

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records \*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
56th meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 7 December 1977  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 56th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

---

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/32/PV.56  
8 December 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 50 AND 127 (continued)

● CONCLUSION OF A WORLD TREATY ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
(A/32/94, 95, 97, 103, 112, 114, 119, 122, 123, 131 and Add.1)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY  
(A/32/68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78, 89, 93, 117, 123, 140, 153, 154, 157, 164 and  
Add.1, 165 and Add.1-2; A/C.1/32/2, 3; A/C.1/32/L.45)

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)

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): Beautiful words have been found for the titles of agenda items 37, 50 and 127, which we are now discussing. But, as the representatives of many countries have already emphasized, these beautiful words cannot at all be the subject of satisfaction.

Bearing in mind the troubling and dangerous situation existing in the world and the policy of hegemony of the two imperialist super-Powers, it can clearly be seen that the proposals made every year by the Soviet social-imperialists to inscribe on the agenda of the United Nations subjects such as "the non-use of force for aggressive purposes", "deepening and consolidation of détente", "prevention of nuclear war" and "international security" are but hoaxes and attempts to use the work of international organizations for political and propaganda purposes.

The American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are making much over so-called détente. For years the word "détente" has been widely used in the pages of their newspapers, in political statements and official declarations. The Soviet socialist imperialists say that they are the great champions of détente and seek to make points by making a lot of noise here at the United Nations.

It is sufficient merely to compare the two super-Powers' words with their actions to note behind all their talk about peace and détente that they are disguising their aggressive designs and their war preparations, that slogans on disarmament are concealing the arms race and that words on international security and the non-use of force are intended to camouflage attempts to provoke conflicts and disorder.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The two imperialist super-Powers deeply desire to give the impression that détente is now established and that the only remaining problem is to preserve the results obtained and to deepen the process of détente. They proclaim their "détente" as a magic means to create miracles, a means which can ensure peace, disarmament, the non-use of force, the peaceful settlement of conflicts, mutually advantageous co-operation among States and respect for international principles, norms and treaties. They claim that it is sufficient to deepen the process of détente a little further for conditions to be met to liquidate the dangers of war and aggression, to put an end to pressure, blackmail and interference in internal affairs, to establish tranquillity and harmony in the world and to solve all the problems of concern to mankind. The Soviet social-imperialists seek to make us believe that détente can liquidate colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid, and solve the problems of youth and of women, of food and population in the entire world and that, thanks to détente, exploitation and social injustices will disappear of themselves.

Those are the demagogic slogans and words. But we cannot forget reality and facts that prove that détente is but a slogan invented to misguide peoples. What kind of détente can it be when we see that the international situation is full of contradictions and major confrontations which are extended throughout the entire world and which affect every aspect of human society today? Can one say that détente already prevails in the world when we note that the two imperialist super-Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - and other imperialist Powers are striving by every means to exploit political and economic situations for their own benefit and to take advantage of the backwardness of a large number of countries, particularly in Africa, Asia and Latin America, in order to preserve their privileges and to penetrate further in order to pillage their natural wealth and hinder their free and independent development. There cannot be détente in the world at a time when the imperialist super-Powers and other reactionary forces are feverishly preparing for wars and acts of aggression, when the arms race is continuing and war budgets are increasing. The word "détente" has a false ring when we note that every day serious events occur where one State is pitting itself against another and where hardly has one fire been put out before another is kindled.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

And all this is because of the policy of "divide and rule" being practised by the two imperialist super-Powers.

The alleged détente cannot in any way be interpreted as an important feature of the present world situation. This situation, on the contrary, has its fundamental feature in the ever-growing struggle of peoples for national and social liberation, and in their increasingly firm opposition to the aggressive and hegemonic policy practised by the imperialist super-Powers, to their plots and machinations and to the crafty manoeuvres of the false friends of the peoples.

Imperialism, social-imperialism and reactionaries under any label may speak of détente or new conditions which are allegedly being created throughout the world. They can propagate deceptive slogans, but they can never conceal reality nor embellish the aggressive nature of the imperialist super-Powers or the dangerous character of imperialist military blocs and alliances.

Peoples can always perceive that so-called détente is but an aspect of the relations between the imperialist super-Powers at a time of bargaining between them to the detriment of freedom and independence and of the sovereign rights of peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples and States.

Peoples have fought and are fighting to defend their rights both against the external enemy, represented in the first place by the two super-Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - and against the internal enemy, which is linked to imperialism and social imperialism. There can be no détente between the peoples and their enemies. The successes so far won by the peoples are due only to their struggle and not at all to détente, as the imperialists and the social imperialists claim, nor to the fact that various States are linked in heterogeneous groups expressed in algebraic or arithmetical numbers, according to arbitrary criteria.

Many other facts bear witness to the truth that there is no détente in the world and that far from it there is an aggravation of contradictions. Imperialism and social-imperialism have become increasingly bogged down in a profound crisis, which inevitably leads to the aggravation of the inter-imperialist contradictions, to growing rivalry between the two super-Powers to dominate the world, to more desperate competition between the imperialist Powers and the capitalist monopolies so as to ensure for themselves markets and sources of raw materials.

( Mr. Baleta, Albania )

In many regions the danger of fascism is becoming more and more threatening. The situations that exist are not such as to inspire satisfaction, even less euphoria, or as to allow us to think that we can take shelter from the dangers by relying on imperialism or social-imperialism.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The so-called anti-imperialist front extolled by the socio-imperialists of the Soviet Union and the reiterated appeals to support American imperialism for the alleged purpose of opposing Soviet social-imperialism are intended to involve peoples in the dangerous game played by the super-Powers. But nations have learnt from their own experience that the two imperialist super-Powers are their greatest enemies, both equally dangerous.

Since the end of the Second World War, American imperialism has been engaged in criminal activity on a wide scale against the peoples of the entire world; it has clawed its way into every continent. Its entire policy has been and continues to be based on aggression, violence, blackmail, subversion and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, including their allies and their partners. American imperialism has suffered stinging defeats throughout the period of so-called détente, but that has not changed nor can it change its aggressive nature. After each defeat, it makes even greater efforts to pull itself together and prepare for new ventures against the peoples of the world.

Soviet social-imperialism, which makes wide use of demagogy on the subject of détente in order to disguise its aggressive character, is a no less ferocious enemy hungering for expansion than American imperialism. It too practises a policy of colonialism and neo-colonialism based on the power of its capital and its weapons. The Soviet socio-imperialists have just given legal sanction, through the interpretation of many articles of the constitution which was recently approved, to its foreign policy as an imperialist super-Power whose official doctrine is the notorious theory of "limited sovereignty". That constitution serves as a legal basis for the idea of complete militarization of the whole of contemporary Soviet society and the policy of hegemony of the Soviet Union.

The two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, often reproach each other for wishing to slow down or halt the process of détente. That is nothing but a trick to deceive other countries over their policy to derive the greatest profit possible from the illusions created today to make

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

peoples believe that they can defend their interests by relying on the super-Powers to oppose one another. But nations that have had to wage long and difficult campaigns to free themselves from the oppression of the colonial yoke refuse to accept that fatal logic. They will not accept the neo-colonialism of one super-Power to free themselves allegedly from the danger of domination by the other. Nor can they place their hopes in the support of former colonizers to counter the aims of the new colonizers.

Of course, the imperialist super-Powers are not free to do what they want throughout the world. The hatred of the sovereign peoples and countries that love peace and freedom for the imperialist super-Powers is growing and they are becoming ever more opposed to the policy of the super-Powers.

We should also mention the many growing contradictions even within the aggressive blocs and alliances established and controlled by the super-Powers. Centrifugal forces are in motion within those blocs because of the exacerbation of internal contradictions and difficulties, because each of the two super-Powers is constantly seeking to stick its nose into the other's sphere of influence and thus embarrass its adversary. It is absurd to try to find any indication of détente in these phenomena. They are in fact simply the result of existing tensions and their aggravating causes.

The two imperialist super-Powers use their concept of "détente", "disarmament", "non-use of force", "prevention of nuclear war" and so on as a means to intimidate people. They demand arrogantly that people should accept their ideas without question, otherwise they say that the whole world will be exposed to the risk of war and will be plunged into disarray.

They assume threatening attitudes and say that in an era of nuclear weapons no alternative exists other than to agree to the détente that they propose. According to that strange logic of the imperialist super-Powers, it is because of nuclear weapons that détente came into being and therefore nuclear weapons are necessary to promote the process of détente. According to that same logic, therefore, nations should have only praise for the continuation of the creation

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

and stockpiling of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the imperialist super-Powers because those weapons do not present any danger but, on the contrary, promote détente.

The Soviet socio-imperialists claim that impressive results have been obtained from détente, that détente means the end of the "cold war" and of the policy of "brinkmanship", that détente has converted confrontation into dialogue, has thus created a fresh atmosphere between the United States and the Soviet Union and has opened the way to various international treaties and agreements. But is it possible to take those sterile arguments seriously? Mere talk of the elimination of the cold war cannot make us forget that the imperialist super-Powers and reactionary forces have not for a single instant ceased launching armed aggression against peoples and interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

Thus the policy of "brinkmanship" continues in even more obdurate fashion than before. Never before have the imperialist super-Powers amassed so many deadly weapons of mass destruction in their arsenals as they have today. The American imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists themselves recognize that those weapons are intended for use eventually in a nuclear war against each other. Equally, they repeat incessantly that there is a great need in the world for military balance between the two imperialist super-Powers.

The Helsinki Conference is often mentioned and the situation in Europe is cited as a model for détente. The two super-Powers, further, have promised to do everything possible to extend that kind of détente to the Mediterranean basin and to other regions. But the history of Europe and the situation existing today in that continent shows that peace and security cannot be established by creating a balance between the two imperialist super-Powers or through their bargainings. The Helsinki Conference and its decisions have brought nothing of value to Europe. No positive change has taken place so far. No real step has been taken to prevent a war in Europe. The American imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists wanted the Helsinki Conference to use it merely as a



(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

bargaining place, in order to regroup and legalize their share of the spheres of influence. A certain "status quo" established by the two super-Powers does not mean that they have in any way renounced their policy or their aggressive activities.

Neither the Helsinki Conference nor its decisions have deterred the two super-Powers from maintaining their armies and military bases on the territories of several European countries, from increasing their weapons arsenals, organizing military manoeuvres, stepping up the number of cruises taken by their war fleets around Europe, and continuing their efforts to strengthen the aggressive blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

Europe cannot become an island of peace and tranquillity in the midst of a turbulent ocean. Europe cannot be shielded from a war in a world full of hotbeds of conflict and of tension. The decisions of the Helsinki Conference are a dead letter and serve only as a pretext for the imperialist super-Powers to engage in mutual recrimination or to promote meetings such as that in Belgrade which is of no interest to anyone.

The words and slogans of détente are a mere deceit, as the leader of the Albanian people, Mr. Enver Hoxha, emphasized when he said:

"The world has never been subjected to diversionary action and diplomatic propaganda campaigns of the scope of those which the imperialists and socio-imperialists are now waging and which tend to present in a favourable light the policy of hegemony and expansion of the super-Powers in justification of their aggression and to camouflage their preparations for war.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

"In the East as well as in the West imperialist and social-imperialist military leaders claim that humanity is in a period of relaxation of international tensions, that the cold war and the dangerous confrontation likely to bring about a confrontation between those super-Powers have yielded to détente, to peaceful coexistence, to international harmony, general security, and so on; that the dangers are gone, that the clouds of war and catastrophes have been dispelled. By these slogans, which are only intended to deceive, the two super-Powers, the bourgeoisie and international reactionism intend to mystify peoples, weaken their resistance and impose on them imperialist control and domination."

The two imperialist super-Powers also make a great deal of noise about the horrors of nuclear war and invite others to understand without delay that such a war must be avoided. But never do they dare to reply to a simple question, namely: who wants a nuclear war and who is preparing it? We know well that they want to avoid having to reply. It is they themselves who are preparing to unleash a nuclear war, who threaten the entire world with their atomic weapons, who zealously keep these weapons and perfect them for further blackmail and to intimidate the peoples.

On the other hand, in speaking of the horrors of a nuclear war, the super-Powers seek to create the impression that it is only nuclear wars which are dangerous, and thus divert the attention from conventional wars which have been unleashed or which they are preparing. But we know very well that the imperialists have exterminated millions of people and massacred entire peoples by unleashing conventional wars and that they continue to kill and destroy by using conventional weapons.

The two imperialist super-Powers seek to prove that it is sufficient to take a formal decision and nuclear war will be prevented. After that peoples will be able to be calm, even if preparations for a nuclear conventional war of the two super-Powers continue, and even if there are local wars and aggressions.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

Under the pretext of a fictitious prevention of a nuclear war, the imperialist super-Powers seek to compel peoples to renounce their struggle for freedom and independence and efforts to defend their national rights. The best proof of this is given by the arrogant attitude of the social-imperialists, which reflects the intentions of the two super-Powers. The social-imperialists issue warnings to peoples and countries deprived of nuclear weapons to be vigilant and not to create complicated situations which might compel the imperialist Powers to use atomic weapons. How cynical to say that peoples and States which have no nuclear weapons will bear the responsibility for nuclear war should it break out.

It is not necessary to prove that peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples and countries are against nuclear war and against any local aggressive war or generalized war waged with conventional or modern weapons. The fundamental problem is how to fight against aggressive wars. There is much speculation on the point of how to induce people to have a mistaken idea. Some spread the illusion that the existence of nuclear weapons and of weapons of mass destruction on both sides compels those who possess those weapons to think carefully before using them and that, accordingly, it is almost impossible that they will decide to start a war.

Others affirm that world war is by fate inevitable and the most one can do is to delay its outbreak. Others still defend the theory that the leaders of the imperialist super-Powers have become and will become increasingly more reasonable and that we have to let them reach an agreement and work quietly to avoid war.

All these dangerous ideas are expressed and spread to disguise the genuine causes of wars of aggression and to camouflage the preparations for war. Those who invented them scorn the aspirations of peoples and seek to weaken their will and their confidence in their own strength to combat the danger of war.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

It is notorious that wars of aggression are not purely and simply the effect of weapons as such. All wars of aggression, which are unjust wars, are the direct result of the policy of the imperialist Powers, and weapons are only the means of waging war. At present, the aggressive policy and aims of hegemony of the two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, constitute the main source and the greatest danger of war. Imperialism and social-imperialism mean war and aggression. Their aggressive policies of rivalry they engage in to establish their hegemony and domination in the world leads them to war, which may start in Europe but also in Asia and the Middle East or in Africa.

The dangers of war are real and the peoples cannot remain inactive when confronting these dangers, nor can they be reduced to passivity or to resignation or become simply spectators of war preparations. Nor can they remain inactive and run the risk of becoming the victim of the deceptive sophistry of the authors of war who intend to spread the psychosis that people can do nothing against war.

Peoples can struggle successfully against war without thereby renouncing their right to liberation and national defence. They must redouble their vigilance in the light of the war preparations of the imperialist super-Powers and firmly oppose them so as not to give a free hand to the warmongers to execute their plans.

Peoples are able to bar the way to war by their resolute struggle to defend their freedom, independence and national sovereignty and their determination to undo the aggressors should they dare to start a war. Peoples cannot renounce the struggle against imperialist war and seek their well-being under the tutelage of imperialist Powers, nor can they believe that war will be avoided by placing their hopes in the role of the United States and the Soviet Union, or by hoping that the military blocs controlled by the two imperialist super-Powers will be consolidated and counter-balance one another.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The events which have taken place this year show how false and dangerous are the fabrications of the Soviet socio-imperialists, who trumpet it abroad that the use of force for aggressive ends in international relations can be eliminated by the conclusion of treaties and conventions. These events prove that the imperialists, the socio-imperialists and the reactionaries are making much ado about détente, the non-use of force and the prevention of nuclear war to lull the vigilance of the peoples, in order to be able to strike later, hard and without warning. That is why we have denounced and will continue to denounce these demagogic slogans.

Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): My delegation thought it useful to speak today in the debate on items 37, 50 and 127, now under consideration in our Committee, in order to show, first of all, my country's interest in these questions, to express its appreciation of the praiseworthy efforts undertaken by the USSR for many years in this field, to indicate the attention it is giving the latest Soviet initiative concerning international détente and, finally, to offer a number of general observations prompted by the situation as it appears now and by certain opinions expressed in the course of the present debate.

In the view of a small non-nuclear country, international peace and security, the elimination of the nuclear threat and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war cannot depend only on an improvement in the international climate between certain Powers situated in certain regions. International peace and security require a real redefinition of international relations in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter. They call for an end, desired by the overwhelming majority, to confrontation within spheres of influence in the Middle East and in southern Africa, as well as the establishment of equitable economic relations.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

It is in this context that we believe items 37, 50 and 127 should be considered, for their interdependence is too obvious to need any further comment.

On item 37, "Conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations", my delegation, at the thirty-first session, welcomed this idea and voted in favour of the proposal that the General Assembly should be asked to invite Member States to set forth their views and observations on the subject, since we believe that we would thus open the way to a more thorough study of the draft treaty.

The idea behind the renunciation of the use of force in international relations is not new, it is to be found in Article 2, paragraph 4 of the United Nations Charter and underlies all the efforts to create a system of international relations founded on the primacy of law.

Among the most important documents which have reaffirmed the provisions of the Charter, one cannot fail to mention the following: the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, dated 24 October 1970; the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, dated 16 December 1970; the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, dated 14 December 1960; the Definition of Aggression, dated 14 December 1974.

In the course of the three decades that have elapsed since the establishment of the United Nations, however, the world has witnessed the persistence of conflicts among States, conflicts originating in political, military, economic and social disparities and inequalities. The fact is that the most powerful States can always get their way with the less powerful States, explicitly or implicitly, directly or indirectly, and without even having open recourse to force.

The adoption of agreed rules of conduct and of procedures for the settlement of international disputes does not seem to us to be useless. We do not think that it would detract from the clarity of the Charter or undermine its authority.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

Under item 37 my delegation is, in fact, giving its closest attention to a document in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter whose provisions would usefully supplement the instruments and documents that already exist and which would tend to strengthen the system set up by the Charter and repeatedly confirmed since then. For its part, the Sixth Committee, is now considering a draft resolution on the subject of item 37 within its own field of competence. My delegation expresses the hope that it will be possible for that Committee to come to a decision in due course.

Item 50, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" is of capital importance for all the regions of the world. The Declaration adopted by the General Assembly in 1970 by a near-unanimous vote, is based on the United Nations Charter which enunciates the principles of equality, sovereignty, territorial integrity, the peaceful settlement of disputes and non-recourse to the threat or use of force.

My country has always respected those principles and is resolutely committed with other countries to the policy of strengthening the role of the United Nations. I should like to repeat that Tunisia, as a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, is increasingly concerned at the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and at the qualitative and quantitative escalation of the arms race, the exorbitant cost of which is a serious obstacle to development.

Alongside measures aimed at preventing the outbreak of new wars, we believe it is essential to continue determined efforts to eliminate existing conflicts and hotbeds of tension, the continued existence of which, particularly in the Middle East and in southern Africa, constitute a permanent threat to international peace and security. It is also urgently necessary for the same reasons to establish equitable economic relations.

The inclusion in our agenda, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of item 127 entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war" has, we believe, the important merit of extending détente beyond what has thus far been its more or less narrow and exclusively bilateral framework and of dealing with it on a multilateral basis in the broader context of the United Nations.

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

We believe it is only at that level that it is possible - if that is really what is wanted - to promote the adoption of measures to take simultaneous effect in the three areas of disarmament, decolonization and development, making possible the establishment of the sound and lasting co-operation, which ought to be established between nuclear and non-nuclear Powers, between nations great and small, between the "haves" and the "have nots", between States with different social systems.

Furthermore, it is in the United Nations that the term "international détente" can be defined in such a way as no longer to lend itself to different interpretations and uses in different quarters.

My delegation reserves the right to make more specific statements in the discussion of the draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the USSR on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war and, in particular, on the compromise text arrived at by Mr. Hoveyda of Iran after consultations with various delegations on the draft resolution relating to the Declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente, of which my delegation became aware yesterday when it was distributed in the Committee.



Mr. FADHLI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): We believe that the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war is a noble objective which will be of benefit to all mankind. If this objective is achieved, it might lead to serious efforts to ensure the progress and welfare of peoples. Détente will remain a dream until it is based on practical measures and urgent steps in the field of international relations. International détente will never be complete so long as it remains confined to a particular region of the world. Détente must be extended to all regions of the world. It must not be merely a political détente but also a military détente. How can international détente be achieved so long as in certain regions of the world events continue to take place which endanger international peace and security? We are thinking in particular of the Middle East, South Africa and Cyprus.

We belong to a geographical region consisting of countries known as developing countries. These countries are endeavouring to promote and develop their economies by all lawful means. How can we achieve economic and social progress for the benefit of our peoples when we see that their future and the development of their natural resources are controlled by the imperialist States?

At its sixth and seventh special sessions, the General Assembly of the United Nations drafted a political declaration and a programme of action that have not been implemented either by the industrial Powers or by the monopolies under their jurisdiction. We therefore believe that international détente will be achieved only by establishing the new international economic order which will govern economic relations among States on the basis of equality and justice, principles emphasized by the United Nations Charter.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The question of the application of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, is of capital importance today, for despite recent progress in the relaxation of international tension, many hotbeds of tension continue to exist throughout the world. The nuclear peril has not been eradicated and the threat or use of force have not diminished.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

Nevertheless the great merit of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is that it paves the way for an improvement of relations among States and for the elimination of the threats to international peace and security. Indeed, does it not reaffirm the unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the United Nations as the basis of international relations? Does it not call for their strict application? Above all, does it not establish the supremacy of obligations flowing from the Charter over obligations contracted under any other international agreement?

One can draw the following conclusion from an analysis of the Declaration. The threats to international security stem principally from the weakening of respect for the Charter, from the violation of its purposes and principles and from the ineffectiveness of the Security Council as the organ having primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, the diagnosis is very clear; so is the remedy. The only way out is a return to the principles of the Charter and the strengthening of the United Nations.

Unhappily, it must be agreed that the present international community is far from having been restored to health, not because the remedy prescribed is ineffective, but because the obstacles to its application are very powerful. What, then, are these obstacles to the implementation of the principles of the Charter, obstacles that contribute actively to the weakening of our Organization? A brief look at history will show that the main causes of the poor functioning of the United Nations as a system of collective security are great Power rivalry and the desire of the great Powers to have their national interests prevail over the interests of the international community. By using and abusing their right of veto, the great Powers have helped to paralyse the United Nations and to divert it from its aims. Whereas the Charter bans war as an instrument of international policy, some Members of our Organization have repeatedly used force against the territorial integrity and political independence of a Member State in order to preserve their national interests. Similarly, they have regularly intervened in the domestic matters of other States and have very often completely disregarded the right of peoples to self-determination.

As for the permanent members of the Council, they have been unable to exercise the responsibilities incumbent on them except in a very erratic way. Most of the time their disagreements have prevented them from even considering common action in the face of crisis situations or acts of aggression committed in various parts of the world. The Security Council has thus been deprived of its real role and reduced to a mere forum where aggressors are almost always certain to find willing protectors who will enable them to act with impunity no matter how serious their actions. Thus, it has been unable to prevent the many conflicts which have not failed to arise since the signing of the Charter, still less to halt them.

This disease has finally spread to the United Nations as a whole. The prestige and authority of the Organization was bound to be affected by this. A number of attempts have been made to deal with major international issues outside the United Nations. Is it then surprising that the strengthening of international security has made little progress, and that international security is still seriously threatened? The arms race, the nuclear threat, economic exploitation, racism, colonialism, the struggles for spheres of influence, and aggression are flourishing more than ever before. Similarly, the likelihood of nuclear war has considerably increased, on the one hand, through technological progress on the part of the super-Powers as regards the accuracy of their missile delivery systems and, on the other, through the possibility afforded to certain régimes, like South Africa, to manufacture nuclear weapons.

Hunger, poverty and illiteracy are rife in large parts of the world. Yet the wealthy countries still refuse to engage in a serious discussion on the establishment of a new international economic order. In so doing, they take a short-term view of the future and help to strengthen insecurity throughout the world.

Some efforts have been made by these Powers in recent years to improve the international situation. I refer to the draft world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, submitted by the Soviet Union. My delegation has taken a favourable view of this initiative, the existence of the United Nations Charter having been unable to prevent the outbreak of many conflicts

since 1945. Any attempt to strengthen the Charter and to ensure the non-use of force in international relations should, in my delegation's view, be encouraged and supported. However, as was stressed by the Foreign Minister of Senegal in the statement he made on 13 October 1977 in the General Assembly of the United Nations:

"Indeed, it is important to note the fact that resort to force in international relations is linked to the fundamental inequalities which characterize the modern world; it reflects a situation in which the weakest nations are subject to domination and interference on the part of other States.

"Accordingly, any instrument designed to promote the non-resort to force in international relations cannot be dissociated from the task of establishing justice and order in relations among States".

(A/32/PV.33, p. 12)

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

One of the objectives of such a treaty, in the view of the delegation of Senegal, is to help usher in a new international order characterized by the equality of States, economic justice and the abandonment once and for all of the use of force in all its forms by all countries.

The contemporary world is characterized by the relaxation of tension between the two major military blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the intervention and the disguised use of force by the great Powers against the countries of the third world, and lastly by the appearance of numerous regional conflicts.

Recently the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact embarked upon a process of relaxation of tension in Europe, which is a matter for gratification. Nevertheless, we must note also that this process of détente rests on the balance of terror and that it has not sufficed in all cases to rule out the use of force. The military balance plus the enormous dangers which have restrained action on the part of the great Powers in Europe is not to be found in other parts of the world. There, the great Powers have been free, without much danger to their own security, to make war through intermediaries, to try out new weapons and reciprocally to attempt to extend their spheres of influence in areas where they felt there was a power vacuum.

Those Powers have thus embarked upon an intense rivalry to gain political and military influence in certain regions of the world, which for them either are of great strategic interest or represent a market for weapons or a source of cheap energy and raw materials. In order to gain the necessary political affiliations, they introduce sophisticated weapons or support the aggressive policies of certain States of a region, thus unleashing an arms race among the States of that region.

This destabilization of regional balance is fraught with danger, not only for the States of the region but also for the international community, for the conflicts which are bound to break out there will lead to direct confrontation between the great Powers. Furthermore, the involvement of certain States in regional conflicts does not always have a happy influence

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

on the settlement of those conflicts. In general it introduces a further element of complication and makes a peaceful settlement more difficult.

Another adverse aspect of direct involvement in regional conflicts is the fact that it distracts certain countries of the region from seeking a peaceful solution within the regional context. It opens the door to other types of settlement, such as recourse to armed force.

Nothing better illustrates these adverse aspects of relations between the great Powers and the small countries than the present situation in Africa. Since 1961 that continent has been the scene of uninterrupted colonial wars. Despite the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire, the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury persist in maintaining their colonial yoke over the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe. Those régimes have long benefited from the active support or the complicity of certain great Powers. Today, the Pretoria régime, which is armed to the teeth, supports the acts of aggression of Ian Smith against neighbouring African States and arrogates to itself the role of regional gendarme. It has developed a vast machinery of repression in order to maintain its policies of apartheid and exploitation of the African masses. South Africa has thus become an immense time-bomb and the Pretoria régime represents a danger to international peace and security.

In other parts of Africa numerous conflicts have flared up in the aftermath of intervention by the great Powers, which have used mercenaries as a major instrument. In recent years many African States have thus been invaded by bands of men armed and financed from abroad who have sought to overthrow the existing régimes. Those mercenaries endanger the security of all States and represent a new technique for interference in the affairs of African countries and in this attempt to continue to control their destinies.

The increasing insecurity in the world, which I have just described, requires vigorous action in order to promote respect for the Charter of the United Nations and to extend détente to all regions of the world.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

In the opinion of my delegation, in addition to the reaffirmation of a certain number of major principles, we must consider concrete measures to be undertaken. The permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility in this respect. Those States should devote themselves to preventing an outbreak of conflicts in the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America, by avoiding any encouragement of the arms race or of armed aggression. Furthermore, they must also support mediation activity of regional organizations and continually promote the quest for peaceful solutions within a regional context.

Other measures, such as the granting of meaningful guarantees to non-nuclear weapon States and respecting nuclear-free zones and zones of peace, would promote the extension of détente. Those measures, obviously, are far from being exhaustive. Many other measures could be considered with a view to decreasing the nuclear danger, slowing down the arms race and eliminating the disguised use of force in international relations and the serious economic inequalities between the developing and the developed countries.

To conclude, my delegation hopes that the Committee will decide concretely this year on ways and means to promote the application of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.



Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): During the next few days the First Committee will be concluding its consideration of the agenda item introduced by the Soviet Union on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war. The work of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly as a whole is also entering upon its final stage. In the main Committees of the Assembly and also here in the Assembly's plenary meetings there has been comprehensive discussion of a large number of important and urgent international issues. Quite a few useful resolutions have been adopted aimed at resolving those issues.

In the view of my delegation, there is every reason to say that the idea of the deepening and consolidation of international détente has run like a leit-motiv throughout the work of this session of the General Assembly - starting with the general debate, where leading statesmen of the States Members of the United Nations reaffirmed their commitment to the deepening and consolidation of international co-operation and security, subsequently in the discussion of the various agenda items and concluding within the last days of the session when, in a number of Committees, principles have been under discussion affecting the foreign policies of States.

A favourable influence of the changes for the better which have taken place in recent years in international relations has been noted in the discussion with respect to the various aspects of the problem of disarmament, the question of eliminating the vestiges of colonialism and the task of establishing equitable and mutually beneficial economic relations.

It has also been noted that the opponents of détente are very active in the world and are attempting to thwart efforts to curtail the arms race and to distract the attention of the world from a cardinal settlement of the most burning international problems.

The timeliness and importance of considering the question of the deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war at this session of the General Assembly emerged particularly clearly in the discussion on disarmament matters. It would be pertinent here to recall the remarks made by the General-Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist



(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Republics and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid I. Brezhnev, which he made on 2 November this year, to the effect that:

"International relations are now, as it were, at the crossroads and can lead on either to growing trust and co-operation or to growing mutual fear, mistrust and the stockpiling of weapons, roads which, in the final analysis, will lead either to lasting peace or, at best, to balancing on the brink of war. Détente offers an opportunity of choosing the road to peace. To let this opportunity slip by would be a crime. The most important and the most urgent task now is to put an end to the arms race, which is scourging the world."

It is therefore natural that there should have been deep interest and hope aroused by the favourable effects of détente and its favourable influence on disarmament.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

In the recent period, and while this session of the General Assembly has been at work, the Soviet Union has undertaken another important initiative aimed at resolving such urgent problems of disarmament as the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests and the simultaneous halting by all States of the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Wide satisfaction has also been expressed by delegations at the progress recently noted in achieving a convergence in the positions of the parties in the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons. The fact that during this session of the General Assembly a resolution was unanimously adopted welcoming the proposals of the Soviet Union and the United States and appealing for the successful completion of the Soviet-American negotiations testifies to the wide recognition of the importance of progress in this area, both from the standpoint of improving the general climate of Soviet-American relations and in terms of stimulating new and more far-reaching international actions to restrain the arms race.

It is characteristic of the statements made by many delegations that appeals have been made that the achievements of the policy of détente in relations between two States or among a number of States should be extended to other regions and continents and indeed to the whole world. Thus the representative of Nepal declared:

"It is generally recognized that the international climate has changed for the better in recent years as a result of the relaxation of tensions. We welcomed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation, held at Helsinki, as a positive contribution to an atmosphere of co-operation. However, we have continually urged that the process of détente must not be limited to certain areas or regions but should be extended to all parts of the world. Such an extension would, we feel, lead to the defusing of areas of tension in the world today."

(A/C.1/32/PV.49, p. 36)

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

As has been noted by delegations, in order to develop the process of détente it is important to launch new initiatives in the most diverse fields of international relations with the object of consolidating the successes already achieved and making the process of détente universal and irreversible.

The main trends of action to advance the cause of détente may be seen in the Soviet Union's draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and they have been further set forth in detail in the speech by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, during the general debate and also in the statement by the Soviet delegation in the First Committee at the opening stage of its work. As the course of the discussion in the First Committee and the consultations held with the object of reaching an agreed text on the draft declaration have shown, these trends are fully in keeping with the interests of all the States of the world and determine the sphere in which States should combine their efforts and where they can most successfully act, jointly or along parallel lines, in order to strengthen peace and prevent the threat of nuclear war.

The proposal of the Soviet Union that the United Nations should use its entire authority to back the policy of détente has met with the widest support and sympathy from delegations. As a result of the comprehensive consideration of this question, both in meetings of the First Committee and in the course of consultations of various kinds among delegations of countries belonging to all geographical regions and various social systems, agreement was reached on a generally acceptable text of a declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente. Taking into account the full diversity and peculiarity of the views of the Members of the United Nations, considerable efforts were required to reach this objective. Here the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to note the major contribution of the representative of Iran, Mr. Hoveyda, who displayed thereby his characteristic high diplomatic qualities. Considering that a very large number of delegations were involved in the preparation of the draft declaration circulated by Mr. Hoveyda and that it does reflect the main provisions of the Soviet draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/32/L.1, the Soviet delegation will not insist on a vote on the draft it introduced and, together with other delegations, will support the draft introduced by Mr. Hoveyda.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet delegation considers that the adoption by the thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly of a Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente will represent a major contribution to the carrying out of the main task of the United Nations, which is to ensure international peace and security. This document will take a worthy place among those international documents that recognize and consolidate a kind of code of rules for honest and fair mutual relations among countries and create legal and moral political obstacles to those who like military adventures. We recognize, of course, that the mere adoption of this declaration by the General Assembly will not suffice to resolve the task of deepening and strengthening international détente and that further sincere and persistent efforts will be required on the part of all States to implement it. The Soviet delegation will bend every effort to achieve that purpose. At the same time, we should like to make it perfectly clear that the process of détente does not mean giving up the right of States to self-defence, which is established in the United Nations Charter, or giving up the right of national liberation movements to fight for self-determination by all the means available to them. These inalienable rights are enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the decisions of the United Nations stemming from it. In accordance with the United Nations Charter the Soviet Union will continue to give unfailing support to countries and peoples fighting against aggression and foreign occupation and fighting to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid. The position of the Soviet Union in these matters is a position of principle and it will remain so in the future.

As was declared during the general debate by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, for the Soviet Union - and we are convinced, not only for us - the struggle for the deepening and consolidation of détente is at the same time a struggle for the complete elimination of the danger of nuclear conflict. To broaden the scope of détente means at the same time to move farther away the threat that mankind will be crushed under the destructive steamroller of nuclear war.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

These are in essence two most important aspects of ensuring a stable and genuinely lasting peace on earth.

In order to involve the United Nations in more active participation in the pursuit of that objective, the Soviet delegation introduced for consideration by the General Assembly the draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war. That draft resolution outlines a series of measures aimed at preventing situations which may lead to a dangerous deterioration of relations among States and, in the final analysis, to nuclear conflict. The draft resolution also provides for important steps to curtail the nuclear arms race, steps which if carried out would unquestionably lead to substantial progress towards nuclear disarmament.

We note with satisfaction that the delegations of many States have spoken in support of immediate efforts aimed at carrying out the task of preventing nuclear war. As was stressed by the representative of Iran:

"We hope ... the discussion of this item, in which a link has been established between the consolidation of détente on the one hand and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war on the other, will stimulate efforts by all States on disarmament matters, especially nuclear disarmament, in various bodies." (A/C.1/32/PV.49, p. 16)

In the course of the discussion and the consultations many views have been expressed as to how one or another measure could be carried out in practice. At the same time many delegations have noted, at recent meetings of this Committee and elsewhere, that at this session they have been unable to give comprehensive consideration to the key problem of preventing nuclear war in all its various aspects. The wish has been expressed that there would be more detailed consideration of the question of preventing the danger of nuclear war. The Soviet delegation is prepared to meet those wishes and in the present circumstances will not insist on a vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.2.

The easing of the threat of war - in particular, of nuclear war - followed by its complete elimination is the age-old dream of all peoples and it is the subject of untiring efforts of all people of goodwill.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

We believe that the question of preventing the danger of nuclear war will inevitably be the focus of all negotiations on disarmament and will be given an appropriate place in the work of the United Nations special session of the General Assembly on disarmament and also in the period of preparations for that special session, inter alia, in the course of work in the Preparatory Committee for the special session.

Mr. ISMAIL (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): International peace and security have constantly and over a long period of time been considered an urgent question by the countries of the third world and, in particular, by the small countries. That was so even before the international organizations we know today came into being. Their aim was to ensure stability and to organize the other aspects of peoples' lives, and to satisfy their aspirations for progress and well-being. If we now believe that the peoples of the world and the countries concerned failed by the standards then prevailing, it is because of the conditions and mentality of the times. For the world of yesteryear lived subject to the law of the jungle according to which might was right. In those circumstances it was inconceivable that any principle or ideal or morality could prevail.

If we take a rapid glance at world conditions since the end of the Second World War we will note fundamental changes in the different aspects of life. Those changes are a result of the liberation of most countries which were once subject to colonial domination. Colonial peoples have paid the price for their freedom, which colonialism did not present to them on a silver platter.

And yet the world is not yet fully liberated because there still are regions which suffer from colonial domination and foreign occupation. More than three decades have gone by since the United Nations came into being as an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security and to prevent war. The founding Members committed themselves to preserve future generations from the scourge of war and emphasized the safeguarding of human rights, the dignity of man and the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Ismail, United Arab Emirates)

After a third of a century we note that the world has not achieved peace and security. The obligations entered into by States under the Charter are far from fulfilled. An unjust situation exists in South Africa where the white minority controls the destiny of the black majority. Furthermore, there is the racist Zionist entity to which imperialism has given concrete form in occupied Palestine where an entire people have been expelled and replaced by another. Arab lands have been occupied by that expansionist and aggressive entity and the Arab people of Palestine have been dispersed and forced to live in hovels a few hundred yards from their homeland, Palestine, with crumbs as their only food. The abnormal conditions in the Middle East and in southern Africa constitute most dangerous hotbeds of tension in the world and might explode at any moment, thus jeopardizing international peace and security.

The strengthening of international peace and security cannot be effected as long as there are flagrant violations of the resolutions of international organizations and challenges to our Organization by a few racist régimes.

(Mr. Ismail, United Arab Emirates)

This conduct, which is unique, can only be interpreted as a challenge to the entire international community.

Resolution 2734 (XXV) with regard to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, was a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, that resolution has not been implemented in practice in order to bring about a world living in security and stability. Resolutions are not important because they have been adopted; they are important only when they are implemented so as to put an end to the problems afflicting the world. We consider that the interests of certain great Powers should not constitute an obstacle to security based on justice and to peace throughout the world. The great Powers should strive to make genuine efforts and a positive contribution to the elimination of the tension from which we have been suffering for so long. We are convinced that such a step would undoubtedly contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.

The strengthening of security depends on disarmament and economic development, for general and complete disarmament would pave the way for the solution of the economic problems besetting the world today. General and complete disarmament would open up new horizons and make it possible to overcome all the obstacles and the problems threatening mankind, which would contribute to the strengthening of peace and security.

We expect much from the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament next year because it is our hope that effective measures will be taken towards disarmament. The results achieved by that session will indicate the seriousness which the international community, and the great Powers in particular, attach to strengthening world peace and security so as to attain the progress and well-being of all the peoples of the world. Disarmament indicates the will of countries to refrain from the use of force in international relations and in the settlement of disputes. This in turn will certainly contribute to strengthening the policy of international détente.

In speaking of the non-use of force in international relations, I should like to make it clear that the policy of my Government is based on this principle of the non-use of force in any conflict which now exists or may arise with other countries. We apply the policy of dialogue and understanding to resolve all differences of opinion, on the basis of justice, law and



(Mr. Ismail, United Arab Emirates)

good-neighbourliness. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country made this policy explicit in his statement before the General Assembly during the general debate.

We attach great importance to the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. We wish once again to emphasize the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, since these internal affairs are exclusively within the jurisdiction and sovereignty of each country.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): I should like to remind my colleagues of what I said yesterday with regard to the draft declaration distributed in document A/C.1/32/CRP.1. It will be recalled that I said that for technical reasons this document should have a sponsor. I should like now to confirm that my delegation is sponsoring this draft declaration for the technical reasons which I explained yesterday. This draft declaration thus becomes a draft resolution, and I should like to request the Secretariat to distribute it in that form.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Many issues and conflicts weigh heavily on the state of international relations today and pose a challenge to the United Nations. But, in the opinion of my delegation, the most formidable challenge that is facing the United Nations - indeed the whole of mankind - today is the prevention of a new world war, which will inevitably result in nuclear annihilation. Certain conflicts and wars can be confined to a given region, but nuclear war knows no such geographical boundaries. The rapid development of science and technology not only has increased the risk of the annihilation but also has made the attainment of our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament not only more formidable but equally urgent. In this precarious nuclear age, therefore, there is no alternative but to concentrate our efforts on reducing tensions between States by creating favourable conditions for solving international problems by peaceful means, building mutual confidence and strengthening international peace and security, thereby reducing the risk of nuclear conflagration.

Although the principle of the non-use of force or threat of force is enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter and elaborated in numerous other important resolutions and declarations, armed conflicts unfortunately still continue to take place in different parts of the world with a heavy toll in lives and property, thereby threatening international peace and security. The world is now witnessing a most distressing instance where force is being used by a State against another for the achievement of a narrow national objective. We believe, therefore, that a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations would curb such use of force as an instrument of State policy and increase mutual confidence among States.

The three closely interrelated items, namely, "Conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations", item 37, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", item 50, and "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war", item 127, deal with the foremost preoccupations of the international community today. In this connexion we should like to offer our congratulations to the Soviet Delegation for having taken the initiative in introducing yet another item of considerable importance, that is item 127, for consideration by the United Nations.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

It is indeed proper and timely for the international community to discuss thoroughly the substance of this item to which my delegation attaches great importance.

Ethiopia is already on record in another forum as having expressed its appreciation of the content and substance of what would constitute genuine *détente*. As we see it, the non-aligned movement has been the single and foremost driving force which has encouraged the evolution and implementation of *détente* in our time. For that reason, *détente* will have to be viewed within the over-all framework of the cardinal principles of non-alignment, which include, among other matters, respect for the Charter of the United Nations and total rejection of imperialism and colonialism in all their manifestations. To say that *détente* is non-alignment's greatest achievement is therefore but to state the obvious.

Some exclusivists apparently consider *détente* solely in terms of an equation in big Power relationships. To them, *détente* seems to mean only mutual accommodation of big Power global interests and mutual recognition of their respective spheres of influence. A corollary of such an interpretation is that *détente* is an instrument for the preservation of the status quo as opposed to necessary fundamental socio-economic and political transformations within a given country. Ethiopia does not subscribe to such a stagnant, and indeed retrograde, conception of *détente*.

We view *détente* essentially as a dynamic force which seeks to replace big Power confrontations by rational dialogue, directed at removing the root causes of actual or potential frictions. At the same time, with respect to the rest of the world, *détente* will have to be a positive force, promoting and encouraging the oppressed peoples in their struggle to free themselves from imperialism and colonialism and in their resolute resistance against aggression and expansionism. Nor should *détente* restrict the right of the people of any sovereign nation to change oppressive and obsolescent socio-economic structures within their own country, embark on a constructive road to bring about fundamental changes in their own national institutions and, to that end, seek the individual support of progressive nations in Africa, Asia, Europe or the Americas.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

Nor, given the sovereign attributes of any modern nation State, can détente in any way restrict either its non-alignment or the strategy it may adopt in its struggle against imperialism, colonialism and blatant racism. Indeed, the nations of the world can support and encourage détente only to the extent that at least it does not circumscribe their legitimate and inalienable rights. If some are to invoke détente to undermine the Charter principle of the right of any nation to self-defence to preserve its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and if an unnecessary furore is to be raised when a victim of aggression seeks and obtains assistance for solely defensive purposes from friendly and peace-loving countries near and far, then surely détente ceases to be a positive and dynamic factor in the international relations of our times. Similarly those who accept and encourage détente will surely not opt to be held at bay where their own paramount national objectives and interests are actually at stake.

There is no doubt that the limitation and eventual elimination of the danger of nuclear war will consolidate the process of détente. For that reason, my delegation has carefully studied the proposals contained in A/C.1/32/L.1 and L.2 and in Conference Room Paper 1. Some aspects of those proposals have already been considered in sufficient detail in this very Committee during our debate on disarmament. Others, particularly the proposal in A/C.1/32/L.2, which merits an in-depth analysis, could not be fully considered at this session of the General Assembly because of lack of time.

On the other hand, the subject will surely occupy the coming meeting of the Preparatory Committee and the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

That is why my delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its gratitude to the representative of the Soviet Union for heeding the appeal made to him this morning by the delegations of Liberia and Sri Lanka, among others, not to press his draft resolution to the vote.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

The ardent desire of the Ethiopian people is to live in peace and harmony with all nations of the world on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence and, to that end, my delegation is prepared to support any measure that will enhance international peace and security in every corner of the globe.

Mr. KITI (Kenya): Speaking at this stage of our debate, I should like to express my delegation's deep satisfaction at the manner in which the work of our Committee has progressed. We have so far completed the important items on disarmament as well as the question relating to international co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of outer space. My delegation has noted the keen and genuine desire of the international community to co-operate in these fields by adopting over 20 resolutions on these items, more than half of them either by consensus or unanimously. That is a commendable record, but as the representative of Nepal reminded us only yesterday, the adoption of resolutions alone is not sufficient. What are needed are the concerted efforts and political will of Member States to implement those resolutions, otherwise they will remain dead letters.

The concern of the international community about the question of international security is well known. Indeed, it has been a main preoccupation of the Organization since its foundation. My delegation therefore finds it appropriate that the Committee at this stage should engage in seeking measures that will facilitate the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

It has always been the view of my delegation that in order to find any solution to any problem a thorough examination of the causes of that problem is essential. In that context therefore it is important for us to examine what continue to be the impediments to the realization of the objectives contained in the Declaration under consideration.

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

Many of the delegations that spoke before me have stressed the unhealthy security environment generated by the excess of armaments and the armament race obtaining in the world today. Kenya is gravely concerned that while the international community continues to discuss this issue year in and year out the realization of the objectives of disarmament is far from sight. Indeed, what is happening is the reverse: there is an ever-increasing escalation of the armaments race, both vertical and horizontal. We must, if we want to achieve the implementation of the Declaration, begin seriously to implement the many resolutions and declarations on disarmament. That is important if we are to prevent the danger of war, for wars are executed with armaments.

The relaxation of international tension is another area which my delegation considers to be an essential element in the implementation of the Declaration. We have noted with some relief the recent positive steps taken in Europe and the other developed nations in that regard. We are, however, greatly alarmed to note that, whereas tension seems to be subsiding in the developed areas, it is rising, nay encouraged to rise, in the developing countries.

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

Kenya cannot but be concerned at the events taking place in southern Africa, where the racist régimes, with the assistance of some Member States, continue to trample on the black masses with impunity. We have stated on numerous occasions that until the racist régimes change their completely outdated and diabolical policies, southern Africa will continue to be an area fraught with the dangers of a threat to international peace and security. We call, therefore, on the international community to take bold steps to eradicate that danger before it is too late. Half measures, as we have just seen after the recent elections in South Africa, will only encourage the racist régime to continue to perpetrate their criminal actions against humanity.

My delegation is equally concerned at the development of new areas of tension in our continent, some of which are too close to us for us not to be concerned. We also continue to note that, in spite of concerted efforts, the areas that have always been a source of international tension, namely, the Middle East, Cyprus and some areas in the Pacific, continue to be so. There are many other areas of tension which are well-known to the international community, and these also need our attention.

As I stated earlier, it is always important to examine the causes of problems in order to find their solutions. In examining the question of relaxation of international tension, one factor seems to present itself as a major if not the major source of the problem. In most areas where there is current tension, we find that there is definite interference in the internal affairs of these States in one way or the other. It is the view of my delegation that the full implementation of resolution 51/91 adopted last year on non-interference in the internal affairs of States would be a positive move towards the implementation of the Declaration at present under discussion. Many suggestions on how to combat non-interference in the internal affairs of States have been proposed in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/32/164. We would recommend a thorough study of these in order that the international community would have a yardstick by which to judge where an act is deemed an interference in the internal affairs of other States.

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

It is now well accepted that there is some relationship between security on the one hand and peace and economic and social development on the other. It is the view of my delegation that there will be no peace and security in the world if the present unjust world order in the economic field is continued. Kenya, like many other developing countries, has called for a speedy implementation of the recommendations for a new international economic order. We are of the view that our demands are legitimate and we call upon the developed countries not to go on frustrating the aspirations of the developing countries, for to do so would inevitably invite and inject instability in the world that is bound to impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

It has to be remembered that no co-operation can last if it is based on the principle of inequality. A very important area that would enhance the strengthening of international peace and security is the scrupulous adherence by all Member States of the principle of non-use of force in international relations. As a small non-aligned country, Kenya has always adhered to the principle of settling disputes peacefully. We are gratified to note that this principle has at long last found acceptance by those who have for some time held the world at ransom by threatening to destroy each other and, in so doing, the whole of mankind.

Kenya, therefore, supports the idea of drafting a world treaty on the non-use of force as a positive initiative towards the strengthening of international security. We are aware that opinions differ on the usefulness of such a step. We are also aware that this principle is enshrined in the Charter. We are further aware that even at the time of drafting the Charter this principle encountered difficulties in San Francisco. We note, however, that while all of us are required to adhere to the Charter, there are many examples that remind us that there is something we need to do more, since force has been known to be used in internal affairs for the enhancement of the foreign policies of some Member States.



(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

We therefore are convinced that drafting such a treaty would act as a further commitment of the Member States on that important principle. My delegation will therefore vote positively for the proposal aimed at establishing a committee to study in depth the Soviet draft treaty proposal and make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly at an appropriate time, but definitely not later than at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

Finally, my delegation fully agrees with those delegations which have emphasized the importance of evolving effective measures for enforcing the decisions of the Organization, especially those concerning the all-important question of security and peace.

My delegation is gravely concerned, indeed disappointed, at the continued disagreement between the super-Powers in this area. My delegation's views on the use of veto are well known and will therefore not be repeated here. We should like, however, to reiterate our great concern at the use of the veto to frustrate measures that are aimed at maintaining or improving international peace and security.

The improvement and implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security without the involvement of the office of the Secretary-General would not succeed. My delegation is in favour of judiciously using the good offices of the Secretary-General. In order to make his efforts effective, however, it is important that the prestige of his high office be enhanced. Kenya pledges to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General and we call on all Member States to do nothing that would diminish or impair his authority.

We hold that no measure in favour of peace is small. We believe that in our quest for what is perfect we should not lose sight of what is good. We should therefore proceed step by step in trying to improve the mechanisms and methodologies by which we can strengthen international peace and security so that generations to come not only shall not live in fear of the possibility of another war, but shall live in true peace and security to enhance the noble qualities of man.

Mr. STRAUB (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The item on the strengthening of international security is no doubt one of the most important being considered at this session of the General Assembly. Under Articles 11 and 12 of the Charter, the General Assembly has direct competence with respect to international peace and security, without prejudice to the competence specifically reserved for the Security Council. This competence is exercised by means of this Committee, the Political and Security Committee of the General Assembly.

International peace and security must constitute a permanent item of the General Assembly and the most important one in the work of this Committee. It is one of the major topics to be considered by the United Nations together with economic and social development, progress in international law, decolonization and the observance and promotion of the noble principles enshrined in the Charter.

The item on the strengthening of international security has not been exhausted by the solemn declaration made on it by the General Assembly in resolution 2734 (XXV). Its consideration is linked to the origin and the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations. However, we believe that the annual debate on the item has lost its original meaning and we should consider how to approach it differently.

Items regarding *détente* or the relaxation of international tensions (item 127) and agreement on the non-use of force (item 37) are part of the major item of international peace and security which should not be considered separately. Accordingly I shall refer jointly to all of them in this statement.

The delegation of Chile, together with several other delegations referred to the subitem of *détente* when all these items were first considered in this Committee.

That debate made clear that *détente* cannot be considered as an additional principle of international law or as an element to be added to the principles of the Charter.

What is known as *détente* is not a principle of law but a policy of balance of power and of coexistence among Powers with different and even opposed systems. *Détente* is not peace nor a substitute for it. Peace is harmony with order, the life of peoples based on natural laws. It presupposes respect for a set of values and principles which were solemnly stated by consensus by the General Assembly during its twenty-fifth anniversary session (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) on "Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States").

Peace presupposes justice, and is based on the existence of a just universal order. Only on the basis of such a peace which goes vastly beyond the mere absence of war, can a system of international security be established. That is why the Charter of the Organization dealt with both items jointly and considered them to be inseparable. The strengthening of international security depends on peace, not on "détente", even though détente when properly understood could assist in arriving at the end we seek and the principles we wish to pursue.

In the debates we have heard, we have listened to some clear limitations of détente which we shall briefly try to outline. Détente is not universal but bilateral and at best confined to the great Powers and their respective areas of power. It is limited in scope. It extends in part to the military area, to the prevention of war - particularly nuclear war - between the super-Powers and the great Powers. It does not encompass all countries, as is evidenced by the approximately 50 local wars which have occurred since the last World War. Nor does it include the ideological battle which inevitably leads to political confrontations. In that field we must emphasize the existence of internal subversion and terrorism, often fomented from outside, and we cannot forget the acts of military, political and economic intervention perpetrated against peoples who lack the power to repel them. Clearly that is not the only way to prevent war and nuclear conflict. It was rightly stated in our debate that the vast majority of States in the world live in peace without any need for détente and they could do so both before and after détente.

The political instruments of "détente" and in particular the Declaration of Principles signed in respect of it on 29 May 1972 by the then Heads of Government, Brezhnev and Nixon, make clear the limitations of that policy to which I referred earlier.

However, it ill behoves us to question its positive character and usefulness since it does mean a lessening of tensions and of international conflicts, that, is, in so far as it constitutes a step towards a just international order, which is the way to genuine peace. Therefore, Chile supports it when extended to all countries large and small, based on respect for their legal equality and self-determination, and when it prevents covert forms of political intervention.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

The prohibition of the use of force in relations among peoples is one of the major principles of international law and an irreplaceable basis of the United Nations system. The non-recourse to force and the prohibition of its use are covered in the United Nations Charter, in the Declaration on Principles of International Law contained in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), complemented by the Definition of Aggression, contained in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, formulated in General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV) and in many other international instruments which are in force.

The proposition to give contractual form again to the principle of the non-use of force could be interpreted as undermining the complete validity and enforcement of the United Nations Charter and other binding international instruments. On the other hand, and in the light of situations which may in fact or potentially cause conflict, it is always important and proper to refer to the non-use of force, to the settlement of disputes by peaceful means as stipulated in Article 33 of the Charter, to full observance of treaties, to non-aggression and, in general, to the international principles and obligations which express and protect peace and security.

Among the principles and purposes of the Charter there are those under which States shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, settle their dispute by peaceful means, not interfere in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, co-operate with one another, respect the principle of sovereign equality of States, and fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter.

These principles were made solemnly explicit by the Declaration adopted by consensus on them during the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations following many years of preparation. It is not necessary, therefore, to go into their substance, but it is important to reiterate that they are fully valid and applicable at times of conflict such as those in which the world is living.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

Full respect for each and every one of those principles is the first and most essential requirement for international peace and security and, of course, my country has incorporated them into its permanent policy of peace.

I shall now refer to the real position as regards international security. Having stated those principles, it is fitting to observe briefly their application in the reality of the contemporary world, although that does not in any way imply an attempt to characterize it or to exhaust the item within the necessary limitations of our debate.

It is true that there has been no world war or nuclear war since 1945 when the Second World War ended and when the first atomic bomb was exploded. That is a success of great importance for the United Nations, one which must be placed on record. However, as has been said, we have not avoided local wars, some of which have been lengthy and have caused immense damage. Nor have we succeeded in avoiding the perpetration of acts of intervention by powerful States in respect of less powerful ones. That intervention has at times been obvious and open, expressed by military occupation, but in others - and most frequently - there have been political and economic pressures which have inhibited genuine self-determination of the peoples affected and have seriously undermined the legal equality of States.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

On the other hand, reality and life, always with a wealth of diversity, have created new forms of conflicts which threaten international peace and security in as serious a form as open war and undermine the principles on which they are based. Such is the case of internal subversion often encouraged from abroad and which not infrequently takes the form of urban wars and even flagrant terrorism.

I do not believe it necessary to recall the painful military interventions which shook Europe on no less than two solemn occasions. In our times, and on the African continent, we have witnessed the practice of all possible forms of intervention in the internal affairs of these brother peoples. This intervention was practised not only by the super-Powers but also by minor Powers, as has been adequately denounced in this chamber.

Together with these acts of intervention which require appropriate action by the United Nations, I must mention in the case of my own country the forms of undue interference in our internal affairs which have been carried out by a great Power for the clear purpose of inciting subversion. Several high-power radio stations daily broadcast Spanish-language programmes to my country clearly and explicitly aimed at internal subversion, a situation which my delegation repeatedly has denounced in this same forum.

To local wars, more or less open interventions, internal subversion, we must add the phenomenon of terrorism, which has been dealt with separately by the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. The Organization of American States has rightly linked this phenomenon to international peace and security, on the one hand, and, on the other, to the full exercise of human rights.

Nor is it possible to ignore situations of latent conflict in various parts of the world which may create problems for international peace and security.

An analysis of the reality of the world in the light of international peace and security - an item which encompasses all - cannot overlook the position regarding the new international economic order, colonialism, and universal respect for human rights.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

Co-operation among developed and developing States, which has been defined as a new international economic order, is far from having been crystallized in reality. Remaining colonial situations have not been able to be overcome completely by the constant and effective labour of the United Nations.

These realities also constitute inseparable elements of the strengthening of international security, together with others which have been dealt with at length in this Committee. The link between general and complete disarmament and international security is so obvious as not to require further comment.

The major factor in political relations among States has been expressed in the United Nations in the item and sub-items we are dealing with, in the item on human rights which has just been concluded in the Third Committee, and on terrorism, with its derivatives, which has been dealt with in the Sixth Committee.

The subject of human rights is linked to international peace and security. in the Charter and in all the declarations we have mentioned previously. It may be said that the item is an essential element of this Organization. The concept of human rights, on the other hand, is also an essential element of Western civilization. In its political derivation, going beyond the specific realm of international jurisdiction which is itself built upon all fundamental human rights - that concept has been used as a weapon of ideological penetration and, at times, as an attempt to impose a given system on other countries.

The reality of a misunderstood détente has, from another point of view, allowed the existence and the extension of the ideological-political weapon of one of the super-Powers and its derivation: internal subversion, to which I have referred, under the pretext of an ideological revolution; and in certain cases, that has been extended in the form of internal guerrilla activity and terrorism.



(Mr. Straub, Chile)

In these specific terms must be presented the political confrontation of our times, underlying détente and in the forms of life of the major ideological-political systems which are operating under its cover.

In the item on human rights it has not been possible to arrive at a system of universal application which would strengthen it and ensure its full enjoyment by everyone everywhere. Once again, in the Third Committee, this fundamental matter was postponed.

Politicization of the item is primarily responsible for this negative result. Human rights have been and are still being used as a weapon of international and domestic policy, as an instrument to pressure States with little power and even to intervene in their internal affairs; and, on the other hand, as a means of placating militant minorities in certain countries.

This politicization has engendered several vices which have aroused the justified alarm of a majority of States: in the first place, the absence of pre-established rules which guarantee what might be called due process; secondly, extending the proper area of international jurisdiction - which is respect for and observance of fundamental human rights - to areas properly and exclusively within the internal jurisdiction of States; thirdly, singling out a State, and hypothetically a few States, all of them being marginal to the power play of the great Powers, when at the same time, more serious situations of conflict are ignored when these might affect the interests of so-called détente.

My country which, from the outset, recognized international jurisdiction in regard to fundamental human rights and which co-operated, and continues to co-operate, with the United Nations - today has been the victim of all the vices I have mentioned: politicization, singling out, absence of minimum guarantees, repeated violations of the rules of due process, and extensive intervention in its internal affairs.

(Mr. Straub, Chile)

I do not now wish to dwell at length on this arbitrariness, but simply confine myself in this statement to emphasizing the negative effect which such a precedent may have for the success of the cause of human rights in the United Nations, and indicating the implications this might have in the broad field of international peace and security.

International peace and security are not détente, nor yet another covenant on the prohibition of the use of force. In this item the entire United Nations system is involved, the organization of the international community in our contemporary era in this great international community. Peace and security are related, above all, to the principles of international law and presuppose the building of an order based on justice among nations. Seeking international peace and security means that we must obtain them for all equally, quite apart from the realities of power; and the creation of a reality which is more positive than the mere absence of total or nuclear war. There must be arbitration to prevent local conflicts, subversion and terrorism directed from abroad. There must be not only military relaxation among the super-Powers, but also military and political relaxation for all.

In the matter of principles, means must be found for strict compliance with what was proclaimed by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth anniversary session, which includes and assumes the universal application of fundamental human rights.

A just peace also assumes that there will be an adequate international economic order, as well as the eradication of the remnants of colonialism and oppression which subsist in the world.

Only by the application of these principles, based on natural law, which inspired this Organization, will it be possible to ensure that men will live in a just peace and enjoy lasting security.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those speakers who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): My delegation has asked to be allowed to speak in order to reply to the statements made by the representatives of Cuba and Uganda in this Committee yesterday afternoon. I shall address myself first to the statements made by Mr. Alarcon.

We can understand that in any open and honest debate there are differences of viewpoints, particularly between differing ideologies and political systems. But Mr. Alarcon did not engage us in a debate of that nature. Instead he chose, for reasons of his own, to make a highly intemperate personal attack on the character and integrity of Mr. Young, charging him with intentionally lying and making demagogic statements. That kind of personal attack is highly repugnant to us and an affront to this Committee. I believe that it is not necessary to go into detail because the members of this Committee who have participated in this session of the General Assembly are well aware of the efforts that my Government and others have been making to try to find peaceful solutions leading to majority rule in southern Africa. Mr. Young's deep personal commitment to that goal is not a matter requiring clarification or proof.

We are particularly struck by the fact that Mr. Alarcon in his rather lengthy statement failed entirely to address the substance of Mr. Young's observations regarding the Cuban role in Africa.

It would certainly help our proceedings were the Cuban representatives to inform us, in this or any other Committee, about the number of Cuban military advisers in, for example, Ethiopia, the nature of their activities and what are perceived to be the contribution of those troops to international peace and security.

Mr. Alarcon spoke of the brutal aggressions of the Salisbury régime against the people of Mozambique. He was quite justified in drawing attention to those reprehensible acts. But he was not correct in his implications as to why Mr. Young did not yesterday speak of those

(Mr. Leonard, United States)

acts. This is a discussion of détente. If it had been a discussion of the situation in southern Africa, then Mr. Young, or any other spokesman for my Government, would have used the occasion to condemn those brutal acts of the Smith régime. I hereby do so, and I do so on behalf of my Government and at the express request of Mr. Young.

As regards the remarks of the representative of Uganda, they indicated, I regret to say, the same sort of disregard for truth and for clarity.

We are being asked to adopt in this Committee a declaration on the deepening of international détente, a declaration which obliges all of us "to encourage and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms". We profoundly hope that all States Members of the United Nations will take that language seriously, not as an empty paper exercise, and that they will carry out that commitment in their treatment of all those living within their borders.

Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In the statement that I made yesterday - which was brief, and I made it even briefer than I had originally intended - I said that I regretted that Mr. Young had felt it necessary to include in his statement to the Committee yesterday, as in other statements he has made recently, attacks against Cuba based on false allegations which alter the reality of the facts in Africa.

I am sure that the United States Government has sufficient information from its own sources to know when it is altering the truth, and it is up to the United States administration to say why it chooses that course of action.

The representative of the United States today claimed that Cuba and other countries - African countries in this case - should inform him or this Committee or someone else of decisions taken with regard to bilateral co-operation, when anyone who is even vaguely familiar with international law knows that those matters are not subject to the decision of any representative of the United States but are the prerogatives of the sovereign States which have subscribed to such agreements.

(Mr. Alarcon, Cuba)

On a previous occasion we had to reply in a similar manner to the representative of the United States in the Security Council when he insisted that such explanations be given in connexion with the co-operation agreements between Cuba and Angola. On that occasion we recalled that the Government of the United States is precisely the one which has, throughout history, been foremost in exporting troops and military bases throughout the world, in some cases to countries whose Governments have bilateral agreements with the United States for the establishment of such military bases, but in other cases even without requesting anyone's permission, and without the consent and against the will of the peoples and Governments affected.

Such imposition against the will of peoples subjected to colonialism, as in the case of Guam or in the case of the people of Cuba, which opposes the continued military presence of the United States on Cuban territory where it has a military base - as everyone knows - in the Guantanamo zone, is condemned by international law.

As regards the sovereign competence of States to conclude any kind of arrangement of bilateral co-operation, the United States has preeminence in that field, which has enabled it to send advisers, troops, military bases and even nuclear weapons to many parts of the world, for example, to western Europe and other places.

What the representative of the United States - either the Permanent Representative or the alternate Representative - should explain is by virtue of what principle of law, policy or morality he can affirm before the world that his Government does not accord the African States, the countries of the third world, the same sovereign prerogatives that it nevertheless accords to what we might call the white Governments. The only explanation would lead us to another item and to another Committee: to the consideration of racism and discrimination in international relations.

(Mr. Alarcon, Cuba)

I repeat, the United States representative has every right to claim that there is one law for white States and another for black or mixed States. That is his right, but it is not in accordance with international law, nor is it in accordance with the views of the majority of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its general debate on agenda items 37, 50 and 127. At our next meeting we shall proceed to consider the draft resolutions before the Committee and take decisions on them.

With regard to agenda item 37, entitled "Conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations", I should like to point out that during the discussion of this item in the general debate which has just ended, a number of valuable observations and suggestions were put forward in connexion with the proposal for the conclusion of an international treaty to further consolidate and strengthen the existing regulations concerning the prohibition of the use of threat of force. I believe that members of the Committee are also aware of the fact that certain legal aspects of this proposal will be carefully studied by the Sixth Committee, in accordance with the decision of the General Assembly. I have been informed that the Sixth Committee, at the conclusion of its discussions on this item, is expected to adopt an appropriate decision for submission to the General Assembly, bearing in mind the observations made by delegations in the First Committee. Therefore I assume that the Committee does not wish to discuss it further and is now in a position to conclude its consideration of the item. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to conclude the consideration of agenda item 37.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that the Congo, Guinea, Egypt and Morocco have become sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.45.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.