and rivalry, rather than evidence of "détente". With the continual escalation of the super-Powers' arms expansion and war preparations, the rivalry between them is growing ever more intense. In particular, Soviet social-imperialism, which is even more aggressive and adventurous in nature, relying wholly on its viciously-swollen military strength, has taken an offensive posture and become increasingly rampant in stepping up its expansion all over the world, with Europe as its strategic focal point. Without mentioning the distant past, in the past year alone Soviet acts of aggression and expansion have reached a new peak in Africa and the Middle East, including the Red Sea area. Following its military intervention in Angola, it flagrantly engineered the invasion of Zaïre by mercenaries. It has repeatedly carried out interference, subversion and infiltration in the Sudan, Egypt and the "Horn of Africa" and spared no effort to sow dissension in the relations among the States in this region, provoking disputes and conflicts among them. As to Soviet infiltration and expansion in other parts of the world, its show of force on the ground, in the air and sea, its wanton encroachment upon the sovereignty of other States and its menace to the security of others, they are obvious to all. What can

(Mr. Chen, China)

be seen here is the intensification of rivalry and the increase of the factors for war, and there is not a trace of "détente". Only in the terminology of the Soviet representative can this situation be called "mutually beneficial co-operation".

The representative of a third world country has rightly said that "if we were to avoid war, the first requirement is that the causes of war be examined". Now it has become ever more clear that it is none other than the two super-Powers which, through continuous arms expansion and war preparations, have expanded their peace-time military apparatus to a scale unprecedented in human history. Aiming at exclusive world domination, each of them is desperately preparing to launch a new world war. Therefore, the source of a new world war lies in the two super-Powers, and not elsewhere. And Soviet social-imperialism, a late-comer which is more aggressive and adventurous in nature, is the most dangerous source of world war. The aforesaid representative of a third world country went on to say that the Soviet new item is making "an appeal in the wrong direction". While it is clearly the Soviet Union and the other super-Power that possess huge quantities of nuclear and conventional weapons and are constantly developing and manufacturing various types of new weapons, it has appealed to all the non-nuclear States, States with few nuclear weapons and States seriously inadequate in self-defence capabilities, "urging" them to implement the so-called disarmament measures. While it is clearly the Soviet Union itself that does not hesitate to use force or the threat of force for flagrant encroachment upon the sovereignty of other countries, for interference in their internal affairs, and even for outright armed invasion and military occupation of other States, it has "urged" other States to observe the principles of "non-use of force or the threat of force", "non-interference in each other's internal affairs" and "mutual respect for sovereignty and independence". The Soviet Union is doing so intentionally, not unaware that this is an "appeal in the wrong direction". Its aim is not only to use this as a camouflage for its arms expansion and war preparations and to shift the blame for its criminal aggression and expansion onto others or even let others share this blame, but to disarm the people of other countries mentally and materially vis-à-vis this number one war-monger which is armed to the teeth, so that they will submit to its pressure and manipulation.

(Mr. Chen, China)

The so-called "draft declaration" produced by the Soviet representative urges all States to "measure their actions in relation to other States and in all parts of the globe against the requirements of détente," and also to "take into account the legitimate interests ... of other States".

What are the "legitimate interests of other States"? As is known to all, in recent years all acts of Soviet aggression and expansion in various parts of the world have been carried out, without exception, under the pretext of taking into account the so-called "legitimate interests" of the Soviet Union. Its military occupation of Czechoslovakia was carried out in pursuance of Mr. Brezhnev's "theory of limited sovereignty" which was, of course, in accord with the Soviet "legitimate interests". It practises maritime hegemony, lording it over others in the oceans and territorial seas of other States, seizing overt and covert military bases, encroaching upon the sovereignty of other States and plundering their natural resources - all this in the name of "freedom of navigation", "freedom of scientific research" and "fuller utilization of resources", which are, of course, also in accord with the Soviet "legitimate interests". It even carried out subversive activities and sent mercenaries to invade other States in the name of "supporting the national liberation movement" and "the progressive forces", which were, of course, in fuller accord with the Soviet "legitimate interests". To put it bluntly, the so-called Soviet "legitimate interests" are a mere synonym for its practice of hegemony. It urges other States to "take into account" or tacitly accept its "legitimate interests", otherwise it would be incompatible with the so-called "requirements of détente" and would be "measured" and dealt with according to the aforesaid criteria.

(Mr. Chen, China)

Is it not clear what kind of stuff its "draft declaration on détente" is? What is more, it must be pointed out that although the "draft declaration" hypocritically refers to the need to "facilitate the earliest possible completion of the liberation of all colonial countries and peoples" in their statement and the "explanatory memorandum" the Soviet representatives have let the cat out of the bag by describing détente as "a prerequisite for the solution of problems of the utmost importance to all mankind" (A/32/242, p.2) and by wielding the nuclear stick to clamour that in the world today "any local conflict" or "regional crisis" can "escalate into a wider conflict". Is this not an attempt to write-off at one stroke the just struggle of the people of the world against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and to warn them that they must not resist imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and that any resistance on their part would escalate into a nuclear war and they would be punished for it? As a matter of fact, a series of just wars have been waged by the numerous oppressed nations and people for national independence and liberation and against imperialist aggression in the three decades and more after the Second World War, and not only have they not led to a world war, but on the contrary they have powerfully hit and weakened the imperialist forces of war and strengthened the forces for defending peace. But according to the logic of the Soviet representatives, these are all against "the requirements of détente", which are, therefore, impermissible. The super-Powers are completely free to practise hegemony according to their "legitimate interests", whereas the people of the world have no right to wage struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. Herein lies the essence of the "draft declaration".

As for the Soviet "draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war", it is another masterpiece of the naked policies of nuclear monopoly, nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail by this super-Power. It is also a manoeuvre to divert the attention of the people of the world from the unprecedented Soviet expansion of conventional arms. The draft resolution has sidestepped the repeated demands of the numerous small and medium-sized countries for the two super-Powers to undertake openly the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in any circumstances,



(Mr. Chen, China)

and particularly not to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear States. It has also evaded the fundamental issue of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, but talked glibly about the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In tune with this, Mr. Brezhnev produced not long ago a so-called comprehensive test ban "proposal". It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has conducted hundreds of nuclear tests. When it had conducted enough tests in the atmosphere, it proposed a partial ban on nuclear tests. Now, when it is about to finish its underground tests, it proposes a "moratorium" on all nuclear tests. This is, in effect, to give a free hand to its tests when it needs them, and when it has had enough of them it will not allow others to conduct tests. Prating about the "prevention of nuclear war", it never fails to wield nuclear weapons in its hands. It is making desperate efforts to improve and develop its own nuclear weapons, and has even deployed nuclear weapons on the territories or at the gate of other States.

Meanwhile, it is vehemently opposed to the possession and development of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear States or States with few nuclear weapons. Is this not an attempt to perpetuate the super-Powers' nuclear monopoly, nuclear supremacy and nuclear hegemony and to reduce the non-nuclear States and States with few nuclear weapons forever to a submissive position as nuclear slaves?

q To date, the Soviet Union has refused to sign Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. But in the draft resolution it has the impudence to declare that nuclear States should "respect" the "establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones by non-nuclear-weapon States". This is indeed the height of hypocrisy. The agreements concluded between the USSR and the United States to "avert the danger of nuclear war and to prevent the accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons" as advertised in the draft resolution neither prohibit the use of nuclear weapons nor provide for the thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, so there can be no talk about "diminishing the nuclear threat". Does not the "prevention of the accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons" mean that under "non-accidental" and "authorized" circumstances one would be free to use nuclear weapons at will? As to the Soviet proposal that "all nuclear-weapon States" should sit down at the negotiating table to

(Mr. Chen, China)

consider the question of nuclear disarmament in all respects, it is in effect a proposal for making nuclear deals and devising nuclear frauds behind the backs of the numerous non-nuclear countries. This, of course, is totally unacceptable to us.

In a word, the "new item" put forward by the Soviet Union this year consists of nothing but used wares with old wrappings. A "declaration" on sham "détente" plus a "resolution" on sham "disarmament" makes a dual fraud of sham détente and sham disarmament.

(Mr. Chen, China)

The fact that the super-Powers are the sources of a new world war and that the Soviet Union, in particular, is the most dangerous source of war is determined by their imperialist and social-imperialist nature and borne out by each and every deed on their part. It is futile for them to deny all this by pretending innocence. Their fierce rivalry is bound to lead to war some day, and this is independent of man's will. They will never change their minds, nor will they possibly put into practice what they "urge" others to do. Now what is the way out? The way out lies in stepping up the united struggle of the people of all countries against hegemonism. History has repeatedly shown that the unity in struggle forged by the people of all countries is the main force in defeating the war instigators. World war, though inevitable, can be postponed. So long as the people of all countries form the broadest international united front against hegemonism, refuse to be duped and defy intimidation, step up their preparations materially and organizationally against wars of aggression while dealing firm blows at, exposing and frustrating every super-Power act of aggression and expansion, and its war plans in various parts of the world, including its fraud of sham détente and disarmament, they will surely be able to upset and hold up the super-Powers time-table for launching war, thus postponing the outbreak of war, and placing the world people in a stronger position with greater initiative.

In the past year, by concerted struggle, the numerous African States crushed the mercenary invasion of Zaire engineered by social-imperialism. Certain Arab States and States in the Red Sea area took bold and decisive actions one after another to abrogate their "treaties of friendship" with social-imperialism and expel its military personnel and experts. By so doing, they have made practical and major contributions towards defending the peace and security in their respective areas and towards frustrating and upsetting the super-Power plans for war. In the world today, the forces against super-Power hegemonism are growing daily in strength. The united struggle of all forces against hegemonism represents the main trend of the development of the current international situation. Should the super-Powers dare to launch a war, there is no doubt that the people of various countries will finally wipe out the instigators of aggressive wars through protracted joint struggle.

(Mr. Chen, China)

In view of the foregoing, we consider that the two Soviet drafts are sinister in intent and pernicious in influence, and it is only natural that the Chinese delegation will expose and oppose them.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR expresses its great satisfaction at the fact that it is our honour to take the floor first on the question of the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war, after the Committee, pursuant to its decision, has resumed its consideration of this item.

I made no mistake when I said that my delegation was speaking first, because its previous statement has no direct relevance to the question we are now discussing and the introductory statement that the Chairman himself made.

The item on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war, which was placed on the agenda of the thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly at the initiative of the Soviet Union, gives all Member States an opportunity to focus their attention on the central problem of contemporary international relations, namely the problem of détente, the meaning of which consists, first and foremost, in ruling out the threat or use of force in disputes and conflicts among countries, and the purpose of which is to prevent the threat of another world war and create conditions in which all peoples can look to tomorrow without fear.

As a result of the efforts of the Soviet Union, other States of the socialist commonwealth and all peace-loving forces, it has been possible in recent years to achieve a turn away from the cold war towards détente, to roll back the threat of world war. The process of restructuring international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence is continuing and the relaxation of tension is emerging as the dominant trend in world politics. Détente is the road from confrontation to co-operation, from threats and sabre-rattling to the solving of disputes through negotiations, and in general it is the restructuring of international relations on the sound principles of peaceful coexistence, mutual trust, respect and mutual advantage.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

As was indicated by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade Leonid Ilyitch Brezhnev, in his report to the ceremonial meeting on the occasion of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution:

"The auspicious changes in the world which have become particularly perceptible in the 1970s have been called 'the relaxation of international tension'. These changes are tangible and concrete. They consist in the recognition and strengthening, by international instruments, of a kind of code of rules for honest and just mutual relations among countries, which create a legal and moral obstacle to those who are fond of military adventures. They consist in the achievement of the first, albeit as yet modest, understandings which have cut off some of the channels of the arms race. They consist in the ramified network of agreements encompassing many fields of peaceful coexistence among States with different social systems."

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

All this creates conditions for strengthening the cause of peace and fruitful intercourse among States, the development of trade and economic relations and the growth of scientific, technical and cultural exchanges. It is perfectly obvious that détente is essential for all countries which participate in normal international intercourse, and it would therefore be no exaggeration to say that the attitude to détente can today serve as a practical criterion for appraising the policies of any particular State and the attitude of each statesman.

It should be particularly stressed that détente brings benefits to all countries and peoples. Détente limits the lawlessness of imperialist and reactionary forces and creates favourable conditions for the development of all countries, including the developing ones, for it is precisely in conditions of détente that it has been possible to take the first tangible steps towards limiting the arms race in a number of directions. It is precisely in conditions of détente that victory has been won by the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos, Kampuchea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Angola and other countries. It is precisely in conditions of détente that a new and powerful blow has been struck at the colonial system in its classical forms and that it has been found possible to take a series of effective measures to isolate and boycott the racist régimes in the south of Africa.

Détente has helped to bring closer to practical realization the question of restructuring international relations on a just and democratic basis through the elimination of all manifestations of inequity and discrimination, all forms of exploitation by capitalist States of their weaker partners. In conditions of détente there are more promising prospects for complete decolonization and better opportunities for the young independent countries to focus their main efforts on solving the problems of strengthening their political independence and advancing their economic and social progress.

Those representatives who have noted that détente still requires deepening and consolidation are of course right. Peace on our earth and the cause of détente continue to be threatened by many dangers, the

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

chief of which is the ongoing arms race whipped up by the venomous propaganda of the warring circles of imperialism and their allies in the person of the Chinese leadership.

There can be no lasting peace or détente until every ember in the hotbed of war in the Middle East has been extinguished, or so long as the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury continue flagrantly to violate the rights of the indigenous populations of the south of Africa, or until other conflict situations - such as, for example, in Cyprus - have been settled. Accordingly, the efforts of all States must be aimed at making détente universal, ubiquitous and irreversible and extending it to all regions of the world.

The United Nations too must make itself felt in this matter, and that is the purpose of the draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente introduced by the Soviet Union, a draft declaration which is enjoying ever broader support in the United Nations, despite the fact that some, without any justification and without even seeking arguments to back their case, have maintained that détente is allegedly a matter for the great Powers only and that the United Nations has nothing to do with it - that, as they say, we have the United Nations Charter and therefore we have no need of a declaration on détente.

One might recall here, for example, that when the General Assembly, at its twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions in 1969 and 1970, discussed the question of adopting a declaration on the strengthening of international security there were also certain delegations which felt that there was no need for such a declaration because we had the United Nations Charter or because that was a matter, first and foremost, for the great Powers. As was rightly noted at that time by the representative of Sri Lanka, Mr. Amerasinghe, those Powers

"... have a special responsibility, but lesser Powers are not absolved from the duty of practising what they profess and preach."

(A/C.1/PV.1663, para. 99)



(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

A similar situation is taking shape in the consideration and approval in the United Nations of a number of other declarations and resolutions on many issues involved in the struggle for peace and international security, decolonization, economic development and co-operation, respect for human rights, the struggle against racism and apartheid, the progressive development of international law, and so on.

The United Nations has always overcome the resistance of those who oppose progressive decisions and has proved equal to the tasks facing it. We are convinced that this time again the United Nations will not stand aloof from the struggle to deepen and consolidate the process of détente - the more so as in its past decisions it has already repeatedly reaffirmed its commitment to the development of that process. For instance, in its resolution 3332 (XXIX) of 17 December 1974 the General Assembly appealed to all States "to broaden the scope of détente to cover the entire world". It addressed the same appeal to States in its resolutions 3389 (XXX) of 18 November 1975 and 31/92 of 14 December 1976.

We are deeply convinced that that appeal needs to be strengthened further. An important factor here will be the adoption of the draft declaration proposed by the Soviet Union. The draft declaration not only calls upon all States to continue and intensify their efforts for the deepening and consolidation of international détente, but also determines the most important directions those efforts should take, such as actively promoting the implementation of multilateral treaties and agreements which serve the interests of the strengthening of international security and the development of peaceful relations; adopting decisive steps to curb the arms race and to promote disarmament; the peaceful settlement of conflict situations and the prevention of new situations of that kind; pursuing a policy of non-interference in each other's internal affairs and mutual respect for sovereignty and independence; settling differences and disputes by peaceful means without resorting to force or the threat of force; facilitating the elimination of racist régimes and of vestiges of colonialism; the development in every way of equitable and mutually beneficial economic relations among all States on a fair basis, with due regard for the interests



(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

of developing countries; promoting the growth of feelings of friendship and mutual trust among all peoples; and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The cause of détente and peace must be the cause of every country, irrespective of its size, economic or military potential or geographical situation. Adoption by the United Nations of a declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente would unquestionably be an eloquent appeal to all Governments, States and peoples without exception. It would represent an important incentive in the struggle to make détente stable and irreversible and to extend it to all regions of the world.

Judging from the statements made within the walls of our Organization, all States are in favour of peace and international security - all, with one or two exceptions, and we heard one of them this morning. But, as was said by Comrade Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev:

"Much use will be all the fine words and declarations about commitment to peace, and much use will be everything that has already been achieved in the field of détente and peaceful co-operation among countries if, one fine day, somewhere, in some sensitive spot a spark is struck and all the accumulated stockpiles of means of destruction should burst into flames, means of destruction that can lay waste the earth and destroy entire peoples."

From this warning by the head of the Soviet State flows the urgent necessity to resolve without delay the task of our time, the task of preventing nuclear war. Many have said in this chamber that measures should be taken to prevent not only nuclear war but conventional war as well. We can only welcome this, and indeed we must not forget that since the end of the Second World War the flames of war have repeatedly broken out in Asia, in Africa, in the Near East and in Latin America. In those wars, the cause of which has been the refusal of aggressive circles of imperialism to accept the emancipation of peoples, millions of people have died. We must not allow this to continue, but I am sure everyone would agree that nuclear war is a qualitatively new and sinister phenomenon. If nuclear war should come, if the accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons should be unleashed, then mankind will be threatened with the danger of complete destruction.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Of course, it would be good if the danger of any war could be removed, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, through the conclusion of and strict compliance, with a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations through general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Union has in fact, from its very inception, worked long and consistently for the attainment of this goal and now the United Nations is considering specific proposals by the USSR aimed at this very objective. Unfortunately, however, the leading Western Powers continue to be reluctant to take such a course. So what then remains to be done? Must we wait passively? We consider that the "all or nothing" principle is absolutely unsuitable in international politics. We must always attempt to make progress here, making use of any opportunity available. We must move forward, even if only gradually and in individual areas, towards resolving the task of the non-use of force in international relations and also general and complete disarmament and preventing the threat of nuclear war.

On this road, through the joint efforts of peace-loving forces and with the most active contribution of the Soviet Union and other States of the socialist commonwealth, it has proved possible in recent years to achieve substantial results. Concrete and binding international treaties and agreements have been concluded on such questions as the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests in three environments, the adoption of measures against the further dissemination of nuclear weapons, the non-emplacment of such weapons in outer space and on the sea-bed and ocean floor, the limitation of the strategic armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States, the prohibition and elimination of bacteriological weapons and the prohibition of the military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, and also agreements have been concluded by the Soviet Union with the United States, France and the United Kingdom with a view to preventing nuclear war.

But what has been achieved needs to be consolidated and developed in order to put a stable and reliable end to mankind's drift towards nuclear war, and it is this purpose that is served by the Soviet Union's draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war (A/C.1/32/L.2), under which States would take concrete measures to eliminate the danger of such war.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The United Nations throughout its history, at the initiative of the Soviet Union and with the active participation of many non-nuclear countries, has been concerned with the problems of banning nuclear weapons, and consequently with eliminating the threat of nuclear war. In this regard it already has a number of positive decisions to its credit which have played and continue to play a positive role as a restraining factor. For example, at its sixteenth session in 1961, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. In that Declaration the General Assembly expressed serious concern that

"... the armaments race, particularly in the nuclear and thermo-nuclear fields, has reached a dangerous stage requiring all possible precautionary measures to protect humanity and civilization from the hazard of nuclear and thermo-nuclear catastrophe ...". (General Assembly resolution 1653 (XVI))

It went on to declare that

"The use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons would exceed even the scope of war and cause indiscriminate suffering and destruction to mankind and civilization and, as such, is contrary to the rules of international law and to the laws of humanity ..."

(Ibid., operative para. 1, (b)),

and also that

"The use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons is a war directed not against an enemy or enemies alone but also against mankind in general, since the peoples of the world not involved in such a war will be subjected to all the evils generated by the use of such weapons ...". (Ibid., (c))

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

In 1966, on the initiative of the Polish People's Republic, the twenty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution instructing the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the consequences of the possible use of nuclear weapons. The report (document A/6858) was prepared, with the participation of experts from Poland, the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Sweden, Mexico, Canada, Japan, India, Norway and Nigeria, describing the consequences of the possible use of nuclear weapons. The experts noted, among other things, the following:

"Were such weapons" - that is to say, nuclear weapons - "ever to be used in numbers, hundreds of millions of people might be killed, and civilization as we know it, as well as organized community life, would inevitably come to an end in the countries involved in the conflict. Many of those who survived the immediate destruction as well as others in countries outside the area of conflict, would be exposed to widely-spreading radioactive contamination, and would suffer from long-term effects of irradiation and transmit to their offspring, a genetic burden which would become manifest in the disabilities of later generations." (A/6858, p.5)

As can be seen, nuclear war would not leave a single State in the world untouched.

In 1972, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly adopted a declaration on the non-use of force in international relations and the simultaneous permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Now, pursuant to its resolution A/RES/31/9, the General Assembly is considering the Soviet Union's proposed draft of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations under which States would refrain from using weapons of any kind, including nuclear weapons.

From all the decisions of the United Nations that I have enumerated, the conclusion follows that we must continue the struggle to remove the danger of nuclear war. The Soviet draft resolution fully serves that purpose. It is particularly topical at this time when technology is undergoing headlong development, including military technology, when there is

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

an ever-closer link among the various regions of the world, when any local conflict can easily escalate into a world conflict. The draft resolution proceeds from the assumption that all States, and in the first instance the nuclear-weapon States, should so build their relations that the danger of nuclear war would be reduced and, in the final analysis, eliminated. It provides that all States, and first of all the nuclear-weapon States, should conduct negotiations regarding measures on the prevention of nuclear war, on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, on refraining from the manufacture of new and even more destructive systems of such weapons, on the reduction of nuclear armaments and on nuclear disarmament as important steps towards general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

The adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the draft resolution on preventing the danger of nuclear war and the implementation by all States of all the measures set forth in that draft resolution would be a new and important contribution to the struggle to eliminate the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

On the basis of these considerations, my delegation appeals to the delegations of all countries anxious to respond to the will of the peoples for peace, to support the Soviet Union's draft resolution on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and the draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war.

Our delegation, expressing the wish of the Byelorussian people to live in peace and friendship with all peoples, a wish proclaimed as long ago as 1919 at the time of the creation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, supports those proposals.

A candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Byelorussian SSR, Comrade Piotr Myronovich Masharov, in his report entitled "Sixty Years on the Road of Great October", said:

"A stable and lasting peace on earth is one of the principal concerns of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the most important prerequisite for the successful building of communism.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The Soviet State, from its very inception, has actively struggled to see the contention between socialism and capitalism resolved not on the field of battle and not in the arms race, but in the sphere of peaceful toil."

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian):

At today's meeting of the Committee, the Mongolian delegation would like to make a statement on the question of the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and once again to reaffirm the resolute position taken by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on this question.

A year ago, when the Soviet delegation put forward this new and important initiative in the General Assembly and proposed that further efforts should be made to ensure strict compliance by all States with the principle that there should be no threat or use of force in their international relations, a significant majority of the United Nations membership, including Mongolia, came out in favour of the comprehensive consideration of this question by the General Assembly and outlined specific steps towards the realization of that proposal.

Pursuant to United Nations General Assembly resolution A/RES/31/9, of which our delegation was also a sponsor, a whole series of States Members of the United Nations submitted to the Secretary-General their views and proposals on this question. The views of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of concluding a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations are contained in document A/32/122 of 22 June 1977 and are reflected, among others, in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/32/181.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In this matter the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic proceeds primarily from the importance of further continuously deepening international détente and strengthening international peace and security. These tasks require that we consolidate the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force, and make it a strict law of international life.

Our delegation takes the view that favourable international political prerequisites now exist for the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. Thanks to the purposeful efforts of the socialist countries and peace-loving States, concrete steps are now being taken towards consolidating the positive changes which have taken place on the international scene and towards making international détente an uninterrupted and universal process.

However, explosive hotbeds continue to exist in various parts of the world, fraught with dangerous consequences. They increase the real danger that local conflicts may escalate into another world war. The arms race is continuing, nuclear weapons are being further perfected, and plans are being hatched to develop and manufacture new and even more destructive means of waging war.

In this connexion, we should like particularly to stress the fact that the emergence of nuclear weapons and their further improvement have wrought major changes in the international political situation since the time the United Nations Charter was signed.

From this there flows the necessity to solve the problem of increasing the effectiveness of the principle of the non-use of force in organic interrelation with the problem of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. As is known, on the proposal of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the General Assembly in 1972 adopted a resolution in which it solemnly declared, in the name of the United Nations membership, that the Members would renounce the threat or use of force in all its forms and manifestations in their international relations, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.



(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

It must be noted with regret that, because of the negative position taken by some of its permanent members, the Security Council has not yet succeeded in taking appropriate measures for the full implementation of the aforementioned Declaration of the General Assembly.

In my delegation's view, the time has come to give that solemn Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly treaty force in international law.

We consider that the draft world treaty submitted by the Soviet Union at the last session of the General Assembly is a good basis for the preparation of an international instrument which would prohibit the use of force in international relations. Here we should like to note that the key element in the Soviet draft treaty is the obligation of all its parties to refrain from the use of armed force, including the use of weapons of any kind, nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction, on land, at sea, in the air or in outer space, and also not to threaten the use of such weapons or force.

The Mongolian delegation considers that the concretization and development of the United Nations Charter principle on refraining from the threat or use of force in international relations, taking into account the changes that are going on in international life, and turning that principle into a universal and binding norm of conduct among States, is a completely realistic and legitimate approach.

It seems to us that the codification of basic principles proclaimed in the United Nations Charter is a generally accepted practice. One might enumerate here a whole series of bilateral and multilateral treaties, conventions and agreements, as well as pertinent resolutions and declarations of the United Nations General Assembly, in which the principle of the non-use of force in international relations has been enshrined.

We find incomprehensible the position taken by certain States that regard the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations as an unnecessary duplication and a selective reiteration of a principle already established in the United Nations Charter. These persons even assert that such a treaty will not actually serve the primacy of the Charter but will in fact tend to reduce the solemnity of legal obligations, and play down the force and authority of the United Nations Charter.

Our delegation cannot agree with such assertions. We take the view that refraining from the threat or use of force is organically bound up with the principle of peaceful coexistence of States. In the nuclear age there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence, which is now universally recognized and is being given more and more practical effect as a result of the deepening of the process of détente and the development of friendly co-operation among States.

Those, therefore, who really favour respect for the principles of the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States, and the peaceful settlement of disputes cannot set themselves against the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

There can be no doubt that enshrining this most important principle of international relations in the form of a single binding universal treaty would serve not only to strengthen trust and mutual understanding, but would also contribute to ensuring equal security for all States.

In this connexion, we should like to point to one of the most important elements of the Soviet draft treaty. Article IV of the draft treaty would bind all parties to making every possible effort to take effective measures to reduce military confrontation and to promote disarmament, which would be steps towards the final objective of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

We particularly stress the fact that the Soviet proposal includes a recognition of the sovereign right of peoples individually or collectively to repulse aggression in order to defend their political independence and territorial integrity, as provided in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. It also reaffirms the lawful right of colonial peoples to carry on the struggle for their freedom and independence using all means available to them.

We should also like to draw attention to another important point. It seems to us that such a treaty needs to be universal. If all major military States are not parties to it, and first and foremost all nuclear-weapon States, it will be impossible to ensure the full effectiveness of such a treaty. We therefore see it as the duty of all States, without exception, actively and constructively to participate both in drafting and in concluding the world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

We are firmly convinced that the conclusion of such a treaty will undoubtedly contribute to ending the arms race, to preventing the threat of world war and to strengthening international peace and security, and it is these purposes that are served by the latest initiative of the Soviet Union put forward at the present session of the General Assembly on the question of the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war. This proposal of the Soviet Union is receiving ever wider support of peoples in every corner of the world, since it is in keeping with their crucial interests and legitimate aspirations and hopes.

Today, the struggle of the peoples for peace and disarmament is becoming a powerful force. No one can halt the invincible process of international détente. The attempts of those that are trying to spike the wheels of history are in vain. The wise old proverb says, "The dog barks, but the caravan goes its way". All peace-loving States are resolved to continue their efforts towards strengthening international peace and security.

My delegation considers that the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, guided by the highest interests of ensuring international peace and security, must carefully consider the question of concluding a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and outline practical measures for drawing up a generally acceptable text of such a treaty. By so doing,

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

the United Nations would make a further tangible contribution to the cause of peace, détente and disarmament.

Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia): After an intermission devoted by the First Committee to the discussion of questions of disarmament, one perceives with yet greater clarity the urgent and importunate nature of the question of the all-round deepening and consolidation of international détente and of the search for new ways of reducing the risk of nuclear war brought up in the current session of the General Assembly by the delegation of the Soviet Union. These tasks are all the more pressing because détente, under the sign of which international relations have been successfully developing in the recent period, still has adversaries that are evidently striving for a return to the cold war. This was evidenced in our Committee this very morning by a statement of one delegation that even did not hesitate to mention the name of my country in a slanderous way.

It is an undeniable fact that the policy of international détente which was an historically unavoidable response to the period in the course of which we were often not too far from an outbreak of a third world-wide military conflict, has substantially changed the over-all picture of relations among States and provided a necessary foundation on which lasting peace could be built. The over-all international climate has considerably improved. There is an increased intensity of relations and a greater volume of co-operation among States in the political, economic, cultural, scientific and other fields of international life. There is a growing understanding of the necessity of shaping mutual relations on the basis of principles of peaceful coexistence among States with different social and economic systems.

A typical aspect of international life in recent years has been the practice of meetings between representatives of various countries at a high or even the highest level which makes it possible to solve flexibly the most pressing problems of mutual relations, increases mutual understanding and confidence, and creates the prerequisites for the continued positive development of bilateral co-operation. Dozens of communiques and joint statements

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

from these meetings reflect a striving to deepen and consolidate international détente and to expand it to all fields of international life, and towards the goal of safeguarding lasting peace and preventing the danger of war. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, too, consistently pursues these objectives in its bilateral relations. For instance, in the communiqué issued after the meeting between the highest representatives of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and of the Republic of Iraq on 3 June this year the two parties emphasized, among other things, the necessity of expanding the process of international détente to all parts of the world and

"expressed their conviction that détente must be based on respect for the principles of equality, non-interference, sovereignty, mutual advantage, the right of peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence", and at the same time they highlighted

"the necessity for the political détente to be accompanied by a détente in the military sphere".

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

Equally, in the communiqué issued following the talks between the Heads of States of Czechoslovakia and Iran of 1 September 1977, the two parties expressed the identical view that:

"the process of international détente is of vital importance for all States of the world regardless of their geographical position, size or the nature of their social system and they expressed themselves in favour of its continuation so that it might become permanent and irreversible."

All this, in our view, testifies to the fact that the ideas of détente are gradually becoming a predominant trend in relations among States and that there is a growing awareness of the necessity of a continuous and all-round development of this positive process.

Of particularly great importance for détente and the continued development of the positive results of international détente is the normalization of relations among nuclear Powers which are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. Of vital importance, in our view, are the measures for the prevention of the danger of a mutual nuclear conflict, measures reached gradually between the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the United States, Great Britain and France on the other. However, the participation of all States possessing these weapons is indisputably necessary, in order to create a truly universal system preventing the use of nuclear weapons and thus creating prerequisites for their liquidation. In this context I should like to highlight once more the proposals by the Soviet Union to hold a conference of the five nuclear Powers which, in our view, could tackle in the most competent way all the questions relating to nuclear security and nuclear disarmament.

Current international relations are characterized by the holding of a growing number of important international conferences dealing with the most varied aspects of world developments and facilitating the gradual unification of views of different States on the most important problems of the current times relating to the prevention of the danger of war and the safeguarding of durable international peace, to the restructuring of international economic relations and to the liquidation of the remnants of colonialism.

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

Many new beneficial measures in that respect were achieved by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which marked a historical watershed in the development of the European as well as world history. At that Conference, 35 countries, including four nuclear Powers, expressed, for the first time, their joint political determination to strive to make international détente an undisturbed, viable and universal process and stated, at the same time, the necessity of adopting effective measures aimed at general and complete disarmament and of proceeding in their implementation primarily from the "interdependence of the political and military aspects of security". At Helsinki, Czechoslovakia initiated the adoption of an agreement to ensure the continuation of the Conference with a view to facilitating practical measures for the continued implementation of the decisions taken by the Conference. We trust that the same spirit of constructive co-operation will result also from the meeting of the participants at the all-European Conference in Belgrade. A significant contribution to the fulfilment of the most fundamental objectives set forth in the Final Act of the Conference could be the implementation of the proposal by the member States of the Warsaw Treaty from November of last year to conclude a treaty among the participants at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other and on the dissolution of the military organizations of the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries or, at least, on their freezing. The next step could be a universal, world-wide treaty on the non-use of force in international relations applying both to nuclear and any other weapons.

The need to continue along the road of international détente and prevention of the danger of war has also been repeatedly stressed on various occasions by the developing and non-aligned countries. It was, after all, thanks to the policy of détente that the process of the liberation of the colonial countries and peoples has been substantially accelerated, and colonialism, racism and apartheid, which not so long ago were regarded as something almost natural, today stand rightly condemned as international crimes. The impact of the policy of détente facilitated the gradual solution of a number of grave



(Mr. Smid. Czechoslovakia)

international conflicts endangering world peace. The armed aggression against the peoples of Indo-China suffered a complete failure and more African countries have liberated themselves from colonial oppression. With better prospects of success and with a greater emphasis we can today conduct negotiations on the liquidation of the remaining hotbeds of war throughout the world, whether in southern Africa, Cyprus or the Middle East, and press for their solution on the basis of the just principles characteristic of the policy of détente.

Significant changes have also been brought about by the policy of détente in economic relations among States. These fundamental changes were also reflected, among other things, in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and in the United Nations Declaration on the establishment of a new economic order. However, while on this point, I should like to stress our conviction that without détente no progress will be achieved in disarmament and without disarmament, even if only partial at the beginning, we shall not succeed in solving adequately the problems relating to the restructuring of international economic relations which is so rightly demanded by the developing countries.

From the rostrum of the United Nations and in other forums it has been repeatedly and correctly pointed out that international détente is a complex and sensitive process which must be continuously revived in the practical activities of States and in which failure in one respect may also entail grave consequences for other fields of international life. Although relaxation of tension is predominant in relations among States, we still cannot say that the process is now irreversible.



(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

It is necessary to search for and to adopt ever new measures, so that the policy of détente, based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, might become an irreversible guideline in the solution of all questions of mutual relations among States of all social and economic systems. The United Nations, too, should play a significant role in this, being the most universal international body whose main purpose, as embodied in Article 1 of the Charter, is:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace ... and to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."

There is no doubt that the United Nations has already accomplished a great deal for the implementation of these objectives, for turning the abstract ideal of international détente into a reality in a number of fields, whether it was the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New Economic Order, the Declaration of the Principles of International Law Governing the Relations of Friendship and Co-operation among States, or a number of other important decisions. All this, of course, detracts nothing from the responsibility of the United Nations and its Member States for the continued progress in the consolidation of world peace and security, and in the prevention of the danger of war.

On the contrary, it is necessary to make full use of all its possibilities and reserves, to use its mediation to mobilize the political will of States to advance the principles of peaceful coexistence and to create a climate conducive to the achievement of new practical measures aimed at these objectives. What ranks foremost among the tasks of the current time is the necessity of deepening and accelerating the process of international détente, and of expanding it to all fields of international relations, particularly to the military field. Closely related with this is the urgent necessity of removing forever the danger of war, especially a nuclear war which represents the greatest danger for the peoples of all countries, both large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear. We therefore consider

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

correct the demand that all States Members of the United Nations should combine their forces within this Organization and, with a view to achieving the aforementioned goals, adopt such measures as the United Nations can adopt and even is in duty bound to adopt.

The Czechoslovak delegation, like all other delegations, has had sufficient time to acquaint itself thoroughly with the proposals submitted to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly by the Soviet Union in documents A/C.1/32/L.1 and L.2 which, at the fourth meeting of the First Committee on 17 October 1977, were already introduced in detail by the representative of the USSR. If we juxtapose the most important problems and requirements of the current stage of international development, as they have been pointed out in the statements at this General Assembly session by the delegations of the great majority of the States Members of the United Nations, and the content of the considered drafts of the declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and the resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war, we reach the unequivocal conclusion that both the drafts that have been submitted fully correspond with the need for concerted efforts by all States Members of the United Nations aimed at the solution of the aforementioned problems. The adoption of these documents could represent a substantial step forward in the endeavour for the universality of the process of international détente and for the application of the principles of peaceful coexistence and collective security, not only to some but to all parts of the world. At the same time there would be an even more substantive reduction of the risk of war and the prospects would grow for real progress in such priority tasks as disarmament, the restructuring of international economic relations, liquidation of the remnants of colonialism and racism and the just settlement of conflicts that are still endangering world peace. In this context, I should like to recall the words of the Czechoslovak Minister for Foreign Affairs who, on 4 October, stated in this year's general debate:

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

"It is therefore not so much our task ... to prove to each other the need for peace, that is, to preach to the converted, but rather, on the basis of a profound analysis, to come to agreement as to what effective, active and constructive measures are necessary to achieve that goal."

(A/32/PV.19, p. 67)

In this connexion the Czechoslovak delegation would like to reaffirm its conviction that the proposals by the Soviet Union which are now under our consideration belong to this category of active and constructive steps aimed at strengthening world peace, and expresses therefore its full support for them. May I, in conclusion, express the hope of my delegation that these proposals will enjoy the widest support of our colleagues in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to suggest to the Committee that we close the list of speakers in the general debate on the agenda items under consideration on Wednesday, 30 November, at 5 p.m. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I request those delegations which have proposals or draft resolutions to submit to the Committee to submit them as soon as possible in order to expedite our work and to give members enough time to study them and to be prepared when the Committee proceeds to take decisions on them.

As there are no speakers for this afternoon it will be necessary to cancel the meeting that was to be held at 3 o'clock.

At tomorrow morning's meeting the Committee will revert to the consideration of the two items relating to outer space, in which connexion I should like to announce that Ghana has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.43.

Immediately after the conclusion of the consideration of the outer space items tomorrow morning we shall resume consideration of agenda items 37, 50 and 127.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.