

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

*Official Records **



FIRST COMMITTEE

57th meeting

held on

Thursday, 8 December 1977

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 57th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

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.57
9 December 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 50 AND 127 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (A/32/68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78, 89, 93, 117, 128, 140, 153, 154, 157, 164 and Add.1, 165 and Add.1-2; A/C.1/32/2, 8; A/C.1/32/L.45 and L.47)
DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DETENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (A/32/242; A/C.1/32/L.46)

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions before it. Before it does that, I should like to call on those representatives who wish to make statements or observations on the draft resolutions, but not as explanations of vote.

Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): The Islamic Republic of Mauritania, true to the Charter of the United Nations, has always been concerned with the need to strengthen international security and with the use of peaceful means for the settlement of disputes that may arise at any time between States. Respect for the independence of States and non-interference in their internal affairs is a matter of importance for us that deserves special attention if we are to move forward to the establishment of tranquil relations, agreement and mutual respect among nations. It is in that context that we give our full support to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45 now before this Committee. That draft is to a large degree inspired by resolution 85 (XIV) adopted by the Conference of Heads of State and of Governments of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which met at Libreville in July 1977, which in many respects fully meets our concerns on the subject.

The emphasis placed in the first paragraph of the draft resolution on the denunciation of

"... any form of interference in the internal or external affairs of other States and ... all forms and techniques of coercion, subversion and defamation aimed at disrupting the political, social or economic order of other States".

(Mr. Ould Hamody, Mauritania)

In our view that is a commitment which is likely to exclude or reduce in the relations between States the facile temptation to impose "diktats" and above all the trend to destabilize those countries for the purpose of dominating them politically or otherwise.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which calls upon "... all States, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to undertake necessary measures in order to prevent any hostile act or activity taking place within their territory and directed against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of another State"

must assume our collective will not to allow opposing groups on our respective territories to engage in activities likely to endanger the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of other States.

By leaving the door open to the right of asylum, which is as old as man's civilization, in our view this paragraph condemns latent trends in many States to misuse that right by distorting it for the purposes of blackmail and intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

My delegation wishes to associate itself with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45 and sincerely hopes that those supporting it will, in justice and morality, abide by the spirit and letter of its relevant recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45 under agenda item 50, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". This draft resolution has no financial implications. It is sponsored by 23 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka on 7 December 1977.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by consensus. If the Committee agrees with that, I suggest that delegations wishing to explain their vote and their positions in this regard do so later.

Ms. BENTON (United States of America): The United States would like to request a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Ms. BENTON (United States of America): The United States strongly supports the principles of the United Nations Charter regarding non-interference in the internal affairs of States. We believe that these principles can best be fulfilled by universal adherence to the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter, adopted by the Assembly in 1970.

We do not believe that this restatement of these principles, as is apparently contemplated by the present draft resolution, would contribute significantly to the strengthening of international security. Therefore, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey): The Turkish delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on non-interference in the internal affairs of States in document A/C.1/32/L.45, because of my Government's commitment to uphold the basic principle which constitutes the main thrust of the said draft resolution. However, my delegation would like to reserve its position as regards operative paragraph 3. In our view, we are all committed to uphold the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, which is enshrined in the Charter. This principle, however, is embodied not only in the Charter of the United Nations but also in many other multilateral international documents, including the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, of which Turkey is a signatory.

Moreover, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, which was supported by my delegation during its adoption at the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1965, constitutes a carefully worded and well-balanced document in this regard. Therefore, my delegation has some doubt whether there is a need for a new declaration on this principle which has already been embodied in several basic international documents.

Mr. ABSOLUM (New Zealand): New Zealand intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.45 as a mark of our support for the general principles it seeks to endorse. Nevertheless, we find ourselves unable to subscribe without qualification to the assertion in operative paragraph 3 that a Declaration on Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of States would be an important contribution to the further elaboration of principles of international co-operation.

In our view the case for such a declaration has not been established, either in the introduction of the draft resolution which we heard yesterday or in informal consultations. We had hoped, therefore, that before any steps were taken to call for the elaboration of such a declaration, full consideration would be given to the content of existing instruments and to the purposes that any such declaration would serve.

Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I should like to express the views of my delegation and explain my vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45. I would first of all like to say that, naturally, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution. We approve of its provisions. We would like to make it clear that we are against interference in all its forms and from whatever quarter. Intervention is not just targeted at certain countries. We see interference in various parts of the world. So it is against interference as such, from whatever source, that my delegation takes its stand by voting favourably on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.45. A recorded vote has been requested by the delegation of the United States of America.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, **United** Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. BERG (Sweden): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45. We understand and respect the concerns and fears that lie behind the putting forward of this draft resolution by the sponsors. At the same time we want to express our reservations with regard to operative paragraph 3 of the text just adopted.

In this context we want to remind the Committee, among other things, that first of all the principle of non-intervention is embodied in the Charter. There also exists the 1965 Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the main part of which was included as one of the seven principles of the friendly relations Declaration of 1970. The friendly relations Declaration itself concluded with the following statement:

"In their interpretation and application the above principles are interrelated and each principle should be construed in the context of the other principles." (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex)

That is the background of my delegation's reservation to operative paragraph 3. We doubt the necessity or advisability of embarking upon the preparation of a new declaration of this kind because we think that it will not facilitate the clear and unambiguous interpretation of either the Charter or the friendly relations Declaration.

Miss DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The nine States members of the European Community abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.45 for the same reasons as those given last year concerning a similar draft resolution.

Mr. MAKOBERO (Burundi) (interpretation from French): I should just like to ask the Secretariat to take note of the fact that if my delegation had been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45, it would have voted in favour.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): I am sorry that the Bahamas delegation was late, and I should like to record its intention to cast a positive vote for the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. MALYE (India): I regret to say that my delegation was slightly late in arriving for the meeting, but had it been present during the voting it would have voted in favour as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. We should like the Secretariat to take note of that fact.

Mr. MOUSSE-KONEGU (Chad) (interpretation from French): I was not in the room when the vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45, but had I been here I would have voted in favour and I would ask the Secretariat to record that fact.

The CHAIRMAN: The statements of those representatives who were unable to be present during the voting will be reflected in the Committee's record.

As there is no other delegation wishing to explain its vote I declare consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45 concluded.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution under agenda item 127 entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war". In this connexion I should like to remind members that the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated at the 56th meeting that he would not insist on the Draft Declaration contained in document A/C.1/32/L.1 and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.2 being put to a vote. Therefore there is only one proposal before the Committee, namely, the Draft Declaration contained in document A/C.1/32/L.46, the text of which was earlier circulated as a conference room paper and introduced by the representative of Iran on 7 December 1977. I am sure that representatives would like me to convey

(The Chairman)

to Mr. Hoveyda our sincere thanks and appreciation for the constructive and great effort he has made to produce such a comprehensive document. Members of the Committee will associate themselves with me in saying that this Draft Declaration is the product of extensive negotiations and consultations among a wide circle of delegations interested in this item.

Miss DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): We understood that delegations which so wished could explain their position on the consensus before a decision was taken on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: If delegations wish to state their position, they can do so after the draft declaration has been adopted by consensus, not before.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): Personally, I believe that it would be better to follow the usual procedure in similar cases in the General Assembly, particularly during special sessions. That procedure consisted in expressing views after the adoption of a particular resolution or declaration or any other document which was before the General Assembly. I say this because this is the established practice which has been followed on many occasions and has speeded up our work. For this reason, I should like to ask the representative of Belgium not to insist on having explanations of position before the adoption but, rather, after it.

The CHAIRMAN: This was the same point that I made here, that it is the general practice for the document to be adopted and then afterwards to have explanation of position, because it is a consensus vote.

May I take it that the Committee agrees to adopt the draft declaration by consensus?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft declaration.

Ms. BENTON (United States of America): As the representative of the United States made clear when he spoke to this Committee on 6 December, the United States has reservations about this declaration and the definition of the concept it endorses. If détente has any meaning at all, it must apply

(Ms. Benton, United States)

to all regions of the world and all situations. It cannot be a double standard with built-in exceptions which permit any country an escape clause whenever it wishes.

Regrettably, the representative of the Soviet Union raised this issue when he spoke yesterday setting forth the Soviet position that détente does not apply to situations involving national liberation movements.

This statement deeply disturbs my Government, not because we do not support efforts being made to achieve majority rule in South Africa and elsewhere, but because this formula has been used in the past to justify the interference of outside Powers in the internal affairs of African States already free from colonial domination.

If this declaration contained language which made it susceptible to the interpretation placed on it by the Soviet Union, my delegation would vote against it. We are able to support this text only because we do not believe it contains provisions which would make it selective in its operations. And on this, we rely on the Charter and the universally accepted declarations of this Organization, most notably the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. The provisions of the Charter naturally govern in respect to the lawful use of force in international relations as otherwise. We interpret operative paragraph 5 in that light.

Operative paragraph 6 we view as a restatement of the more gracefully worded passage of the "friendly relations" resolution which speaks of Governments "representing the whole people belonging to the territory without distinction as to race, creed or colour". (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV))

Operative paragraph 7 is inaccurately phrased since no consensus was reached at the sixth special session of the General Assembly. Rather, a resolution was adopted without objection but with far-reaching reservations, reservations which for its part the United States maintains; and that resolution was not a decision but a recommendation.

(Ms. Benton, United States)

The United States maintains its view on the establishment of the new international economic order which its representative, Mr. Young, most recently authoritatively set out in his speech to ECOSOC. The United States interprets the resolution's reference to racism in the twelfth preambular paragraph as embracing only agreed manifestations of racism. The United States position in this regard is equally clear and equally well known.

In respect of operative paragraph 10, the United States considers that the declaration in no way alters the obligations of States under customary international law.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its appreciation to Mr. Hoveyda for leading the effort which resulted in this text.

Miss DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The nine members of the European Community would like to explain their views on the declaration that has just been adopted by consensus.

We should like to express to Mr. Forayda our sincere appreciation for his tireless efforts in the past few weeks with a view to producing a compromise text. We interpret this declaration as an expression of the firm intention of the States Members of the United Nations to promote international relations on the basis of co-operation and not on confrontation, on moderation and the peaceful settlement of disputes and not on the basis of the threat or use of force.

In the view of the nine member countries of the European Community, détente can be defined as a policy of voluntary moderation. In our view, what we need is a gradual improvement of bilateral and multilateral relations between countries, which entails growing co-operation particularly in the areas of common interest at the same time as moderation in areas where such co-operation is difficult, for example, when fundamental differences of view persist between States.

Our convictions and our efforts are based on the principle of the equality of States and the right of peoples to self-determination. These principles and particularly that of the renunciation of the use of force as a basis for international relations are the very foundations underlying treaties between the East and the West in Europe, including the quadripartite agreement on Berlin which brought about a considerable improvement of the political climate in Europe while making it possible to give a new dimension, namely, a multilateral one, to the policy of détente.

The policy of détente extends to various aspects of international relations, whether they be political, military, economic, ideological, humanitarian or cultural. In our view, these aspects are inseparable, and détente is global and indivisible. It cannot adopt a selective approach which would leave certain areas or regions outside it. Members of the European Community are firmly in favour of practical measures which could bring about progress in the process of détente. However, they are not sure that the adoption of the declaration will necessarily facilitate specific progress.

(Miss Dever, Belgium)

The text in outline constitutes a repetition of what is already to be found in the United Nations Charter and in other documents. However, we note that some of the passages in the declaration are incomplete and in at least one case there is a disturbing addition to terms accepted elsewhere. We should have preferred to have time for more careful reflection, which would have made possible a clearer and more complete drafting of elements which seem to us to be essential in order to bring about progress in détente. In particular, we cannot accept the interpretation that appears to underlie paragraphs referring to economic relations among States. Furthermore, the enumeration of principles in paragraph 5 seems to us to be incomplete and in this regard unsatisfactory. We should have preferred to see, inter alia, a more complete reference to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief for all States, which, in our view, is one of the bases for a radical improvement in their relations. The suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms in certain States has a direct bearing on relations with other States and hence on the whole process of détente. For well-known reasons, we cannot accept either the implications of the inclusion of the word "non-interference", which is combined with the principle of non-intervention enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, the principle of the inviolability of frontiers should take into account the possibility of the modification of frontiers in accordance with international law by peaceful means and by agreement.

We also regret that the text does not refer to the carrying out in good faith of obligations assumed under international law. Although the resolutions mentioned in paragraph 8 have been the subject of consensus, the members of the European Community wish to recall the explicit reservations they formulated in regard to them.

In spite of our reservations on the text, some of which we have just mentioned, we have been able to associate ourselves with the consensus because of the positive elements it contains.

Mr. BALETA (Albania): Mr. Chairman, you have just announced that the draft declaration entitled "The deepening and consolidation of international détente and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war" was adopted by consensus. The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania in its statement before this Committee yesterday expressed its viewpoint and position on the so-called détente and the so-called prevention of a nuclear war. However, the Albanian delegation would like now to elucidate its position as regards the consensus by which the draft declaration was adopted.

It is our view that there has not been and there is no détente in the world. Détente is a fraudulent slogan invented by the two imperialist super-Powers to deceive the peoples and lull them to sleep. Likewise it is sheer deception to speak about the consolidation of détente when the two imperialist super-Powers and other reactionary forces ceaselessly undertake acts of aggression against the peoples, when they threaten, blackmail and interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States, and when the unbridled arms race and war preparations go on.

In our view, it is illusory to believe that, since the two imperialist super-Powers speak a great deal and make a great fuss about détente, they can think seriously about it. It is likewise illusory to think that anything may be achieved as regards improving the international situation or preventing war by simply allowing the Soviet social-imperialists for their demagogic and propaganda purposes to introduce into the agenda such items as the ones on so-called détente and the prevention of a nuclear war or by adopting documents related to the discussion of such items. Even less can it be expected that nuclear war can be prevented by simply formulating documents.

It is clear that the Soviet social-imperialists imposed the inclusion of agenda item 127 in order to intensify their demagogic campaign in the United Nations, in the hope that they would make the Member States accept two pernicious documents that they had prepared, whose aim was the codification of the role of the two super-Powers as the arbiters and gendarmes of the world or in case they would not be able to achieve this, they would aim at obtaining some other document that would satisfy their aims.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

But seeing that their aims were seen through and exposed, they changed tactics. They withdrew their documents so that the whole thing could find a compromise solution.

Their final intention seems to have been to obtain some document that would satisfy their demagogic and propaganda aims. There is no doubt that they have acted like an ordinary peddler who at first asks a very high price so that in the end he may get some sort of price for a commodity that is worth nothing.

The two imperialist super-Powers and the other imperialist Powers would also speculate with the declaration on so-called détente and so-called prevention of a nuclear war in the same way as they have done with many other documents. Such documents will not do any good to the cause of real peace and stability.

In view of all that I have said, the Albanian delegation wishes to stress that it cannot accept and therefore does not associate itself with the consensus which has just been reached on that draft declaration.

Mr. EDMONDS (Canada): Canada has taken part in the consensus on the declaration on détente, but in doing so we must make plain certain reservations that we hold, both on the substance of the declaration and on the manner in which it has been presented to the General Assembly.

In general, Canada does not believe in declarations of intent, preferring instead practical proposals on arms control and disarmament matters. With regard to this declaration, my Government wishes to say that it cannot associate itself completely with everything in the document. In particular, the reference to the "indivisibility of peace and security" is a concept to which Canada cannot subscribe for the simple reason that there does not exist a universally-accepted definition of what it means. In addition, Canada believes that a better balance in operative paragraph 2 between nuclear and conventional disarmament measures would have been preferable.

(Mr. Edmonds, Canada)

If declarations such as the one we have before us are to have any concrete meaning, they require careful preparation in advance so as to ensure the widest acceptability of the document in question. The Canadian delegation is grateful for the efforts made by the representative of Iran in producing a document which could attract consensus support. However, it must also be noted that item 27 was inserted into the agenda of this session of the United Nations General Assembly with no advance consultations at all, and my delegation wishes to express its strong concern over that practice.

Mr. ONDA (Japan): On behalf of the Japanese delegation, I wish to express our deep appreciation to Mr. Hoveyda. Without his sincere and untiring efforts we could not have reached agreement on the draft declaration which has just been adopted by consensus.

Although our delegation joined in that consensus, I should like to make a few remarks on the draft declaration for the record. In our view the concept of détente is not sufficiently clear in the present text. Further problems such as North-South problems, the right of self-determination, and so forth, which are not quite directly related to the problem of détente, are brought into the present text. These problems have been extensively discussed in the various forums of the United Nations.

I shall refrain from touching upon every particular point that we find unsatisfactory in the text. However, with respect to operative paragraph 7 of the draft declaration, my delegation wishes to reconfirm that the position of the Japanese Government on the resolution adopted by the sixth special session of the General Assembly remains unchanged.

Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey): At the very outset I should like to express the gratitude of my delegation to Mr. Hoveyda of Iran for the work that he has successfully done.

(Mr. Ulucevsk, Turkey)

The process of détente is fully consistent with the basic principles of Turkish foreign policy which are aimed at the achievement of a lasting peace throughout the world and the promotion of more effective co-operation among all States. The Turkish Government considers that the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, of which Turkey is a signatory, is a major constructive contribution to the efforts exerted to that end.

My Government has always held the view that the policy of détente should be pursued not only in Europe but also throughout the world. Since détente is an indivisible process, in our view concerted efforts must continue to make détente comprehensive in both scope and geographical extent. In this context, the Turkish Government continues to consider that peace and security in Europe are closely linked to peace and security in the Mediterranean. That is why it attaches particular importance to the document on the Mediterranean of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

My delegation associates itself with the view that there is no reasonable alternative to the policy of international détente and that détente is a prerequisite for the solution of problems of utmost importance to all mankind. We believe that further confidence-building measures and substantial progress in arms control and disarmament negotiations would contribute to the relaxation of international tensions all over the world. The conditions of détente provide wide opportunities for the development of better understanding and closer friendly relations among States, regardless of their social and economic systems, through the expansion of co-operation in the field of economics, as well as in technical, humanitarian, cultural and other fields.

The existence of an international economic order based on the principles of co-operation, equity and mutual benefit is no doubt a fundamental condition for genuine and lasting peace. Moreover, progress in humanitarian questions and broadening exchanges in cultural fields among States will have a positive bearing on the development of better relations through the strengthening of confidence and mutual understanding among nations of the world.

(Mr. Ulucevsk, Turkey)

It is on this understanding that the Turkish delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.46.

Mr. NGUYEN VAN LUC (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam wishes to explain its position following the consensus which has just been reached. Our Vice Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his address to the General Assembly on 21 September 1977, stated the following:

"Over the past 60 years, particularly since the end of the Second World War, the over-all picture of the world has undergone deep changes. The system of socialist countries has increasingly developed, and has opened the correct way for the peoples of the world to struggle for national liberation and social emancipation. The national liberation movement has launched strong attacks on imperialism and colonialism and won victory after victory. It has caused old-style colonialism to collapse and is driving neo-colonialism to total defeat, thereby making a major contribution to the defence of world peace. About one hundred newly independent countries are stepping up their struggle to consolidate their national sovereignty, and are winning an ever more important position in international political life. The struggle of the labouring people in different countries for their economic interests and democratic rights, against fascist repression, has developed extensively and overthrown many dictatorial régimes.

"Faced with the powerful development of the aforementioned three revolutionary currents ... the balance of forces has radically changed in favour of peace and revolution, creating a real possibility of preventing a new world war, and bringing about extremely favourable conditions for the nations to forge ahead and to achieve the lofty objectives of our times, namely, peace, national independence, democracy and socialism." (A/32/PV.3, pp. 76 and 77)

(Mr. Nguyen Van Luu, Viet Nam)

The history of the post-Second World War period has shown that the source of tension in international relations resides exclusively in imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, which have promoted so many wars of aggression throughout the world, especially in the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is precisely the legitimate wars of defence of peoples against aggression or of national liberation that weaken imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and compel the imperialists to speak of peace with the ill intention of benefiting by weakening and dividing the revolutionary forces. Because of those considerations my Government approves the reduction of tension in international relations on the basis of respect for the right to legitimate defence against aggression and respect for the right of peoples to liberate themselves from the colonial yoke.

Mr. LI Chih-hung (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/72/L.46 adopted by consensus under the item "Deepening and consolidation of international détente", the Chinese delegation would like to state that we disassociate ourselves from that consensus and would like to have our statement entered in the record.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): On behalf of members of the group of East European socialist countries, I should like to state the following.

The Draft Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, which has just been adopted by consensus, is a significant result of the work of our Committee and, further, of the thirty-second session in general. That document reflects the progress achieved on the way towards improving the international situation and, at the same time, is a manifestation of the peoples' expectations for lasting peace, disarmament, the elimination of all forms of colonialism and racism, and co-operation among all States on an equal footing. There is, indeed,

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

no task more important than to deepen and to consolidate détente, make it irreversible, and repel all efforts designed to return to the cold war.

We are convinced that the Draft Declaration adopted by the Committee will constitute a broad platform for action by all forces willing to reach mutual understanding and will give new impetus to the taking of concrete measures for the strengthening of the security of the peoples and, above all, for the discontinuation of the arms race and the transition to disarmament.

Moreover, we are convinced that the Draft Declaration will contribute to implementing the right to self-determination for peoples and will facilitate constructive co-operation among peoples and States which is firmly based on the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): Let me first of all, on behalf of my delegation, express our appreciation to Mr. Hoveyda for the intensive efforts that he has made in the preparation and the finalization of this Draft Declaration which has just been adopted by consensus.

Although we joined in the consensus reached, that should not and cannot in any way be interpreted as meaning that we agree with all the provisions of the text of the Draft Declaration. In fact, had a separate vote been taken on the various provisions in the text we would have reserved our position with respect to some of the operative paragraphs contained in it. In this regard I am referring to its operative paragraph 5 which requires States to observe certain principles of international conduct in their relations with other States. Obviously, a close scrutiny and an examination of that paragraph reveal that, while quite a number of cardinal principles of international law are referred to in it, there are a number of other important principles, such as the principle of self-determination, that are omitted from it. The other point in connexion with that operative paragraph to which we want to draw attention is that the manner in which the principles have been set out is not only vague and ambiguous but such as to admit serious short-comings and divergent interpretations. Take, for example, the

principle relating to the inviolability of international frontiers. How could that be interpreted with regard to the liberation movements operating from neighbouring States in pursuance of their right to self-determination and freedom from a colonial or alien Power in occupation of their territory? One can imagine the effect that would have on the legitimate struggle which the liberation movements in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and elsewhere are conducting from bases provided by friendly countries.

The principle should, in our opinion, have been qualified so as to read: "the inviolability of internationally recognized and agreed frontiers". Obviously, an international frontier cannot have only a de facto existence but, to be respected, it should also have legal validity and be recognized and agreed upon as such by the States concerned. It is in the light of this consideration that my delegation registers its reservation with respect to that operative paragraph.

Mr. BERG (Sweden): Sweden has joined the consensus on the draft Declaration in document A/C.1/32/L.46 on the deepening and consolidation of international détente.

My delegation has, however, some doubts as to the real need for declarations of this kind. Our overriding concern has consistently been to avoid the risk of weakening or calling into question the United Nations Charter by making possible differing interpretations of it.

Particular emphasis in special declarations on some principles of the United Nations Charter but not on others would, in our view, not facilitate a clear and unambiguous interpretation of the Charter itself.

That is the reason why my delegation has some doubts and reservations with regard to the idea of the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente as such. On the other hand, we do find positive elements in the text that has just been adopted. The most important of these elements, we find, is included in operative paragraph 5, where respect for human rights is mentioned as a political principle of the same category and on the same level as other international political principles guiding relations between States.

In this connexion my delegation would like to express its great appreciation of and gratitude for the endeavours of Mr. Hoveyda of Iran and his delegation for having so skilfully drafted a text on which it has been possible for a consensus to be reached.

Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would like to make it clear that, having supported the draft declaration in document A/C.1/32/L.46, we want to restate our position, which has already been indicated in detail with regard to this question in our statement at the beginning of the work of this Committee.

I should like in particular to recall our refusal to use the policy of détente to freeze certain situations, to prevent liberation movements from continuing their efforts, and to impede the right of people to self-determination and sovereignty over their natural resources. We believe that liberation movements should have recourse to any means at their disposal, including armed struggle, to confront aggression and liberate their occupied territories to thwart racist régimes.

Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Since my delegation was unable to express its views during the elaboration of the draft declaration on détente, we should like now to express our satisfaction at being able to associate ourselves with the consensus.

The text that we have just adopted is the result of very laudable efforts by Mr. Hoveyda, and my delegation supports in particular the following paragraphs, which, in our view, have a rightful place in a declaration on détente: operative paragraph 6, in which States declare their determination "to ensure the free exercise of the right of the peoples ... to self-determination"; and operative paragraph 7, in which they undertake to "work towards the establishment and development of just and balanced economic relations".

I should like to read out operative paragraph 8, which my delegation is happy to find in the declaration:

"To encourage and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all in conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other relevant international treaties and instruments including the international Covenants on human rights", -
Covenants to which Tunisia is a party.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): The Romanian delegation has joined the consensus reached in this Committee on the declaration on détente with great satisfaction.

My delegation has already had the opportunity to express its position on the substance of the matter of détente during the deliberations on this question. That position remains unchanged and cannot be affected by any other declaration in the Committee.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I should like first of all to apologize for my delegation's absence from the room when the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45 was taken. That was due to circumstances beyond our control. However, I should like to place it on record that had we been here we would have voted in favour. We wish also to associate ourselves with the consensus on the adoption of the draft Declaration in document A/C.1/32/L.46.

Mr. TOWO ANTAGANA (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): I should like first of all to say that my delegation was happy to be able to associate itself with the consensus which has just been reached, by our Committee with regard to the draft declaration in document A/C.1/32/L.46; in particular, we were happy to see operative paragraph 7 of this document.

My delegation would like to add that we regret that, we were not in the room when the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45. Had we been here, we would have voted in favour.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): The Sierra Leone delegation was not present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45. We should like to place on record that had we been present we would have voted in favour of that draft resolution. We should like also to associate, ourselves with the consensus on the draft declaration in document A/C.1/32/L.46.

Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados): The delegation of Barbados regrets its unavoidable absence during the period in which the vote was being taken on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45. Had we been here, we would have voted in favour. We should like to call this to the attention of the Secretariat so that our vote may be recorded.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I am sorry that my delegation was absent when the vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45. Had we been present, we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution, and I should like this statement to be recorded.

I associate myself with my colleagues' views on the contents of document A/C.1/32/L.46, which was adopted by consensus.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I should like to record an abstention with regard to the voting on the draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45.

Mr. FADHLI (Democratic Yemen): During the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45 my delegation was absent. Had it been present, it would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The statements of those representatives who were unable to be present during the voting will be noted in the record.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): I find myself in the paradoxical situation of being compelled to make comments on the draft declaration in document A/C.1/32/L.46, which was put forward by my own delegation. However, this is not the first paradoxical situation which has occurred in the United Nations, and it stems from the fact that I find myself in a position, as I explained yesterday, where I became as it were the author of the draft declaration so as to make it technically possible for it to be submitted to the Committee and adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

However, that does not mean that the delegation of Iran itself unreservedly supports all the parts of this draft declaration. We believe that, as it was the result of a compromise between divergent views, it was possible for us to associate ourselves with the consensus. In our view, the text contains many positive elements and we hope it will prove useful in the future.

I apologize again for being obliged, if not to explain the position of my delegation on its proposal, at least to explain certain aspects for the record.

In conclusion, I should like to thank all those colleagues who have spoken of the efforts made by my delegation in connexion with the preparation of this draft declaration. May I add that my delegation does not believe that it deserves so many compliments. If we have been able to produce the text that was adopted by consensus it is thanks to the untiring efforts of many delegations throughout a period of six weeks; it is because of their co-operation that that result has been achieved.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of agenda item 127.

I call on the representative of Cyprus, who has asked to be allowed to speak to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.47 on behalf of the sponsors.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): It is my privilege and pleasure, on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Cyprus, Guyana, India, Iraq, Mali, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia and Zambia, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.47.

This draft resolution on the item, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", is being introduced by this group of countries as, ever since the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, it has been the custom for the non-aligned countries to prepare and submit resolutions on this item during the debates in this Committee.

The non-aligned countries, by definition not belonging to any military alliance, do not depend mainly for their security on the force of armaments. Consequently, it is only natural that their main interest and concern is

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

focused on international security through the United Nations, through the organization appropriately functioning in this field for a modicum of legal order, security and peace in the world, as provided in the Charter.

Therefore, the non-aligned countries have again prepared this year a draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce.

The draft resolution, in its preamble, reads in part:

"Bearing in mind the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security (resolution 2734 (XXV)) and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly concerning its implementation," ...

"Reaffirming the close link existing between the strengthening of international security, disarmament, decolonization and development and stressing the need for concerted action to achieve progress in those areas and also stressing the importance of the early implementation of the decisions adopted at its sixth and seventh special sessions on the establishment of the new international economic order,

"Noting with profound concern the continuing existence of crises and hot-beds of tension in various regions endangering international peace and security, the continuation and intensification of the arms race as well as acts of aggression, foreign occupation, the threat or use of force, alien domination, foreign interference and the existence of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid which remain the main obstacles to the strengthening of peace and security,"

"Recognizing the need for ... dissemination of information ...".
It then continues in its first two operative paragraphs as follows:

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"1. Calls upon all States to adhere fully to, and implement consistently, the purposes and principles of the United Nations and all the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and to contribute effectively to the increasing peace-keeping and peace-making role of the United Nations;

"2. Reiterates with emphasis its recommendation that the Security Council should consider appropriate steps towards carrying out effectively, as provided in the Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international security and peace."

This is perhaps the important reference for implementation in the draft resolution. It refers to paragraph 9 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which

"Recommends that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter in order fully to develop its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter". (Resolution 2734 (XXV))

Now this paragraph of the Declaration is the one that seeks to bring reality into the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security by implementing the vital provisions of the Charter to ensure international security and the non-use of force. We now have before us many items on the non-use of force, including the proposal for a new treaty to be signed - which we very much appreciate and wish to see signed - but we must bear in mind that the importance lies in implementation. We have now reached the stage of implementation, not of declarations, and therefore we must proceed towards implementation in the appropriate way as provided in the Charter. The Charter cannot be neglected in its main provisions for effectively ensuring international security and peace in the world. If we neglect these provisions, we can never have anything other than the present anarchy and insecurity prevailing in our world.

Therefore, my delegation and the other sponsors attach importance to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, with emphasis being laid on implementation. The operative part of the draft resolution continues:

"3. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial and alien domination to achieve self-determination and independence and urges States to increase their support and solidarity with them and their national liberation movements and to undertake urgent and effective measures for the speedy completion of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples ..."

"4. Calls for the extension of the process of relaxation of tensions ... to all regions of the world and the implementation of the principle of non-use of force or the threat thereof in order to help bring about just and lasting solutions to international problems with the participation of all States so that peace and security will be based on effective respect for the sovereignty and independence of all States and the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their own destiny freely and without outside interference, coercion or pressure;

"5. Reaffirms that any measure or pressure directed against any State while exercising its sovereign right freely to dispose of its natural resources constitutes a flagrant violation of the right of self-determination of peoples and the principle of non-intervention as set forth in the Charter ...

"6. Urges effective measures to put an end to the arms race and promote disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, the creation of zones of peace and co-operation, the withdrawal of foreign military bases as well as the achievement of tangible progress towards general and complete disarmament ...

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"7. Expresses the hope that further positive results will be achieved at the Belgrade meeting of representatives of States participating in the CSCE in the full implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which will be conducive also to strengthening of world security bearing in mind the close interrelation of the security in Europe to the security of the Mediterranean, the Middle East and all other regions of the world, and supports the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation in the interests of peace and security;

"8. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General, and requests him to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-third session a report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-third session an item entitled 'Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security'."

That is the gist of this draft resolution. It really turns upon implementation, which is what is needed in our time.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that Mauritania has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.45, and that Nigeria has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.47.

I now call on the representative of Ethiopia in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Yesterday the representative of the United States, in flagrant violation of the diplomatic courtesy that governs the conduct of relations between States, saw fit to mention my country by name in connexion with a matter that, as I am sure his Government realizes, is strictly within Ethiopian domestic jurisdiction. It is curious to note that

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

when he questioned the presence of Cuban citizens in Ethiopia the United States representative did not see fit to mention also, by way of comparison, not only the presence of American military personnel in Ethiopia until a few months ago but also the presence of hundreds of thousands of American military personnel around the world.

The conduct of relations between States based on sovereignty is not an item before this Committee and I wonder on what legal, moral or any other grounds the United States representative questions the sovereign right of Ethiopia to conduct its relations with various countries of the world. If it is just a matter of curiosity I shall be glad to tell him about the foreign nationals living in and co-operating with Ethiopia, provided he does the same for me with regard, in particular, to American military personnel around the world.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

Perhaps it is as a result of a guilty feeling about their past doings in my country, but I wish that the representative of the United States would refrain from indulging in such futile exercises.

Although I asked to speak in exercise of my right of reply, I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's satisfaction at the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.46, the provisions of which - particularly operative paragraph 5 - my delegation fully supports.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has yet to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.47 which has been introduced this morning by the representative of Cyprus on behalf of the co-sponsors. I presume that delegations will wish to study it with care and will need some time to do so. Accordingly, I suggest that we meet tomorrow afternoon to take a decision on it. That will also enable us to finish our work tomorrow afternoon within the deadline set by the President of the General Assembly. We shall meet next, therefore, tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.