

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L201 (WWRR)

FIRST COMMITTEE  
46th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 29 November 1982  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 46TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 58: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 59: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 137: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

A draft resolution was introduced by:

Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone) - A/C.1/37/L.73

UN LIBRARY  
DEC 16 1982  
UN/SA COLLECTION

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcos Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/37/PV.46  
13 December 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 58, 59 AND 137

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our schedule, as of today we shall begin consideration of the last three items allocated on the agenda of our Committee which relate to the broad and very important objective of maintaining and strengthening international peace and security.

As members may well recall, one of those items refers to the "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States", an initiative introduced in the Assembly debates in 1979 by Romania, which had also been considered during the thirty-sixth session.

For the current discussion, the Committee has before it the report of the Secretary-General circulated as document A/37/476, which contains, in conformity with the provisions of resolution 36/101 adopted by the Assembly last year, an orderly presentation of the views and suggestions received from Governments and the United Nations organs and specialized agencies on this item. Responses provided by States and United Nations organs and specialized agencies contain a wide spectrum of ideas and suggestions with regard to the content of good-neighbourliness and the ways and modalities to enhance it. It has been emphasized, among other things, that a detailed elaboration of good-neighbourliness should be provided to the international community as an instrument for the promotion of regional co-operation and the maintenance of peace and security.

It is my hope that the results of the examination of good-neighbourliness and of the clarification of its elements will permit the Committee to take further action in accordance with the provisions of resolution 36/101.

(The Chairman)

Under the well-known item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", which has been on our agenda since 1970, the Committee will consider at this session the related subject regarding "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the region of the Mediterranean", included in the agenda of the Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

As members are fully aware, the political and security aspects of the Mediterranean region have been raised in the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and at other regional meetings. However, it is at this session that the General Assembly will consider the Mediterranean region as a topic of international peace and security.

For our present debate, the Committee has before it the report of the Secretary-General containing the views of States on this issue, which has been circulated as document A/37/355 and Add.1 to 3.

(The Chairman)

Obviously, it would be premature to formulate at this stage any concrete suggestions regarding the outcome of our debate on this subject. I cannot but hope that the Committee will proceed to a thorough exchange of views on this item; at the same time I express my belief that the conclusions at which we arrive could serve the goals of peace and security of the States of the region concerned and of all mankind.

Finally, our Committee will consider a new agenda item allocated to it, entitled "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security". As members know, that item was proposed by Sierra Leone in the letter from its Permanent Representative to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, which was distributed as document A/37/241.

I believe that we would all agree that this issue is of particular importance and urgency in the light of the present circumstances of a grave deterioration of the international situation, which requires strengthening the capacity of the Organization to solve the major problems pertaining to the maintenance of world peace and security. I sincerely hope that the discussion of this item by the Committee will lead to the strengthening of the capability of the United Nations to carry out its primary function: the maintaining of international peace and security.

I think it is our common understanding that the primary idea behind the establishment of the United Nations is that there can be no assurance of national security without a system of collective security, and that collective security in turn cannot be made to rest on the power factor alone. Contemporary political developments show that security is not to be viewed in purely military terms: the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament points out in this respect that:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority". (resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

(The Chairman)

I believe that genuine peace and security can be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

The debates we are beginning today on all the foregoing problems provide a most timely opportunity for all of us to explore in a constructive manner, and to agree on, those steps conducive to the strengthening of the integrity and credibility of this Organization, thus restoring to it its role as the main instrument for the consolidation of peace and security.

I wish to express once more my conviction that by the recommendations which will be forwarded to the General Assembly the Committee will make its concrete contribution to the reaffirmation of faith in the basic principles and ideals that gave birth to this Organization and which are the very basis for maintaining international peace and security. Our task is neither easy nor simple. We must enhance awareness of our responsibility and obligation to exert maximum efforts, determination and resolve, so that our Committee may contribute to the restoration of confidence in the capacity of nations to impose the power of justice and the rule of law and to establish a global environment of peace and security.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate you on your excellent introductory statement. The importance of international security is paramount, far greater than is considered in our world of today. The mere fact that 60 meetings of the First Committee were allocated this session to the consideration of all disarmament items while only 20 were allocated to items concerning international security in itself shows that the approach to this problem is not what it should be.

There is perhaps a widespread misunderstanding of the place of international security in the Charter and in the work of the United Nations. The meaning of international security in the context of the United Nations and its Charter is not international security in the abstract - including, of course, economic security, the New International Economic Order, the problem of apartheid, and the other problems which are dealt with individually - but is, and is intended to be, the concrete system of international collective security provided for

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

in the Charter, which revolves around the axis of the effective implementation of the decisions of the Security Council for international peace and security. The Chairman's introductory statement pointed to this very clearly, but I wish to stress that the notion that international security as meant in the Charter is but the result of disarmament is fundamentally erroneous: it puts the cart before the horse. The problem is not what will ultimately result from disarmament, but how disarmament is to be attained. Not by mere disarmament negotiations - they proved unproductive over decades of years - but through implementing the Charter system of collective security, parallel to the disarmament effort. This is abundantly clear from the Charter itself. The security system pervades it from beginning to end. From the Preamble which states that:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war... for these ends ... [agree] to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security', to the purposes and principles, culminating in Chapter VII.

The primary purpose of the United Nations under Article 1 of the Charter is 'to take effective collective measures for the prevention or suppression of aggression or other breaches of the peace'. The main principle in the Charter is the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations in Article 2 (4), followed by paragraph (5) regarding enforcement action. Then comes the Security Council as the principal organ for peace and security, by the Charter providing for the effectiveness of its decisions by making available to it a United Nations force to be used for enforcement action, with the advice and assistance of the Military Staff Committee. This Committee, although duly set up from the start of the Organization, has been idle over the years, owing to the continuing lack of a United Nations force as mandatorily required by the Charter. This basic abnormality in the function of the Security Council has led to the present world insecurity and anarchy, as demonstrated in the recent unacceptable series of Security Council decisions, contemptuously disregarded and remaining without effect.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The resulting situation can and should be remedied by the Security Council proceeding to the measures for rendering effective its decisions and thereby making operative the Charter system of security.

This vital aspect of world security obviously cannot be served by any degree of disarmament. On the other hand international security through the United Nations admittedly is instrumental to effective progress on disarmament.

As distinct from the Covenant of the League of Nations - which looked to disarmament measures per se as the way to peace and security - the Charter of the United Nations does not require its Members to reduce their armaments through agreements. It provides, however, the aforesaid system of collective international security and obligates its Members to comply with it. The Charter treats the principles of disarmament as flowing from such a security system dependent on it. This is evident from all references to disarmament in Articles 11, 26 and 47 of the Charter.

The long stagnation in the disarmament negotiations, while the arms race has been escalating, made necessary the first special session on disarmament. A main directive of its unanimously adopted Final Document is: "the implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter" followed by "the speedy and substantial reduction of armaments".

In the four years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Final Document of the first special session, no steps were taken for the implementation of this directive. The Committee on Disarmament continued its dedicated efforts at negotiating disarmament agreements and for a comprehensive programme on disarmament but without results inasmuch as the aforesaid directive of the Final Document for the system of international security was not given any attention and no measures were taken in that direction. In consequence the Comprehensive Programme on Disarmament presented by the Committee on Disarmament to the second special session was full of brackets and caused the apparent failure of that session, which, however, did not fail to reaffirm the main directive of the Final Document of the first special session.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I will quote the relevant part of the Concluding Document of the second special session:

"The General Assembly also stressed the need for strengthening the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations in accordance with the Final Document and to enhance the effectiveness of the Committee on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body".

(A/S-12/32, para. 62)

Therefore the second special session linked the work of the Committee on Disarmament with the need to respect the security system provided for in the Charter and for taking steps in that direction so that its efforts might be effective.

The Committee on Disarmament should comply with the Charter provisions and with the unanimous decisions taken at the first and second special sessions on disarmament, as indicated in the Final Document and the conclusions of the second special session and proceed to consider measures for international security, parallel to its negotiations for disarmament agreements. The question, therefore, of international security through the system provided for in the Charter, based on the effective implementation of the decisions of the Security Council, is a matter of the greatest importance to the United Nations and to the world whose very survival is threatened in the present conditions.



(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Since the Committee on Disarmament is really a by-product of the major Powers, we can understand that they dominate that Committee. But the Committee on Disarmament must comply with the unanimous decisions taken at the first and second special sessions on disarmament as indicated in their conclusions. I hope I have made that point quite clear.

Therefore the position taken by many countries that the question of the attainment of international security through the Charter system is one that can be neglected or one that does not require more than a few days of consideration, whereas disarmament requires many more, is erroneous. I hope it will be reconsidered and that the system of international security will be given its proper place, so that we can move out of the stagnation in the disarmament efforts and the anarchy that prevails in the world today.

It is our hope that in the light of a series of recent events significant of the trends of our times, the leading Powers will realize the compelling need for international security through an effectively functioning Security Council as the only way out of our grave predicament through a new, more positive and ethical approach to world problems, adapted to the needs of a nuclear and space age.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): First of all, my delegation wishes to express its gratitude to the Secretary-General and to the relevant services in the Secretariat for the useful and interesting work that has been accomplished in preparing the report containing a summary of the views and proposals of States and specialized agencies concerning the content of good-neighbourliness and the ways and means for enhancing its effectiveness, which is contained in document A/37/476.

We would express the hope that the debates on the basis of that report, which reflects the wealth of ideas and proposals submitted by States and specialized agencies on the subject of good-neighbourliness, will further assist the clarification and development of this concept which is fundamental to inter-State relations of peace and co-operation.

Romania's initiative in regard to the inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly in 1979 of the item entitled 'Development and strengthening of good neighbourliness between States' was based on the conviction that the

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

promotion of relations of good-neighbourliness between all nations in the world represented a decisive factor in the establishment of a climate of good understanding and mutual respect and in strengthening and guaranteeing peace in the different regions and throughout the world.

Pursuing an active policy of peace and broad co-operation with all countries of the world, on the basis of rigorous respect for national sovereignty and independence, equality of rights, non-interference in the affairs of other States the right of peoples to self-determination, the non-use of force or the threat of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes between States, Romania and its President, Nicolae Ceausescu, give pride of place to the strengthening of relations of friendship and understanding, mutual regard and respect and mutually advantageous co-operation with neighbouring countries, as a basic guideline for Romania's foreign policy. We proceed, as the Romanian Head of State declared recently,

from the need for the continued development of co-operation, first and foremost with our neighbours, with the socialist countries and with our other countries, inasmuch as relations of co-operation and good-neighbourliness constitute a primary requisite for ensuring peace in Europe and throughout the world .

It is our profound conviction that the development of relations of friendship and co-operation between neighbours is the principal means of preparing favourable groundwork for the approach to the peaceful settlement of any problem on the basis of the legitimate interests of all peoples and the fundamental principles which should govern the conduct of States in the present-day world. Only thus can we prevent the emergence of new discords and the deepening of existing ones and bring about a climate in which peace, co-operation and security are conceived of and safeguarded as the common good of mankind.

That is all the more true in the present international situation, which is characterized by an increase in and aggravation of tension and open conflicts, the continuance of the policy of the use and threat of use of force, the growing trend to resort to violence to settle international problems and the intensification of the arms race.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Therefore we are of the opinion that the continued development of relations of good-neighbourliness between States and the solution in that spirit of all the problems encompassed in good-neighbourliness and co-existence between States constitute an effective means of preventing conflicts and settling disputes by peaceful means. As the Committee knows, not much time has elapsed since the adoption by the General Assembly of the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes. Like other delegations, we wish to reiterate the hope that States will respect the commitments proclaimed in that important document and will make good use of the peaceful means and procedures it recommends for the solution of international issues and problems.

Similarly, the cultivation of relations of good-neighbourliness is a indispensable prerequisite for the solution of the major problems with which all the countries of the world are confronted. It is a vital need in an interdependent world, where there are many problems of great importance for the life, the well-being and the civilization of the peoples of our planet, whether of a political, economic, cultural, technical and scientific or any other kind, which cannot be solved without the close co-operation and active participation, on a footing of absolute equality, of all States and peoples. All this gives a fresh dimension to good-neighbourliness, because fruitful co-operation, to which all the peoples of the world can freely make wide-ranging and original contributions while benefiting from its results, can be developed only if there are relations of good-neighbourliness.

The evolution of the international situation has merely strengthened the conviction of the Romanian delegation that consideration of the many aspects of good-neighbourliness, as well as the ways and means of developing and enhancing it in the relations among all States, together with the pursuance of resolute action to that end by the United Nations, represents an outstanding contribution to the improvement of the international climate, the promotion of relations of understanding and co-operation and the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Three years after we took our initiative concerning consideration of the question of good-neighbourliness, we note with satisfaction that it has fallen on fertile ground and has aroused a great deal of interest among Member States. This has found clear expression in the written replies submitted by more than 40 States, large and small, situated in different geographic areas, and by 14 international organizations, as well as in the comments made during the debate on this question in our Committee.

The report submitted by the Secretary-General, which was drawn up on the basis of those replies and comments, contains, we believe, important specific ideas, proposals and suggestions for determining the political and legal content of good-neighbourliness and in particular for defining the practical ways and modalities for promoting the strengthening and development of more harmonious relations between neighbouring States.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

It is extremely significant and encouraging to note the existence of a number of common elements and a similar or nearly similar concept in the views expressed by many States, which serve to give specific guidelines for the consideration of the problem and for future efforts aimed at developing and strengthening good-neighbourliness.

We were struck in particular by the importance States attach to good-neighbourly relations and by the importance international organizations attach to their practical activities aimed at promoting such relations. Romania, like many other countries, considers - and rightly so - that good-neighbourliness is a fundamental objective, a basic guideline, a vital need and a major principle in its foreign relations. The maintenance and development of good-neighbourly relations are closely linked, according to a concept that my country fully shares, with the security of each nation and with the maintenance of international peace and security. It is obvious that the existence of traditional relations of friendship, intensified co-operation and mutual respect can bring stability and durability to inter-State relations, eliminate the possibility of the emergence of conflicts or disputes and, in any event, minimize their gravity and facilitate their solution, and that it can, in short, ensure an increased level of security for the States concerned.

Reflecting the experience of the past and the practice of international relations in general, the replies of States set forth as a fundamental requirement for the establishment and development of good-neighbourly relations strict respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and of international law and, in particular, independence and national sovereignty, non-recourse to force or the threat of force, equality of rights, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Indeed, each time those principles have been flouted and force and the threat of force have been employed, when recourse has been had to various

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

forms and means of constraint in settling problems between neighbours, each time the rights legitimate interests of a people have not been respected, the very foundation of good-neighbourliness has been jeopardized. Romania fully shares the view that a policy of good-neighbourliness excludes acts of force, the occupation of foreign territory, the practices of apartheid, colonialism and neo-colonialism and acts aimed at establishing zones of influence or domination.

It is a matter, first, of obligations that derive from respect for territorial integrity and of refraining from any act that might be regarded as a violation or threat to violate frontiers, of the refusal to condone the use of national territory to perpetrate acts of aggression or other activities against other States, refraining from exercising pressures with a view to destabilizing the legitimate Governments of other countries, and of the obligation of neighbouring States to solve all the problems inherent in their relations by peaceful means. Those obligations obviously concern relations between every State; however, they are of particular importance in relations between neighbouring countries.

It is also obvious that the maintenance and development of good-neighbourly relations are an important element in the promotion of respect for the fundamental principles of international law, a basic contribution towards avoiding the emergence of disputes and conflicts and towards solving those that exist through peaceful means and for halting the worsening of international tension and creating a general climate of understanding and security.

In my country's view, as set forth in the reply submitted by the Romanian Government in 1981 as well as in the position of other States, good-neighbourliness has an increasingly broader content reflecting the requirements of an increased development of international co-operation, particularly among neighbouring countries.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The large volume and diversity of relations that naturally arise between neighbouring States gives a special dimension to good-neighbourliness in international co-operation and in the search for effective solutions to such problems of mutual concern as development, energy, agriculture and food supply, international trade - particularly in the present state of the world economy - and the protection of the environment.

There is a need, particularly for neighbouring States, to promote broad co-operation in all areas by taking full advantage of the favourable conditions created by geographical proximity in order to find joint mutually advantageous solutions to the many problems created by their proximity, including a mutual collaboration and granting of assistance in difficult circumstances such as natural disasters and other situations, that can affect neighbouring countries and peoples, as well as an elimination of the barriers that hinder the free development of exchanges between States.

A number of specific norms have thus crystallized in relations between neighbouring States, norms that are general in scope and that are constantly enriching the content of good-neighbourliness.

States thus find themselves faced with a two-fold duty: to act in a positive sense, that is, to promote good-neighbourly relations in a practical and effective manner, and to refrain from any actions or situations that can hinder or prevent the establishment and development of such relations.

With regard to the areas of good-neighbourliness, objective demands for enhancing co-operation between neighbours are obviously reflected in the extension of the sphere of inter-State relations that good-neighbourliness covers. The replies of States and specialized agencies thus reflect the diversity and dynamism of relations between States that extend to an ever-growing area of activities, ranging from traditional co-operation in frontier areas to the exploitation of shared natural resources and the notion of zones of co-operation and good-neighbourliness.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We have also noted with particular interest the proposals and suggestions made by States concerning methods and procedures for enhancing good-neighbourliness. A large number of those proposals and suggestions highlight the existing practice in relations between States. For example, there are contacts and meetings at the highest levels and exchanges and contacts at all levels, both central and local; there are agreements on different aspects of mutual relations and mixed commissions and other bodies that deal with co-operation in the most varied fields. Others refer to concepts that are newer but highly important in present-day international relations, such as confidence-building measures, nuclear-free zones or zones of peace, co-operation and good-neighbourliness.

As the representative of a country that for a long time has been active in promoting the creation of such a zone in our own region and that has supported efforts made to that end in any part of the world, I should like to reaffirm our conviction that zones of peace, co-operation and good-neighbourliness can have a beneficial influence on relations between the countries concerned, as well as on the international climate in general.



(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In the context of good-neighbourliness, the establishment of mutual confidence between States, founded on the mutual understanding and regard of peoples, respect for national values and for the contribution made by each people to a universal heritage and, above all, respect for the legitimate interests of others, is of particular importance. Confidence, which is an indispensable element of good neighbourliness, obviously requires positive action by States; recent practice shows that in addition to traditional action designed to win the trust of neighbours, States are increasingly interested in confidence-building measures in the military and security fields. Convinced that the present international situation makes it necessary to restore and increase confidence among States, Romania supports the adoption and implementation of confidence-building measures that are both binding and forceful. Romania itself maintains relations of friendship, multilateral co-operation and mutual confidence with its neighbours, relations that it intends to continue developing and strengthening.

The role of the United Nations and its organs, subsidiary bodies and specialized agencies in the development and enhancement of good-neighbourliness are reflected both in the suggestions of States, and in the practical activities of those international bodies, which are set forth in their replies.

The report of the Secretary-General brings to light a large number of common elements in the replies of States, both as regards the content of good neighbourliness and the ways and means of enhancing its effectiveness. I shall not attempt to give a complete list of those ideas and common elements, but even a brief perusal of the document reveals their wealth and scope. This confirms our original opinion that it is both possible and useful to try to clarify the various aspects and rules of good-neighbourliness and its common elements.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

As the General Assembly has reaffirmed in successive resolutions on this problem adopted by consensus, the wide application of the long practice and rich experience of all countries in their foreign relations and the principles and rules that have emerged in the area of good-neighbourliness can strengthen friendly relations and co-operation among States, which, like good-neighbourliness, are fundamental aims of the United Nations according to the Charter.

Indeed, the rules of law established in customary inter-State relations and in bilateral and multilateral agreements concluded by States, the new content of important documents adopted by the United Nations, and existing practice in the solution of many problems arising from among neighbours, provides a wealth of material that makes the task of wide application possible.

We are convinced that the important task of determining and defining the elements of good-neighbourliness and reaching agreement on an overall view of the subject, will require a sustained effort. However, such an effort seems to be justified by what we believe can be achieved as a result - namely, a substantive document reflecting the agreement of all States on the content of good-neighbourliness, the principles and rules on which it is based and the methods that States can and should use to strengthen it. This is an area that lends itself to a project of political and legal drafting which could well prove very important in promoting relations of friendship, understanding and peace in the world.

The Romanian delegation therefore considers that the necessary conditions are now available, on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General and the replies of States and specialized agencies, for studying and clarifying the component elements of good-neighbourliness, and for undertaking the drafting of an appropriate international document on the subject.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We see this as an important contribution to the development of relations between neighbours and the improvement of international relations and the international climate in general, and hence of the cause of the peace and security of all States.

As I have said, there is a close link between good neighbourliness and international security. My delegation will speak later on the other questions relating to the broader item of international security.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): The general debate on disarmament that our Committee has just closed has yet again underscored both the gravity of international problems and the profound disquiet engendered by the steady worsening of the international situation.

In the light of this situation, it is more necessary than ever before to work towards the adoption of specific measures and seek wise solutions if we are to discharge our collective responsibility with the support of the proper political will. It is high time for us to draw the appropriate lessons from the senseless temptation men feel to destroy mankind.

Today more than ever, if we commit the fatal error which the dangerous possibilities of military nuclear adventurism entail it will not only debase the human condition but will also make us accomplices in a criminal undertaking. Our analyses demonstrate that the choice is to work for peace or perish, a choice which now faces all nations, strong or weak.

Fortunately there is still time for us, faced with those alternatives, to opt for the right response, and for constructive solutions based on plain common sense. Those solutions will emerge not from an accumulation of repetitive resolutions, but as my delegation has already stated, from a firm political determination to set out on the path of mutual concessions, in the absence of unilateral initiatives such as those of China and the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

It is on behalf of the highest ideals of mankind and its basic common interests that my delegation would like to appeal urgently for us to work together to avert, once and for all, the final catastrophe, and to build a better world. My delegation is convinced that this is the only course responsive to the requirements of the world situation, particularly those requirements arising from the principle of good-neighbourliness, which have been recognized by this Organization.

Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity, in the light of the excellent relations of good-neighbourliness and bonds of traditional friendship that link our two peoples and our two countries, Ghana and Mali, to convey to you the cordial and heartfelt congratulations of my delegation, congratulations motivated both by fraternal esteem and on the confidence and respect earned by your personal talents and your qualities as a skilled diplomat. Our congratulations are also extended to the other officers of the Committee. Furthermore, my delegation would like to offer its very sincere congratulations to Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden and Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico, who so well deserve the Nobel Peace Prize recently awarded them.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

How can we conceive of collective security of nations and the peace of each of them without mutual confidence? The reply is obvious. That security is both the means and the core of the confidence which we have to bring into being as a matter of high priority. That is why my delegation recently appealed to everyone, and particularly to the great Powers, for dialogue, active tolerance and the right to be different.

In the opinion of my delegation, dialogue and mutual tolerance of different socio-political systems and the recognition of the right to be different - which is one of the finest expressions of human rights - constitute a first set of conditions indispensable for the effective observance of the principles which all of us invoke. Our security and our survival, as well as our peace and stability, are all at stake.

The positive movement towards concrete measures is all the more relevant and valuable when one considers that there are many pressing reasons which require it.

My delegation thus sincerely feels that these concrete measures obviously include the urgent establishment of a necessary instrument with universal scope to provide an institutional framework for good-neighbourliness.

My delegation is convinced that the elaboration of such an instrument would provide the beginnings of a solution to the grave international problems of our day, including the many regional crises.

One can thus clearly see the full wealth and importance of the notion of good-neighbourliness which can serve as an instrument for integration and co-ordination of all the principles whose application contributes to the safeguard, maintenance and strengthening of peace in the world.

At a time of upheavals and crisis in the world, which has been eloquently emphasized by all delegations, it is no mere coincidence that there has come into being between certain concepts a relationship concretely expressed by the principle of good-neighbourliness. We have extended this relationship to the concepts of co-operation, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, active solidarity and strengthening of bonds of friendship among peoples.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

Such a relationship indicates that solutions are interdependent and cannot be hierarchical. Good-neighbourliness is and continues to be crucial to our survival.

Seen from this point of view, considering once again the draft presented by Romania, my delegation feels that the contribution which it makes is very important and encouraging and can constitute the basis for the elaboration of an instrument universal in scope.

The report of the Secretary-General, in document A/37/476, properly delimits the extent and scope of the principle of good-neighbourliness and its sphere of application.

The Charter of the United Nations, in its preamble, recognizes the willingness of the peoples of the United Nations to "live together in peace with one another as good neighbours" as an element of solidarity, concomitant with the other fundamental goals enunciated in the Charter.

Thinking may differ, of course, on the precise scope of this clause, and more extensively again as to the legal significance of the preamble.

However, there is no denying that the preamble has a normative value in a field other than that of law, in other words, it has a political normative value and it cannot be denied that it is an expression of a positive legal perspective.

Hence the impossibility of rigidly enclosing the principle of good-neighbourliness in a tight framework, no longer adapted to present circumstances. Hence also the fragile relativity of doctrinal variations which make the dual character of this same need so essential.

Nothing excludes the urgent possibility of filling in any gap in various provisions or a legal void, and still less is there any reason to prevent us from giving instrumental form to a provision which is recognized as having legal effect.

Here again resides the very essence and justification for the concern to which attention has been drawn and the dangerous though reversible trends of fatal events.

(Mr. Cisse, Mali)

It is this task of peace to which my country intends to contribute at all levels, particularly at the regional and sub-regional levels, convinced as we are that it is active participation in the patient construction of regional and subregional groupings with one's neighbours which is a powerful factor in safeguarding peace and in securing the economic, social and cultural development of our countries.

Basing its position on these considerations, Mali is prepared to engage in dialogue and in any constructive discussion because we have always been aware of the solidarity and interdependence of the fundamental interests of all peoples.

My delegation reiterates its initial proposition that the maintenance and strengthening of relations of good-neighbourliness at all levels is the only way to improve the state of international relations, including relations of co-operation which the prodigious progress of science and technology may raise to unheard of levels in the service of the lofty ideals of friendship and solidarity for the benefit of all nations.

Mr. BELISARIO (Philippines): Perhaps many in this Committee have, at one time or another, witnessed the performance of a Philippine dance troupe called "Bayanihan." "Bayanihan" is a Filipino term that, liberally interpreted, connotes mutual assistance among and between neighbours without compensation. It is an age-old custom among Filipino farmer folk whose origins are lost in the mists of antiquity. When a man's neighbours together help him in planting his crops or bringing in his harvest, that is "bayanihan". When his neighbours aid him in moving his house from one site to another, that is "bayanihan".

"Bayanihan" thus signifies the spirit of good neighbourliness, not only in terms of being friendly but, more importantly, of being helpful. Would that this spirit could permeate the relations between and among peoples and States which, after all, are but neighbours and neighbourhoods writ large.

As neighbours ought to be friendly and helpful to one another, so that the neighbourhood can enjoy tranquillity and progress, so States should also be friendly and helpful to neighbouring States. Thereby, a real and meaningful contribution will be made towards international peace and security.

But the term "good neighbourliness" should not be interpreted in its narrow sense; its application should not be confined to the nations that lie within a particular geographical vicinity. Rather, my delegation would imbue the term with a spiritual connotation; its essence should be intention and desire rather than geography. In this day of instant electronic communications, of jet and supersonic airplanes, it cannot be otherwise. All the nations of our planet are now neighbours of one another - nay, they are brothers. Our globe is one great neighbourhood made so by advanced and fast moving technology and rapidly growing interdependence.

Thus, some seven to eight years ago, when my President, Ferdinand E. Marcos, boldly broke with the past and opened diplomatic ties with the countries of Eastern Europe, he did so under the concept that these nations are our neighbours, spiritual rather than geographical, with whom we desire to live in peace, friendship, harmony and co-operation. Good-neighbourliness also demands that nations disregard the ideological preferences as well as the



(Mr. Belisario, Philippines)

political, social and economic systems of other nations, so long as these wish to live in peace and amity. This is merely respecting a nation's right to choose its own destiny; this is merely practising international tolerance; this is merely observing the Charter's injunction never to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign State.

To my delegation, therefore, good-neighbourliness is basically a spiritual thing; thus, it possesses no boundaries save those of intention and mutual desire.

So many practical things present themselves as measures that could promote good neighbourliness among States. Educational and cultural exchanges in their various forms, especially in the performing arts, certainly promote this concept. Tourism is also a most effective and economically rewarding measure.

Another is athletic exchanges, and the regional games in the various continents clearly demonstrate that this activity produces excellent dividends in terms of amity, understanding and good will. None the less, we cannot but view with alarm the rabid and violent partisanship which has characterized the behaviour in recent years of some spectators of professional sports, particularly football. I think it is time that sports authorities in the various countries concerned took immediate and effective steps to remedy the situation. The riotous behaviour of these fans damages the relations between States, defeats the essential purpose of sports, and violates the spirit of good-neighbourliness.

It will be noted that Romania is the principal proponent of the item under consideration. And I can say that in this Romania translates its words into deeds. When the Philippines decided to open diplomatic relations with the socialist group of nations, it started by simultaneously establishing ties with Romania and another country. Romania soon after took the initiative and suggested an exchange of resident ambassadors -- which was done -- then followed up by sending President Nicolae Ceausescu on a State visit to my country. Thus Romania became the first socialist State

(Mr. Belisario, Philippines)

to exchange resident envoys with my country, and President Ceausescu became the first socialist Chief of State ever to visit the Philippines.

All these were certainly widely applauded and deeply appreciated by the Filipinos, and most surely contributed to the warm and fruitful relationship prevailing between the Philippines and Romania.

Further, I have observed the regular and constant flow of visiting foreign dignitaries to Romania, and of high Romanian officials to foreign lands. Now contacts between foreign leaders, especially Foreign Ministers and Heads of State or Government, develop personal friendships, and these not only enhance greater understanding between States but also generate a higher degree of tolerance for each other, thereby facilitating the resolution of such differences and difficulties as may arise between them.

Allow me a bit of immodesty, when I say that in his wide-ranging foreign travels over the years as the Philippines' premier diplomat, my Foreign Minister, Carlos P. Romulo, had done more than any other Filipino to make the Philippines better known and understood, and to make friends for my country. Incidentally, his first official visit to Eastern Europe was to Romania, in response to the invitation of the Romanian Government, and he has not forgotten the hospitality and cordiality with which he was received. These visits constitute a heavy financial and physical burden but they represent the spirit of good-neighbourliness in action.

May I therefore say that just as good neighbours visit one another and keep in touch so too should nations keep in touch through the medium of reciprocal visits by their high functionaries.

But perhaps one of the best examples of good-neighbourliness is that existing in the relationship of the member countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). As the Philippine Permanent Representative described it in an intervention before this Committee:

"The experience of ASEAN, of which my country is a member, provides an excellent example ... In ASEAN, where Heads of State or Government and the Foreign Ministers are personal friends and can talk to each other on the phone to consult and even reach agreement without much formality, where high officials meet frequently and regularly in each other's country, establishing personal ties of friendship, and where

(Mr. Belisario, Philippines)

each State knows what the other is doing, we might perhaps find the basic ingredients for making the system operate."

Let me tell a true story illustrating how well the ASEAN system works. A South Asian Ambassador once asked for an appointment with the Foreign Minister of an ASEAN country to inquire about the latter's official position on an international issue that had very recently arisen. The Ambassador was given an appointment for the following day. When he called, the Foreign Minister informed him not only of the latter's official position but that of ASEAN as well. The Ambassador was amazed beyond measure, but what had happened was that the Foreign Minister had gotten on the phone, and consulted each of his four ASEAN colleagues, and in a matter of hours a common position was reached. This could not have been achieved without the close personal friendships and contacts that have been developed between the ASEAN Foreign Ministers, and without that spirit of good-neighbourliness permeating their relationship. And, of course, without the magic of instant communication.

At this point, I would however emphasize that good neighbourliness is not an end in itself. Its nature partakes of a confidence-building measure which promotes greater tolerance and deeper understanding between States. This in turn facilitates negotiations towards disarmament and arms reduction. The ultimate aim of good-neighbourliness is, of course, international peace and security.

Good-neighbourliness as a measure to promote international peace and security is not a spectacular act. It lacks the ringing and vibrant notes of a call to arms. It is not embodied in, nor does it depend upon, any impressive document signed with extravagant display and solemnity. It will get no headlines in the world press nor receive high-sounding praises from editorial writers. Good-neighbourliness is more a feeling, a sentiment, an attitude. As I said before, it is essentially a spiritual thing.

But then, are not things of the spirit more meaningful, more abiding, more permanent? Intangible though it may be, is not a spiritual thing really more binding, based as it is on free choice and conceived in unselfishness and the highest of motives? Indeed, I will suggest that spiritual things, like good-neighbourliness, will still retain vigour and relevance even when so many treaties and conventions signed with great pomp and pageantry have become mere scraps of paper.

Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia) Since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the First Committee has been dealing only with questions of disarmament and related international security questions. That is, we think, the fitting and reasonable consequence of the fact that disarmament and international security are two sides of the same coin.

There is no doubt that the situation in the world gives cause for grave concern. We are faced with the ever more frequent threat and use of force, interventions and interference in the internal affairs of States and various other forms of threats and jeopardy to the freedom, independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of countries throughout the world, but mainly of the non-aligned and developing countries.

Focal points of crises in the world are multiplying and grave international problems remain unsolved. Bloc rivalry continues to burden not only the relations between the big Powers and blocs but it also exacerbates tensions and complicates the situation in many regions of the world.

The arms race, particularly in its nuclear dimension, is taking a new sharp turn upwards, threatening the extinction of mankind, while an increasing number of countries are forced to arm themselves in order to defend their endangered independence and sovereignty. The world economy is in deep crisis. The consequences of that situation are felt mostly by the developing countries. The system of collective security as envisaged by the Charter has not been put into effect and negotiations on various problems in different forums are at a stalemate.

All of that has been amply stressed and widely elaborated during the general debate held at the beginning of the current session. It has reflected the widespread feeling among all Member States that the international situation is reaching a critical point. Therefore, we hold, concerted efforts should be made to stop that dangerous trend and to reverse it towards positive international co-operation based on equality and benefit for all.

The instruments for that course exist and are in our hands. They are contained, first of all, in the Charter of the United Nations and in a number of other important documents adopted by the General Assembly throughout the years, such as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted barely a year ago;

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, which was approved only a few days ago; the Definition of Aggression; and so forth. Certainly not the least important of those documents is the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, whose implementation this Committee is now reviewing.

I feel it would be appropriate now to recall some of the salient points of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That Declaration solemnly reaffirms the universal and unconditional validity of the Charter of the United Nations; it calls upon all States to adhere to the Charter's purposes and principles, to refrain from the threat or use of force, to settle international disputes by peaceful means; it reaffirms the right of peoples to determine their own destinies, and states that no territorial acquisition shall be recognized as legal and that a territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation; it recognizes the need to suppress acts of aggression and breaches of the peace and to establish an effective system of universal collective security without military alliances; it urges all Member States to implement the decisions of the Security Council and to respect the resolutions of the United Nations organs responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security; it affirms the close connection between international security, disarmament and economic development; and it solemnly reaffirms that universal respect for and full exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms is essential for the strengthening of international security.

That is an increasingly appropriate list of some of the provisions of the Declaration with respect to the present international situation. I should like to say that the Declaration has not lost any of its meaning or validity.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

Not only does the review of its implementation remain important, but it is obvious that renewed efforts are needed to translate the Declaration into practice. We cannot agree that the international situation must remain unchanged, but believe that insufficient efforts are being undertaken to change it. The non-aligned countries were the moving force in the elaboration and adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, as well as in the regular review of its implementation. The Declaration reflects to a great extent the positions of the non-aligned countries and the principles of the policy of non-alignment. The main provisions of the Declaration, based on the Charter of the United Nations, at the same time constitute the substance of the principles and objectives of non-alignment as they have been elaborated since the first summit conference of the non-aligned countries held in Belgrade 21 years ago. Proceeding from such positions, the non-aligned countries continue to endeavour to achieve a solution of international problems.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The process of decolonization has undoubtedly been one of the greatest achievements of the world Organization, but we cannot stop short of bringing it to completion. It is high time that the independence of Namibia were achieved and the shameful system of apartheid eradicated.

Peace should finally come to the region of the Middle East and to the Palestinian people. Without a solution of the Palestinian question, no State in the region can have security. Israel must change its policy and withdraw from the occupied Arab territories, and the Palestinian people must have a State of their own.

Adjacent to that region, the Cyprus question remains unresolved, and the island remains divided. We support a solution through the intercommunal talks and on the basis of relevant United Nations resolutions.

The crises in South-East and South-West Asia continue to burden the situation in wider regions. That goes for the situation in North-East Asia, where the people of Korea remain divided. We support the peaceful unification of the Korean people, and consider that the initiatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constitute a constructive basis to that end.

In Central America and in the Caribbean region, peoples are fighting for their national and social identity and for liberation from patronage and foreign interference.

Disputes between States often result in military conflicts and wars. In the light of so many conflict situations involving or threatening the stability of whole regions, it is important, in our opinion, that we search for solutions and settlements of crises and for ways of strengthening peace and co-operation; this also should be done wherever possible on a regional basis.

Great efforts have been exerted to date to establish a zone of peace and co-operation in the Indian Ocean. We fully support the efforts of the countries of the region, of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, and of States outside the region, aimed at diminishing the arms race, the military build-up and the growing military presence of big Powers in that region. We regret that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean has again run into great difficulties and that the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean has had to be further postponed.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

We believe that we are going to need more political will and more understanding of and support for the expressed interests of the littoral and hinterland States, regarding both the question of the Indian Ocean and the peace and security of that region.

As a Mediterranean country, Yugoslavia attaches particular importance to the situation in that very sensitive and complex region. We know that it is overburdened with crises, tensions, bloc rivalries and military presence, as few other regions in the world are. The strategic importance of this region, between Europe and Africa and on the shores of Asia, makes the Mediterranean Sea and its coasts significant in global terms, causing constant threats and augmenting existing problems and hindering their solution. Our efforts are aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a region of comprehensive, constructive co-operation among countries on its coasts, and at creating conditions in which all countries of the Mediterranean could live in full security, free from outside pressure and interference. We are aware that this is a long-term process whose progress depends also on the situation in neighbouring regions. However, that should in no way discourage us or prevent us from continuing with our endeavours. That is the reason for our belief that the United Nations should actively consider the situation in the Mediterranean.

We therefore suggest that this issue be inscribed as a separate item on the agenda of next year's General Assembly session. Through such an approach we believe that we could gradually overcome controversy and contribute to the strengthening of co-operation, and to the security and progress of all the countries of the region.

The Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe resumed its work a few weeks ago. Difficulties facing the whole process of the Conference are also a consequence of exacerbated relations between the big Powers and of the aggravated international situation in general. Europe is passing through yet another phase of tension. Non-aligned and neutral countries of that continent constitute today the bridge of reason, and their constructive efforts give us hope that it will be possible to surmount differences and bring about a relaxation of tensions - a goal towards which all peoples of Europe are striving, and a goal of the Helsinki Final Act.



Military power is increasingly becoming an instrument of policy. It is being used in order to create and expand the boundaries of interest and influence of those that are powerful. In addition to its direct application, the strengthening of military power itself, its spread throughout various parts of the world, the ever more numerous military bases in foreign territories, and the concentration of enormous destructive power in certain regions, are all ever more frequently used as an instrument of pressure, threatening the independence of countries and their right to determine their own destinies. The nuclear menace is overshadowing the world. Notwithstanding that, wars are being waged, causing enormous destruction and loss of life, with weapons which we call conventional, implying somehow that their use is admissible or, in a way, even justified. The mere existence of such weapons, and particularly the vast disproportion between the might of the militarily most significant countries and that of the other members of the international community - especially since they frequently demonstrate their readiness to use that might - violates the basic principle of international co-operation and relations, that is, the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

We are therefore particularly concerned over intensified military activities whose proportions and intensity and the area they encompass have given them a new quality, especially in the regions burdened with crises and in critical situations, where they continue to threaten peace and represent an additional threat to the security of a number of countries and, hence, of the world in general.

Together with a group of non-aligned countries, Yugoslavia is working on a draft resolution on the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security which we hope to be able to submit very soon for the consideration of the First Committee. We express our readiness to co-operate with all delegations in its elaboration, so that it might be given the broad support it deserves.

This year again, the question of the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness is on the agenda. We regard the consideration of this question as both very important and very timely, for the situation in the world, more than ever before, calls for ever greater co-operation among all Member States. We think that the development and strengthening of good-neighbourly relations is one of the most important factors in establishing links between peoples and countries. It is at the same time a significant part of the overall effort for the promotion of international co-operation and the solution of problems among States.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The views and suggestions of Governments received so far and the report of the Secretary-General show the interest with which Member States regard the consideration of the question of good-neighbourliness. We think that this question should be further examined in order to strengthen and further develop its content and the ways and modalities of enhancing its effectiveness. In consideration of elements of good-neighbourliness, the principles of the United Nations Charter and the friendly relations Declaration have to be borne in mind, and we believe that good-neighbourliness can only be based on the mutual respect for the principles of independence, equality, sovereignty, territorial integrity, the inviolability of borders and non-interference in internal affairs.

Yugoslavia attaches particular significance to the free development of national minorities. They should constitute bridges of friendship and co-operation among neighbouring countries. The strengthening of good-neighbourliness is one of the preconditions for strengthening the status and rights of national minorities, and if good-neighbourly relations are to be strengthened, the national minorities should enjoy equality and equal opportunities with the majority nations for the broad expression and development of their national identities.

For all these reasons we believe that the continuation of current efforts towards the promotion of good-neighbourliness can significantly contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

In concluding, I should like to say a few words about the new item included on our agenda on the initiative of Sierra Leone and entitled "Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the Maintenance of International Peace and Security". This item may be new, but the problem that it refers to is not. Our support for the initiative, which we consider to be timely and important, is expressed in our sponsorship of the draft resolution so ably formulated and then submitted by the delegation of Sierra Leone and a number of other sponsors.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): On behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Bahamas, Benin, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Egypt, Ghana, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Panama, Qatar, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Sierra Leone, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the Maintenance of International Peace and Security"<sup>17</sup> contained in document A/C.1/37/L.73 of 26 November 1982.

The problem of collective security, namely, concerted diplomatic, economic and military action to deter and terminate all armed attacks which this draft resolution seeks to address, is without doubt one of the fundamental issues of contemporary international relations. For not only is it closely related to the maintenance of international peace and security, but it also engages the continuing relevance and effectiveness of this Organization. The non-fulfillment of these fundamental provisions of the Charter regarding this issue since the inception of this Organization may by itself have been sufficient reason for us to pursue our efforts persistently to reconstruct the collective security machinery that was envisaged by the framers of this Organization.

However, as was explained when this item was introduced, its inscription has not been inspired by idealism, but by our concern over the critically deteriorating international situation resulting from the recrudescence of the resort to force by States in total disregard of the Charter scheme and the provisions of our Organization. Today, States or groups of States increasingly resort to the use of force in violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which proscribes the use of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any other State or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of this Organization.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Confronted by such activities, many of the States present here, particularly the small nations, have felt a chilling sense of insecurity. Such insecurity has been further compounded by the fact that this Organization is increasingly perceived and regarded as helpless in its duty and responsibility to safeguard the peace and to ensure the security of all nations and peoples.

It is because of such inability to maintain the peace and safeguard the security of all nations that serious doubts have been cast over its authority and ability to maintain the peace.

The urgency and relevance of this matter further derive from the fact that in the present circumstances the ability of the Organization to maintain peace has been so seriously undermined that even its once credible capacity for peace-keeping is beginning to lose its effectiveness. While on this issue, my delegation would like to reiterate that it does not believe that the increasing tendency to establish multi-national forces outside the framework of the United Nations provides an adequate alternative to the collective security system envisaged by the Charter.

As is well known, the collective security system was intended to prevent war, to maintain peace, or failing that, to defend States that had become victims of force and armed aggression undertaken in violation of the Charter. It was in order to achieve that objective that the Charter laid down an institutional framework, namely, a system of collective security to support the decisions of the Security Council and within which the Security Council is granted the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In other words, the Security Council, in cases where there have been breaches of the peace or acts of aggression, is to decide what action to take for the restoration of peace. Regrettably, over the years this intrinsic belief in and expectation of the collective security system have not been fulfilled. The reasons for this are manifold. First of all, there is the disagreement among the permanent members of the Council on the way to implement the relevant provisions of the Charter on this all-important matter.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Furthermore, there is the inability of the Security Council to implement its decisions even when they are unanimously agreed upon. Indeed, as the Secretary-General stated in his report:

"There is a tendency in the United Nations for Governments to act as though the passage of a resolution absolved them from further responsibility for the subject in question. Nothing could be further from the intention of the Charter. In fact, resolutions, particularly those unanimously adopted ... should serve as a springboard for governmental support and determination and should motivate their policies outside the United Nations. This indeed is the essence of the treaty obligation which the Charter imposes on Member States." (A/37/1 p. 6)

On the other hand, decisions favoured by the overwhelming majority of the international community are subject to and thwarted by the use of the veto. This is all the more alarming when such decisions pertain to the maintenance of international peace, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State or the right of peoples to self-determination.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

It need hardly be stressed that effective implementation of Security Council decisions is central to the whole structure of the United Nations in its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

However, since it became apparent that the Council would not implement its decisions, that it would not institutionalize the provisions of the Charter on collective security measures, that it would not deploy concerted diplomatic, economic and military action to deter or terminate all armed attacks, States started to seek refuge in armaments. Today we are witnessing the most rapid escalation in the arms race - all in the name of national security. However, there is no security in armament or even in its accumulation. In our view, States could agree to the regulation, limitation, reduction and elimination of their armaments, armed forces and military expenditures only with the establishment of an effective system of collective security. However, not only has the failure to implement the provisions of the Charter on collective security measures resulted in an ever-increasing arms build-up but that failure has also weakened the essential foundation of the United Nations system for maintaining peace and security, including its provisions for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Therefore, with a view to reconstructing the collective security responsibility of this Organization, with a view to restoring its authority and effectiveness, the sponsors believe that it is propitious that this question be seriously and urgently addressed once more and action taken once and for all in the matter.

The preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution stress the primary purpose of the United Nations as being the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as the requirement to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. In addition, the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security is underscored.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Furthermore, the importance of collective security measures for the maintenance of international peace and security and the fact that the relevant provisions of the Charter have not been fully developed are also underscored. The penultimate preambular paragraph recognizes the interrelationship between disarmament and collective security, given the fact that disarmament, as an important objective of the United Nations, is impracticable without the assurance given by collective security.

According to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, in a spirit of compromise and co-operation and in the hope and indeed the expectation that the Security Council will assume its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security through collective security measures, the Council is invited to undertake, as a matter of high priority and urgency, a thorough examination of this question and to report with its comments and recommendations.

As may be recalled, during the first years of the Organization considerable efforts were made by the Security Council itself to formulate "general principles governing the organization of the armed forces made available to the Security Council by Member nations of the United Nations". Despite the exertions of the Military Staff Committee, it was not possible to reach agreement on those principles.

Since the report of the Military Staff Committee of 30 April 1947 on this matter, no agreements under Article 43 of the Charter have been negotiated or signed. In June and July 1947 the Security Council considered an item entitled "Special agreements under Article 43 of the Charter and the organization of the United Nations armed force". Again, no definitive decision was reached on the matter by the Security Council. On numerous occasions during discussions in the General Assembly references have been made to the provisions of Article 43 of the Charter, on ways of providing the United Nations with the necessary support for maintaining international peace and security.

Unfortunately, none of these efforts have proved fruitful so far; and, as I stated earlier, this inability to implement the relevant provisions on collective security measures has weakened the essential foundation of the whole United Nations system as regards maintaining peace and security, including its provisions for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Be that as it may, in view of the present critical international situation, we cannot abandon the concept of a collective security system for the maintenance of international peace and security. In the words of the Secretary-General:

"our most urgent goal is to reconstruct the Charter concept of collective action for peace and security so as to render the United Nations more capable of carrying out its primary function." (A/37/1, p. 5)

Since this item was inscribed on the agenda it has drawn widespread support and comments from the international community, as reflected in the debate in the General Assembly.

Therefore it is timely that this all-important matter be seriously and urgently re-examined and action taken once and for all to bring stability and security to the world. We hope that, while further negotiations or consultations are still going on, this draft resolution will find general approbation in this Committee.



Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The discussion of the question of the strengthening of international security, which was raised at the United Nations on the initiative of the Soviet Union, is more relevant than ever before today in the present exacerbated state of the international situation. The discussion enables us to give thorough consideration to the most important problems related to the maintenance of peace throughout the world. It also gives us an opportunity to draw the right conclusions, and to adopt practical measures to halt the increase in international tension and avert the threat of nuclear war.

We do not consider détente to be merely a chance occurrence in history or a phase that is now behind us forever. It is up to us, through our common efforts, to ensure that détente has a future. From the first legislative act of the Soviet State, the Decree on Peace, the main course of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has been above all the quest for the preservation of peace and the elimination of war from the life of mankind. We use the conditions of peace to strengthen our economy so that the Soviet people can live better lives with each passing year and so that our socialist structure can manifest its humane character and creative potential more fully. This year, which saw the sixty-fifth anniversary of the great October socialist Revolution that we have just celebrated, in which we shall in a few weeks celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of the formulation of our multinational socialist State, the Soviet people have much to be proud of.

In recent years, the years of détente, the Soviet Union has emerged as the leading country in the world in terms of the production of steel and pig-iron, coal and oil, cement and chemical fertilizers, not to mention many other economic indicators. These are the facts, and this is the truth about the Soviet Union and its colossal peaceful accomplishments. This is the truth about the purposes for which the Soviet Union has used détente. That truth has been studiously ignored by those who would like to convert an ideological dispute into a confrontation between States and peoples. That truth has been maliciously distorted by those who seek to ensure that the gauge for measuring the potential

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

of a social system should be armaments and the readiness to use them. Those forces, the hawks of the cold and hot wars, have cynically been attempting to take refuge in the fallacious thesis of a Soviet military threat. Let us consider the arguments they advanced.

The first argument put forward by those who would poison the well, as it were, is the fallacious - and I would emphasize that word - statement that the Soviet Union's defence expenditure exceeds the military budget of the United States by 50 per cent. That figure has repeatedly been invoked by representatives of the United States here in the First Committee. In actual fact, however, nothing could be less true. The truth is - and this is worth noting - that in the spring of 1976 the accounting method used for American expenditure was changed. A confidence trick was played in calculating the rate for converting Soviet roubles into their dollar equivalent. In other words, the maintenance cost of the Soviet conscript forces was, by a stroke of the pen, made equal to that of the expensive United States army. At the same time, an impression was created that Soviet tanks were being purchased by us from United States companies such as Chrysler and General Motors, or at the very least the same inflated prices. As a result, although in real terms Soviet defence appropriations did not rise by a single rouble - I repeat, not one single rouble - according to United States estimates they were, as former President Nixon admitted, doubled over night. That is clearly an underhand operation whose purpose was to attempt, by employing outright lies, to poison the atmosphere of détente and to provide a pretext for the United States to increase its military expenditures. There is a saying that an unjust cause cannot be defended with clean hands, and that makes good sense, for a trick of this sort was obviously played by unclean hands.

The second argument of the falsifiers is the assertion that the Soviet Union has embarked on a course aimed at military, and even nuclear, supremacy. However,

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

the truth is that had we chosen to strive for nuclear supremacy, we could have achieved it more than ten years ago. The Soviet Union consciously refrained from pursuing that possibility, and renounced it. In this respect, it is interesting to quote the following passage from the memoirs of the former Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger.

"By 1969, it was clear that the number of Soviet missiles capable of reaching the United States would soon equal that of all American missiles. And if the Soviet programme continued through the 1970s, that number would come to exceed the United States total."

Kissinger goes on to say:

"As a result of decisions taken by our predecessors, no American programme existed that could possibly produce new missiles for at least five years. That we achieved it" -

Kissinger is here alluding to the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks agreement, SALT I -

"was due to several factors."

The first of those factors Kissinger singles out as being the fact that the Soviet Union "chose not to exploit" the possibilities that had opened up for it. As Kissinger recognizes, therefore, under conditions in which the Soviet Union could have achieved strategic supremacy, we advocated parity, stability and a responsible approach in Soviet-American relations. The Soviet Union signed SALT I and then SALT II, consciously tying its own hands and restricting itself to parity with the United States. That shows the magnanimity and statesmanlike wisdom of our country. This is evidence that it is not our policy to pursue an arms race, but rather to curb that race and reverse it. That is the substance of Soviet foreign policy today. It is not the Soviet Union, but another country, that is trying to overturn SALT II and is refusing to ratify that vitally important agreement. The same side that is renouncing the system of parity carefully elaborated by both parties is the one that is aspiring to military supremacy.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

One final point in this connection. In the United States it has been stated, and still is, that the Soviet Union is preparing for a nuclear strike against the United States. Our reply to that is embodied in the Soviet Union's historic and unprecedented action on 15 June of this year at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, when the Soviet Union publicly assumed a unilateral obligation not to be the first to employ nuclear weapons. This obligation was effective immediately, from the moment it was proclaimed from the rostrum of the General Assembly. So far, however, no similar undertaking has been forthcoming from the United States. Is this not proof of who, in fact, is counting on the possibility of making a first nuclear strike? It is not the Soviet Union that is thinking in terms of methods of beginning and pursuing a nuclear war. It is not the Soviet Union that is engaging in brinkmanship. It is not the Soviet Union that is using the threat of such a war as an attempt to alter a social system unpalatable to it. Such an approach is radically alien to the socialist Power that I represent and contrary to the very basis of Communist philosophy. The nuclear maniacs are here in the United States. One of them, a certain William O'Brian, published last year a book entitled "The Conduct of a Just and Limited War." In that book he wrote in black and white, that since hopes for an agreement with communism have proved fruitless and since hopes for a softening of the socialist countries have also been dashed, it is therefore necessary to proceed to a nuclear confrontation with socialism. He states:

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

"The alternatives to confronting the nuclear question have been tried and have, to varying degrees, failed. And the moment when confrontation can no longer be avoided is here. ... The only defence in a nuclear war is pre-emptive destruction."

These cannibalistic utterances acquire particular weight in light of the fact that this book was written within the framework of and with the blessing of the leadership of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University in Washington. This is the well-known organization whose members are well represented in the higher echelons of the current United States administration.

There are other utterances of this sort. For example, Laurence Bellenson expresses the following thoughts:

"We ought to try to overthrow any Communist Government. I go all the way. I include Yugoslavia."

And, further:

"I would try to overthrow the Government of China, too."

The author of those utterances is a person whom the President of the United States has publicly called his good friend and whose books he has publicly quoted. Moreover, the President of the United States himself, as is well known, speaking in London on 8 June, appealed for communism to be placed "on the ashheap of history". A month and a half ago, in October, in the State Department of the United States, a so-called conference on the democratization of Communist countries was held. These are links in the same sinister chain. This is why the international situation has become so aggravated, thereby threatening not just the socialist countries, but also those young, newly emancipated countries that would like to construct their own lives according to their own wishes.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The Soviet Union, together with other fraternal socialist countries, hold diametrically opposite views. In his statement in the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party on 22 November, the Secretary-General of the Party, Mr. Andropov, stated:

"Soviet foreign policy has been and will continue to be that which was defined by the decisions of the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth congresses of our Party. The securing of a stable peace and the protection of the right of peoples to independence and to social progress are the unswerving aims of our foreign policy. In the struggle for those aims, the leaders of the Party and the State will act in a principled way, with consistency and after due reflection."

The firm intention of the Soviet Union to apply systematically a policy of peace, détente and international security, aimed at eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and improving relations among States and to develop a constructive dialogue between countries constitutes the substance of the programme of peace adopted by the twenty-sixth congress of the Communist Party for the 1980s. This is a basic foreign policy document of the Soviet State.

Acting in accordance with the letter and spirit of the programme, the Soviet Union emphatically advances proposals designed to improve the international atmosphere and to show in actual practice a willingness to arrive at equitable agreements to curb the arms race, and to that end the Soviet Union has taken unilateral practical measures. A clear expression of that policy was provided by the initiatives taken by the Soviet Union at this session of the General Assembly on questions of disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. They have already been considered and adopted by the First Committee.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

While emphasizing the exceptional importance of the removal of the threat of nuclear war, the Soviet Union at the same time does not limit its struggle to preserve and strengthen the peace to the question of the limitation of armaments. We are quite convinced that progress in the strengthening of international security and in the field of disarmament must be sought through parallel measures, because those questions are bound by an organic link.

It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet side has emphasized and continues to emphasize the need for all States to assume an obligation not to use force or the threat of force at all in their relations. As far back as 1976, the Soviet Union proposed the concluding of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and presented in the United Nations a draft providing for States to abstain from the use of force involving the use of any types of weapons.

In the conditions of today's highly complex international situation, the beginning of serious negotiations and the completion of the elaboration of such a treaty would be major acts contributing to confidence between States and would help reduce the level of tension in the world and to settle disputes and disagreements by peaceful means.

However, the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), particularly the United States, for some years now have been doing their utmost to obstruct progress and work on the treaty. Moved by a desire to promote a general lowering of tension in the world and to strengthen international security, the Soviet Union has proposed that the leading organs of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty should make a statement on the non-extension of the field of action of those alliances to Asia, Africa and to Latin America. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries advocate a just solution of conflicts and contentious international problems by peaceful means, without recourse to force. It is our position that, given good will and a reasonable approach, taking into account objective conditions, it is possible peacefully

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

to resolve any problem, be it global or regional. All that is needed for this is the renunciation of diktat and violence and the cessation of sabre-rattling and interference in the internal affairs of States.

The situation in various regions of the world shows, however, that these principles have unfortunately not become norms of international life. We should like to dwell on the situation which has come into being in some of the more explosive areas of the world.

First, there is the problem of the Middle East. The Soviet Union has most strongly condemned the criminal aggression and genocide committed by Israel against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. They are the direct consequence of the policy of separate deals and of American-Israeli strategic co-operation in the Middle East. We are deeply convinced that no new variant of such deals can bring the people of the region anything but deepening hatred and conflict. A truly stable, just and comprehensive peaceful settlement in the Middle East requires the full withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the eastern section of Jerusalem.



(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

It requires recognition of the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine, including their right to establish their own independent State, it must provide for the securing of the right of all States of that region to a secure and independent existence, the cessation of the state of war and the establishment of peace between the Arab States and Israel, and the elaboration and adoption of international guarantees of such a settlement. We should like to emphasize yet again that proceeding along any other course of ostensible progress towards peace would mean that the victims again would be the Arab countries and peoples.

The preservation in southern Africa of the criminal régime of the Republic of South Africa, which is conducting with the connivance of Washington an undeclared war against Angola and other States of the region, is a permanent threat to international peace. The people of Namibia must immediately be accorded an opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence on the basis of the preservation of their unity and territorial integrity. We should emphasize in this regard that the attempts of the Pretoria régime and its Western protectors to link the question of the granting of independence to Namibia with the presence of Cuban military contingents in Angola is totally and absolutely unfounded.

The cause of the strengthening of international security also requires the prompt cessation of the campaign of pressure and threats against Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada and the prompt elimination of focal points of tension in the South Atlantic.

My country, as in the past, continues to advocate the continuation and further enhancement of the political dialogue between States belonging to different social systems. We are prepared to contribute to the success of the recently reconvened Madrid Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which is of special significance in today's conditions for the improvement of the political climate in Europe and the whole world.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The Soviet Union would welcome the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and co-operation as an important step towards guaranteeing a general and stable peace. The strengthening of security in the Mediterranean region could, in our opinion, be promoted by efforts to extend to it confidence-building measures in the military sphere which have already proved their merit in international relations, and the agreed reduction in that area of armed forces, the withdrawal from the Mediterranean of nuclear-weapon carrying vessels, the renunciation of the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries and the adoption by the nuclear Powers of an obligation not to use nuclear weapons against any Mediterranean country which does not allow the stationing of such weapons on its territory. The normalization of the situation in this important and potentially explosive region would be promoted by a prompt, stable and just settlement of the problem of Cyprus, without military or any other kind of interference from outside, through constructive negotiations taking into account the legitimate interests of both communities, and provided that there is a withdrawal of all foreign troops and the elimination of foreign military bases. This would guarantee the existence of Cyprus as a single independent, sovereign, non-aligned State.

The Soviet Union unswervingly advocates the cessation of the senseless and dangerous war between Iran and Iraq, States with which our country has traditional links.

We sincerely strive for a normalization of relations with our great neighbour, the People's Republic of China, and we are doing our utmost to bring that about. The ideas formulated by Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev in his statements in Tashkent and Baku and the emphasis he placed on common sense and on the need to overcome the inertia of prejudice, express our desire to look ahead as far as the future of Soviet-Chinese relations is concerned.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The Soviet Union expresses its solidarity with the struggle of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for a normalization of the situation in the Korean peninsula. We advocate the solution of the Korean question by peaceful means without outside interference, on the basis of the well known proposals by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

We also fully support the useful initiatives of the Mongolian People's Republic, proposing the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific.

The Soviet Union took the initiative in seeking ways to strengthen the security of the States of the Far East. These aims are promoted by our proposal for the consideration, with regard to that region, of the useful experience acquired in Europe in the application of certain measures to build mutual confidence. Our willingness in practical terms to discuss this question, with the participation of the People's Republic of China and Japan, was yet again emphasized at this session by the chief of the Soviet delegation, the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko.

However, what was put forward in response to our clear and constructive policy designed to strengthen international peace and security by the Western States and particularly by the United States? We have to note that the present United States Administration is virtually following a policy of attaining military supremacy at any price and quite openly seeks to impose its will on other States and peoples. It is pursuing a policy of escalating conflicts. The United States is carrying on a shameless campaign of blackmail and intimidation against the young liberated States in order to hurl them backwards in their development and to snatch away the gains which they have made in a long and difficult struggle of their peoples for national independence and social progress. Washington is trampling underfoot the sovereignty of independent States and meddling in their internal affairs. It is inconceivable that the tragedy of Lebanon could have taken place if the United States had wished to call to order its Tel Aviv ally which conducted its aggression with means provided by the United States, using weapons supplied by the United States and with the political support of the United States in the Security Council.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The United States is continuing its strategic co-operation with South Africa and encouraging the Pretoria racists to wage an undeclared war against Angola, Mozambique and other States and, under various devious pretexts, they are slowing down the granting of freedom and independence to the people of Namibia.

In order to secure its geo-political aims, Washington has elaborated a programme for the build-up of strategic offensive forces and nuclear and conventional weapons, and for an increase in the military might of the United States and of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The resources allocated by Washington for military preparations have attained truly unprecedented dimensions. It is well known that in the next five years there are plans for the spending of more than \$1.5 trillion.

All of this is a short-sighted, senseless and dangerous policy. But there is no future for a policy of strength. There is no other way to resolve contentious and unresolved problems than honest and constructive negotiations. The elimination of the threat of nuclear war, the strengthening of international security and the elimination of existing situations of conflict can be brought about only by combined efforts, and the point of such a dialogue is seen by the Soviet Government not as conducting negotiations for the sake of negotiations, simply placing on record points of disagreement, but rather in the quest for a sound, mutually acceptable basis for the solution of the most complex problems, primarily, of course, the problem of curbing the arms race in both nuclear and conventional weapons.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

In its foreign policy the Soviet Union has always proceeded from a conviction that all States have an interest in the preservation of peace and détente. Therefore, one cannot really take very seriously the assertions of the representatives of the United States Administration that readiness for normalization with regard to the Soviet Union is linked to demands for preliminary concessions in all areas. The Soviet Union resolutely declares that it will not enter this kind of dialogue - if it can properly be called a dialogue. We continue to advocate equity. We insist that the interests of the parties should be taken into account and that agreements reached should be honourable.

In the present alarming international situation there is more need than ever for practical realistic measures in order to protect peace and avert a nuclear disaster. The dangers threatening the world are great, but the possibilities of preventing a nuclear threat are no less great. The difficulties can and must be overcome. Mankind cannot reconcile itself endlessly to the arms race and to wars unless it is prepared to place its entire future in the balance. We have to return to the principles of détente and relaxation of international tensions, which was the historical gain of the 1970s. It is our deep conviction that the years of détente were as some imperialist individuals are now claiming, a mere fortuitous episode in the difficult history of mankind. It is precisely toward the resurgence of détente that the United Nations must move.

As to the collective expression of the desire of the peoples for a stable peace, the United Nations must not allow one or more States to cancel out all the positive gains which have been accumulated in the last decade in international relations and simply scrap the accomplishments of détente, pushing the world ever further along the road to war. The Soviet Union resolutely advocates a prompt reversal of today's crisis situation. It will continue, as in the past, to do its utmost to ensure that its international relations should develop precisely along the lines of détente, because there is no reasonable alternative.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Mr. Andropov, the General Secretary of the Communist Party, declared in his statement in the plenary of the Central Committee on 22 November:

"The Soviet Union rejects outright the views of those who would like to make people feel that force and weapons solve and will always solve everything. The peoples of the world have now entered the forefront of history as never before. They have acquired the right to speak and their voice cannot be stilled. They are capable of taking active and determined steps to remove the threat of nuclear war, to protect the peace and, consequently, to protect life on our planet, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State will do everything to ensure that that is precisely what happens."

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.