



FIRST COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Friday, 3 December 1982
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 51ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3850, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa 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.51
15 January 1983

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 58, 59 AND 137 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its general debate on the agenda items relating to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Mr. DORN (Suriname): Although the activities of this Committee for this session are drawing to an end, my delegation wishes to congratulate you now, Mr. Chairman, on your election to your office, since we have not spoken before. Our congratulations go also to the other officers of the Committee. The way you are conducting your tasks is evidence of your skill and experience.

International security is a universal right. I am speaking of the right of all States to live in peace and freedom, without outside interference, and of respect for their sovereignty and national integrity. It is the duty of all States not to threaten the security of other States or to jeopardize the aforementioned rights. These principles are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and reaffirmed in relevant resolutions of the Organization.

In addition, the members of the Non-Aligned Movement are guided by the principles of the Movement, namely, non-intervention, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the sovereign equality of all States and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The members of that Movement are also committed to peace with a view to disarmament, the reduction of tension between States, especially the major Powers, the right of self-determination of all people, the search for a new international economic order which takes into account the just aspirations of the people of developing countries especially, and genuine co-operation among States.

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

The present international behaviour of some States gives rise to the question of the extent to which Member States are abiding by the principles and commitments they have assumed. We therefore wonder if it is not the time to redefine more precisely the principle of the non-use of force. Having said that, we are aware that some States have a very broad concept of use of force, assuming that some of their acts are consistent with the right of self defence. Force is used not only in the form of military might, but also through economic, political and cultural means. In this respect, I would like to touch on some of the problems with which the developing States are faced.

The greatest problem for developing countries in terms of security is not only the fact that they are subject to the use or threat of use of force in international relations, but that they are also troubled by the interference of some States in their internal affairs.

The interfering States use various forms of intervention. These interventions are carried out in economic, political and cultural fields through a covert system that is in itself interrelated and tends to destabilize those régimes, one that can ultimately endanger peace and security in the region and, consequently, international security as a whole.

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

As a consequence of their narrow economic basis, developing States, in contrast to industrialized States, are not always in a position to generate funds. In order to obtain the necessary funds for economic development, they have to apply for development aid or loans from financial institutions and industrialized countries. Circumstances are sometimes of such a nature that the recipient States are being manoeuvred into a position where they are confronted with no other choice than that of take it or leave it.

As producers of raw materials, small States do not always get a fair share out of what they export. As a result of their lack of expertise and know-how, they are forced to conclude contracts which later on turn out to be very disadvantageous. Furthermore, small States are confronted with measures on the part of some capitalist countries and international financial institutions which they experience as economic sabotage, such as the blocking of loans.

In our region, we have seen how loans have been refused to some progressive developing States on so-called technical grounds. At the same time, we see that the granting of a loan of \$1.1 billion by the International Monetary Fund to the racist régime in South Africa has been approved. Collaboration of this nature with the racist régime in South Africa is viewed as thwarting the decisions of the majority of our Organization against the said régime. The possibility that the régime is using these financial resources for carrying out aggressive acts against its neighbours cannot be excluded.

One of the ways to interfere politically in the internal affairs of States is through the use of mercenaries. These mercenaries are trained and financed by neo-colonialist countries and are recruited locally or abroad to take part in hostile activities with the aim of opposing by the threat of use or use of armed violence the territorial integrity of sovereign States. In doing so, they not only endanger the lives of innocent people in the country concerned, but ultimately topple the Government, replacing it with a puppet régime.

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

Another way of threatening the security of developing countries is through television and films. My delegation looks forward to the conclusion and speedy implementation of an international agreement governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting. In this way, we can minimize developing States being overloaded with ideas and cultural values which are alien to the people and to their culture.

With regard to the settlement of disputes, my delegation favours a solution through direct negotiations by the parties concerned. If bilateral negotiations are carried out without reaching a solution, the parties will have to submit their problem to regional or multilateral forums or apply for arbitration. The parties concerned must not use force or the threat of force to solve their problems but must resort to negotiations, as stated before.

The principles of the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes, territorial integrity and the sovereignty of States are the pillars of the collective security system. According to the report of the Secretary-General, this concept of security needs restructuring. Each State has the obligation to maintain peace and security.

We are of the opinion that abiding by the principles laid down in the Charter, such as non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, non-intervention, the sovereign equality of all States and the peaceful settlement of disputes, will not only certainly lead to an improvement in the present situation but will also enhance international understanding and co-operation.

As our Minister for Foreign Affairs said in his statement of 11 October, the Government of the Republic of Suriname renews its pledge to uphold the principles and objectives of this Organization.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece): As we approach the end of the work of this thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, we unfortunately realize that a sense of uneasiness and of insecurity is very much present in the minds of all us who this week are dealing with matters of security.

The Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Haralambopoulos, speaking in plenary meeting on 30 September, said:

"I feel compelled at this juncture to express the profound disappointment of my country at the fact that the United Nations has failed to contribute to the maintenance of peace and to protect the sovereignty of Member States. I am afraid that I am stating the obvious when I say that if this trend continues, this Organization, which was created to fulfil the hopes and expectations of mankind, which had been devastated by the Second World War, will be transformed into a decorative international bureaucracy." (A/37/11, p.76)

This same feeling of uneasiness was expressed by many other speakers, and the same apprehension was formulated by the Secretary-General of our Organization, who in his well-known report of last September realized that:

"We are perilously near to a new international anarchy." (A/37/1, p.3) and, further on,

"... the lesson is clear - something must be done, and urgently, to strengthen our international institutions and to adopt new and imaginative approaches to the prevention and resolution of conflicts." (ibid., p.4)

This state of affairs in our Organization creates yet more uneasiness when one considers the international situation. The General Assembly, in 1981, had expressed its deep concern over the aggravation of focal points of international tension and crisis in the world, over more frequent recourse to force and over increasing violations of the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

At the end of 1981, however, a great deal of hope was expressed, either in various texts of the Organization or orally. There was then hope that the world economy would revive and that the second special session on disarmament scheduled for last spring would succeed. There was also hope that progress would be made in restructuring international economic relations through global negotiations. Those hopes proved to be unrealistic. Moreover, further crises have in the meantime worsened an already depressing international climate.

Disarmament and security are inextricably linked. Speakers in this Committee have argued that the latter follows the former or vice versa. It is undeniable, however, that these two fields influence each other in a decisive way.

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

A third and no less important factor for the life of our countries is development. An acceptable rate of development, however, cannot be reconciled with the continuation of an arms race. Similarly, substantial progress in the field of development is recognized as being essential for the preservation of world peace and security. Thus, peace and security cannot in the long run be preserved in a world where the armaments race is an obstacle to the peaceful use of resources badly needed for the survival of nations. The final conclusion is that genuine security cannot be assured by the accumulation of armaments but only through an increased atmosphere of security between nations, through co-operation, growth of exchange and interdependence among peoples, and, eventually, through promotion of mutual confidence.

Security for peoples and States is of particular importance. It is of unique importance. There is a comparative element in armament. It is better or worse, stronger or weaker than the armament of another State. But security is an absolute notion - it either exists or does not exist.

The conclusion drawn from every piece of information concerning the international situation is always the same. We need more collective security, and this is where States Members have to help the United Nations to accomplish its task of maintaining world peace and security. If in our days there are Member States living under the constant threat of aggression, if others live under foreign occupation, if aggressors and occupation forces can do whatever they please without the United Nations being able to take decisive action, then there is something wrong with the collective security system entrusted to the United Nations by the Charter. Modern political developments have shown, though, that what we lack are not written principles, declarations or resolutions. What we lack is the political will to apply these principles strictly and without further delay. It is in this spirit that we totally agree with the Secretary-General, when he states in his aforementioned report:

"I believe ... that an important first step would be a conscious recommitment by Governments to the Charter". (A/37/1, p. 3)

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

It is high time, we think, that we turn away from a profusion of words designed sometimes to create an illusion of security. The time has come for bold and practical initiatives, not of the rhetorical sort. It is, we think, time to move towards mobilizing all the legal and moral resources of our Charter, before it is too late for the United Nations and for Member States.

We frankly wish that the United Nations can overcome its weaknesses so that it can fulfil the mission entrusted to it by mankind. Despite its many shortcomings, the Organization remains - and it should remain - a great hope for peace-loving peoples the world over.

Until such a hopeful development takes place, my delegation welcomes initiatives such as the proposals which we shall be examining in this Committee under items related to security. In this context, I shall refer to two particular items: the first concerns good-neighbourliness.

My country attaches much importance to the notion of good-neighbourliness. We consider it an essential factor for regional and, by extension, for international security. In fact, we think that it is indispensable to create the best possible conditions for living and co-operating peacefully among neighbours. That is why we were eager to approve the Romanian initiative from its very inception. As my delegation has repeatedly remarked, the merits of this proposal were only one reason why we supported it. In fact, we also favoured this idea because it originated both from our own neighbourhood and from a country with which Greece maintains very close friendly relations.

Having always been profoundly attached to maintaining good-neighbourly relations in our region, we consider it useful, however, to define certain conditions which are indispensable for developing good neighbourly relations. We think that neighbouring States should strictly respect each other's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. This presupposes that States will abstain from any act which could be considered to constitute a

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

violation or a threat to violate frontiers; by that term we mean not only land frontiers but sea and air space as well, as these are defined by bilateral or multilateral treaties and by international law. Acts equally to be avoided are any threat or use of force, intervention, invasion or occupation, as well as any act which might reasonably be interpreted by the country concerned as a threat to its national interests. At this stage, I should like to point out that differences between neighbouring countries should, in our opinion, be resolved peacefully and on the basis of international law, either contractual or customary. Greece favours not only bilateral negotiations but also any other procedure which could lead to a peaceful solution of differences and especially judicial and arbitration procedures.

Whenever the above principles prevail and there is no negative act among neighbouring States, then we think it is possible to proceed to developing close relations and to further co-operation for the benefit of all peoples concerned.

A second item which we hope will have a favourable effect on international security is the idea of transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation. My country regards this concept as a constituent element of international security since, as a European and Mediterranean country, it is most concerned at the constant increase of centres of conflict and confrontation in this region. The continuing Middle East crisis and the unresolved question of Cyprus are two significant examples of the tension that prevails in the Mediterranean which can entail serious consequences both for European and for international security.

In 1982 we have unfortunately seen a worsening of the situation in the Middle East from both the political and humanitarian points of view, by comparison with the previous year. In defiance of the express and explicit recommendations of the United Nations, a large part of the Republic of Cyprus still remains under the occupation of foreign troops, whose presence is the main obstacle to progress in the inter-communal dialogue.

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

We are therefore convinced that a speedy, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East and Cyprus questions would improve the dangerous situation which now exists in the Mediterranean. Such a settlement should also prevent the proliferation of new centres of tension in the region. Accordingly, my Government is in favour of, and strongly supports, every initiative aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation, free of nuclear weapons and of the presence of foreign military forces.

However, security in the Mediterranean is not a notion independent of security in Europe and in examining the former we should also keep the latter constantly in mind. In this same line of thinking we feel that, for the concept of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean to become a reality, it must be based on respect for the principles and obligations of the United Nations Charter, the principles of international law, the development of measures of confidence and equal security and the principles of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States. Further principles that should prevail are non-intervention, non-interference in internal affairs, inviolability of frontiers, non-use of force or threat of force, peaceful settlement of disputes and respect for the right of States to sovereignty over their natural resources. In this context, I should like to add that the Greek Government, recognizing the importance of maintaining peace, co-operation and security in the Mediterranean, accepted with satisfaction last February the declaration made by Malta by which that Republic adopted the status of neutrality. The Government of Greece stressed the importance of the Maltese declaration as constituting a factor for stability, promoting progress and peace for the peoples around the Mediterranean. Greece, in keeping with the United Nations Charter, supports the status of neutrality of the Republic of Malta and pledged fully to respect it.

Mr. GARCIA ITURBE (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): It is a fact that the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is taking place in a depressing international climate, when the most reactionary circles of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism are striving to do away with the spirit of détente which prevailed a few years ago in international relations.

I need only mention that the backdrop to our meetings this year has been the events in the Malvinas Islands and in Lebanon, where two peoples had to face the forces of colonialism and aggression openly supported by the United States of America.

These events were the culmination of actions which were taken some time ago by those who have seriously obstructed the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. It might be useful to remember that while we were gathered here at the first special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, the United States and its allies, who were talking a good deal about peace at the time, decided to increase their military expenditures on a permanent basis, thereby initiating a further escalation in the arms race and giving a very significant reply to the deliberations on disarmament which were being held in New York.

The United States claim that its military expenditures in 1983 will amount to \$201,300 million is a clear example of this war frenzy. In addition, it wants to maintain in Europe a force of 331,705 men, which certainly does not promote peace and security on that continent. It might also be useful to recall the creation of the interventionist rapid deployment forces of a markedly aggressive nature, made up of 230,000 men whose mission is to "defend" the interests of the United States in the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Gulf area and the Caribbean, among others, thus practically the whole world.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

It should perhaps also be recalled that a number of excuses were concocted at the time in order unjustifiably to delay ratification of the SALT II agreement, so as to allow the installation of 572 medium-range nuclear rockets, to manufacture neutron bombs, and finally to establish bases for negotiating from a position of strength, which we are witnessing today. These were followed by the doctrines of limited nuclear war, winnable nuclear war, first nuclear strike, and others to be added to the list of acts which are poisoning the international climate and bringing the world to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe.

Recent decisions on the production of binary chemical weapons, and to postpone indefinitely the ban on nuclear-weapon tests, and everything having to do with nuclear disarmament negotiations, all have a most adverse effect on the present international situation. These events are obviously related to other regional actions which serve to create hotbeds of tension and crises, these being essential to keeping up the arms race and the cold war policy which, so it seemed, had already been buried in the archives of relations among nations.

The aggression against Nicaragua and the current situation in Central America and the Caribbean in general are also serious threats to international security, because the consequences and outcome of these actions could go far beyond the calculations of the aggressor forces. In Central America and in the Caribbean the present United States Administration is taking very serious steps to prepare a favourable climate for interventionist adventures. It is now not only providing weapons to and training the enemies of Cuba and Nicaragua, and opposing serious dialogue and peaceful settlement of disputes, which is in the interests of the Governments of both countries, but in addition is trying to make its aggressive policies lawful, as is shown by the Symms amendment approved by the United States Senate last August.

The Symms amendment, based on the outmoded Monroe Doctrine of 1823, which was called, "America for Americans" - adopted just three months after the United States gave decisive support to British colonialism in the Malvinas war - authorizes the use of force, including the force of weapons, and coincides with intensive preparations which have taken place and been promoted by the United States Government for the past few months in preparation for a military offensive against the region. And as if all that were not enough, threatening and intimidating military manoeuvres against the States in the area are continuing, as are criminal acts of hostility and aggression against the countries of the area. These acts are military, political and economic. One example is the blockade of which my country has been a victim for more than 20 years, in spite of the fact that President Reagan himself has said recently that trade restrictions threaten peace.

These are the facts in Central America, very similar to those found in other parts of the world where imperialist and colonialist forces are opposed to peoples of the world using their own natural resources and where a philosophy of plunder is a condition sine qua non. This is an expression of imperialist power bent on perpetuating the régime of neo-colonial domination which it has imposed and does not wish to give up.

The clearest example of this policy in Latin America may be found in Puerto Rico, where the people are still fighting against colonialism and trying to make their ideals of independence, which they have so ardently desired for more than a century, a reality.

In southern Africa, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), recognized by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, has been forced to continue its struggle against the South African racist régime, in spite of the fact that the South African mandate over Namibia lapsed a long time ago.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

We all know why South Africa is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and is undertaking military actions against Angola and the other front-line States. We have seen that it is still necessary in this Committee to insist that an end must be put to collaboration with South Africa in various areas in particular the military area, so that these actions will not continue in defiance of the urgings of the African peoples. For example, in the year 1982 South Africa will have received \$60 million from various assistance programmes of the United States Government in order to 'promote United States objectives in the area'.

Today we see how those who are primarily responsible for the fact that racism continues to exist in South Africa, that Namibia is still not independent and that the South African people still has to fight for independence are using political manoeuvres in order to try to ensure solutions that will guarantee profits for the multinational corporations, in violation of the resolutions of the Security Council. The Committee might well be reminded once again that what is happening in southern Africa endangers peace and security in Africa and internationally. Responsibility for what has happened and might happen in that area rests with and will continue to rest with the racist Government in South Africa and the Western Powers who support it and make possible South Africa's nuclear capability, which truly poses a genuine threat at this time.

In the Middle East, recent events in Lebanon and the continued aggressive policies of Israel against the States of the area show that it is illusory to believe that there can be peace when the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to its own land, are not recognized. A just and lasting peace in the Middle East will be possible only if those rights are taken into account and respected.

In recent years we have witnessed the increase in Israel's nuclear capability and in imperialism's nuclear collaboration with Israel, and we have seen how that collaboration has also "diverted" enriched uranium to increase Israel's nuclear capability. We have seen how Israel has become one of the primary weapons-producing and exporting countries, thanks to support from its American allies. In addition to the loans that Israel will be receiving from the United States in 1982 for other assistance

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

programmes, it will receive \$1.4 billion from military sales abroad alone as a consequence of United States policy in the area. As a result of recent events in Lebanon the Pentagon has used the area as a testing-ground for a new lethal weapon, the implosion bomb.

All these actions are directed against the Arab and Palestinian people, but, as the Palestine Liberation Organization has shown with its heroism in the streets of Beirut, the Palestinian people is a fundamental element in the Middle East, and its legitimate rights must be recognized. They will be implemented no matter how great the obstacles placed in their path.

Another hotbed of tension that is an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security may be found on the Korean peninsula. Eight years ago the General Assembly decided that the United Nations command should be dissolved and that all foreign troops should be withdrawn from South Korea. Yet today we see that United States troops are still stationed in Korea under the United Nations flag and are using Korean territory as an important base for imperialist plans in Asia.

This situation only promotes aggressive acts against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, maintains potential conflict in the area and raises obstacles to the peaceful reunification of the Korean people on bases to be freely determined by them.

In the Indian Ocean the situation does not seem to be improving. On the contrary, it is a source of great concern. Several years ago the General Assembly decided to hold a conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo, Sri Lanka. For just about as long, that event has been postponed for reasons familiar to us all. As in southern Africa, where procrastination is taking place to the detriment of the interests of the States of the area, in connection with the Indian Ocean the United States is also trying to introduce concepts and positions aimed solely at preventing the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, in spite of the interests of the majority of the international community. The objectives being pursued through this policy are very clear, namely, to retain its military presence, including its nuclear presence, in the Indian Ocean at all costs, regardless of the clearly-expressed

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

wishes of the littoral and hinterland States of the region. Moreover, it has little regard for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The assignment of missions to the interventionist rapid deployment forces in the area and the strengthening of the Diego Garcia base are clear examples of these objectives.

We note with concern how the events in Lebanon; the pressure and aggression upon the independent States of the Mediterranean; the intimidating military manoeuvres; the maintenance of foreign military bases and the stationing of nuclear weapons in NATO States in the Mediterranean area have all served to promote tension and to endanger international peace and security. It should also be stressed that a solution of the question of Cyprus will play an important role in promoting security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. This must take place on the basis of unity, territorial integrity and non-alignment.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has played a fundamental role in creating the conditions necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security and for co-operation and peaceful coexistence among States. However, notwithstanding the demands of the overwhelming majority of the international community, the Declaration continues to be violated flagrantly, in particular through the actions of those who strive to maintain colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, including zionism and apartheid.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

For all those reasons, my delegation has always opposed, and will continue to oppose, the policies of those who are trying to crush the struggle of peoples for their independence simply in order to retain their traditional sources of raw materials. It is those very States which are now bent on extending to the developing countries the effects of the present economic crisis, which they themselves caused.

For us, the concept of security is a broad one, and encompasses the strengthening of peace, the promotion of international détente, peaceful coexistence, the adoption of effective disarmament measures, and economic co-operation for development, among other factors.

That is why, along with the elimination of hotbeds of tension, which we have mentioned -- whether in the Caribbean Sea or the Indian Ocean, the Malvinas Islands or the Mediterranean, the Middle East or southern Africa, the Korean Peninsula or Puerto Rico -- we must also ensure the establishment of the New International Economic Order, for the strengthening of international security is inconceivable while the majority of mankind is denied the right to development.

In conclusion, I should like to quote the statement made by President Fidel Castro at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. He said that

"The clashing of weapons, the threatening language and the overbearing behaviour in the international arena must cease. Enough of the illusion that the problems of the world can be solved by nuclear weapons. Bombs may kill the hungry, the sick and the ignorant; but bombs cannot kill hunger, disease and ignorance". (A/34/PV.31, p. 62)

Mr. THIOUNN PRASITH (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French):

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has already an opportunity to congratulate you most warmly on your election to guide our work, but as this is my first statement before this Committee I should like now to address to you my personal congratulations and assure you of our full co-operation in helping to ensure that, under your wise and farsighted leadership, our work will be as successful as it should be.

Everybody recognizes that international peace and security are in greater jeopardy now than ever before. The reasons for this are the proliferation of hotbeds of tension and armed conflicts in the world and the inability of the international community, in this case the United Nations, to remedy the situation through the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic
Kampuchea)

In his first report on the work of the United Nations, the Secretary-General most lucidly stated that:

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

Governments that believe they can win an international objective by force are often quite ready to do so ... The Security Council, the primary organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, all too often finds itself unable to take decisive action to resolve international conflicts and its resolutions are increasingly defied or ignored by those that feel themselves strong enough to do so." (A/37/1, p. 3)

And the Secretary-General added: "We are perilously near to a new international anarchy". (ibid.)

That forthright judgement is based on specific situations and facts in the world, especially in Namibia, the Horn of Africa, the Middle East including Palestine, Lebanon, Iran and Iraq, Korea, Afghanistan and Kampuchea: everywhere where there has been a breach of international peace and security. By way of a solution, the Secretary-General advocated that Member States should rally once more to the principles of the Charter and thus to the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The delegation of Democratic Kampuchea wishes to renew to the Secretary-General the expression of our great appreciation for his courageous analysis of the international situation. We support unreservedly his urgent appeal for the enhancement of the role of the United Nations, especially the principle of collective action for peace and security. We fully share his view that Member States, particularly those which are small and weak, more than ever before need a viable system of collective security in which they can have complete confidence. He was thus right to affirm that:

"Without such a system, the world community will remain powerless to deal with military adventures which threaten the very fabric of international peace, and the danger of the widening and escalation of local conflicts will be correspondingly greater". (ibid., p. 5)

It is in this spirit that my delegation welcomes the inclusion on our agenda of item 137, entitled "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic
Kampuchea)

security¹⁷, and draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.73, which was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone.

In its consideration of agenda items 58 and 59, our Committee should by no means lose sight of the report of the Secretary-General from which I have quoted, or of the comments and recommendations contained in that report.

My delegation considers that the establishment of zones of peace in the world would contribute to the promotion and strengthening of international security. We should like to say how much we appreciate the efforts made by the Littoral States of the Mediterranean Sea, particularly Yugoslavia and Malta, to make that sea a zone of peace. We also reaffirm our constant support for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and we hope that the preparations for the conference on the Indian Ocean scheduled to be held in 1984 at Colombo will be crowned with success, particularly in view of the fact that since 1979 the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has heightened tension in that area. Democratic Kampuchea attaches great importance to that conference, because the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia constitute two contiguous zones of strategic importance for the future of peace and security in the world. It is for that reason too, and even more for the preservation of the security and national identity of Kampuchea, that my Government has always supported the Kuala Lumpur declaration of November 1971, which was aimed at making South-East Asia a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. But such a zone can be established only following the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea.

In Kampuchea, the Vietnamese expansionists continue to strengthen their military contingents with a view to escalating their war of aggression and genocide. They have sent in further troops and war matériel. In recent months, they have despatched more than 23,000 men and many tanks and heavy artillery pieces. They have already begun new military campaigns and with the help of the dry season have begun again to wage chemical and biological war against the defenceless population, thousands of whom have already fallen victim to this in past seasons. The very recent report of the United States Department of State, issued as United Nations document A/C.1/37/10, has provided new proof of this chemical and biological war in Kampuchea, Laos and Afghanistan.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic
Kampuchea)

The invasion of Kampuchea by Vietnamese forces, like the invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet forces, destroyed regional peace and security and constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of two States Members of the United Nations and of the Non-Aligned Movement have been deliberately violated. The fundamental principles of the Charter, such as non-use or threat of use of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes, have been brazenly flouted in the interest of the expansionist strategy of Hanoi and Moscow.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic Kampuchea)

To speak only of my own country, two successive vetoes by the Soviet Union left the Security Council unable to oppose the Vietnamese war of aggression or to discharge its principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. And yet, for the last four years, our General Assembly has adopted with increasingly large majorities four resolutions demanding the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea so that the people of Kampuchea would be able freely to determine their own future without any outside interference and so that Kampuchea would become once again independent, united, neutral and non-aligned without any threat to its neighbours.

Viet Nam, which is trying to pose as a model defender of international peace and security and as a perpetual victim of imperialism and hegemonism, has always trampled underfoot these just and reasonable demands of the international community. What is more, it has constantly been slandering, libelling and threatening all the peace and justice-loving countries, particularly the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), which have lent their support in solidarity with the struggle of the people of Kampuchea and their coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea for national survival and the restoration of peace and security in South-East Asia.

How can we apply the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security at a time when Viet Nam, in flagrant violation of this Declaration and of the Charter of the United Nations and in arrogant contempt for the many relevant resolutions of our General Assembly, continues to invade and occupy Kampuchea and at a time when the Soviet Union is continuing to invade and occupy Afghanistan? How can the countries of South-East Asia and the countries of South Asia establish, still less develop and strengthen, good relations with neighbours that are so aggressive and so greedy?

My country, Kampuchea, which has common borders with Viet Nam, has always sought to have good-neighbourly relations with that country based on equality and mutual respect. In his statement on 30 September last in the General Assembly, the President of Democratic Kampuchea, Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, could not have stressed better the consistent position of my country. He said:

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic Kampuchea)

"...the geographical position of our two countries makes them neighbours to the end of time and...they are, because of this, compelled to understand each other and to listen to each other. This understanding, however, can be established only between equals and not between servant and master.

"The present Government of Hanoi does not accept this analysis. It has chosen to forget, and how quickly, the repeated help that our people and I myself have rendered during a crucial period to the people of Viet Nam in their struggle for independence and reunification. It has also very quickly forgotten - this is even more serious - that the support it has received in this struggle from a large part of the international community resulted from the fact that it appeared to be the innocent victim of colonialism and imperialism.

"Today, this very Viet Nam, restored in its territorial unity and independence, indulges, in its turn, in imperialist and colonial rule. It goes so far in its arrogance as to make serious threats against some of the neighbouring countries, which quite rightly are concerned about its expansionism...

"The Vietnamese Minister has accused certain Governments of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) of interfering in the internal affairs of Kampuchea, but, as we know, it is Viet Nam which has interfered in a shameless manner in our internal affairs, occupying our country with large numbers of troops and appropriating to itself material parts of our national resources, whereas ASEAN has only asked our occupying Power to let Kampuchea become yet once more the master of its own destiny.

"President Ho Chi Minh, at whose funeral I was the only Head of State present to pay my respects, loved to say that 'nothing is more precious than independence and liberty'. This adage, one now sees, is to be applied, according to his successors, only to their own country, which arrogates to itself the right to confiscate the independence and liberty of its immediate neighbours - our country, Kampuchea, and the unfortunate Laos - whilst waiting to attack other nations which may be militarily weaker.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic Kampuchea)

"In so far as Kampuchea is concerned, it is clear that the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam seeks to retain it indefinitely under its heel by the intermediary of a puppet Government which can refuse it nothing."

(A/37/PV.11 pp. 7, 8-10)

Viet Nam, by its policy of aggression and expansionism which it has pursued for several centuries, has shown to the world that it is the grave-digger of peace, security and stability in South-East Asia. History shows that the North Vietnamese that came from Tonkin and the Red River delta swallowed up the Islamic Kingdom of Champa in the late 17th century and made it the present central Viet Nam, and they used it as a take-off point to invade and swallow up 65,000 square kilometres of the territory of Kampuchea in the rich Mekong delta to convert them into what is now South Viet Nam. Since 1930, the Vietnamese Communist Party has directed all its activities towards the establishment of an Indo-Chinese Federation which would include Laos and Kampuchea under Vietnamese domination and which would later form a "Greater Viet Nam" after completely absorbing those two countries, just as it did the Islamic Kingdom of Champa and the Mekong Delta.

Today Viet Nam has become the main bridgehead of regional and global expansionism in South-East Asia. Since 1975, Moscow and Hanoi have constantly been proclaiming that Viet Nam is the secure forward-post of the socialist camp in South-East Asia. At the Nguyen Ai Quoc Institute, the school for the Vietnamese Communist Party cadres in Hanoi, plans and tactics are being established to draw up the constitution for what in the 1990s will be the "Union of Socialist Republics of South-East Asia" within the regional orbit of Viet Nam.

Despite the limited resources of the country and the enormous obligations that they have to their people, more than 50 million of them, the Hanoi authorities have for this purpose continued to keep under arms 1,200,000 men, to which should be added 2 million men and women of the militia and other paramilitary units. In absolute figures, this is the third largest army in the world, but in relative population terms, it is the largest army in the world: one Vietnamese out of 16 is under arms.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic Kampuchea)

Moreover, with 250,000 soldiers in Kampuchea and 60,000 more in Laos, Viet Nam is, in relative terms, the country which has the largest number of soldiers on foreign soil. Annual military expenditures exceed 50 per cent of the budget at a level of \$110 per capita, that is, seven times more than those of the developing countries members of the Group of 77, whose military expenditures are of the order of \$15 per capita.

It is clear that Viet Nam could not cope with such war efforts, continue to invade and occupy Kampuchea or threaten its South-East Asian neighbours without the tremendous comprehensive assistance it receives from the Soviet Union, which has obtained in exchange the Vietnamese military bases of Cam Ranh, Da Nang and elsewhere to strengthen and expand its naval and air forces in Asia and the Pacific.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic
Kampuchea)

In his statement of 30 September, our President, Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, very clearly interpreted the unanimous feelings of the people and nation of Kampuchea when he said:

"We are not making war on the Vietnamese people. We are fighting for peace and the restoration of independence and freedom to our country which is now reduced to slavery. We do not want a "Pax Vietnamica" or a "Pax Sovietica" but simply a peace of free men.

"We ask nothing from others. We ask but restoration of our national sovereignty and our territorial integrity; and once that is achieved, we solemnly commit ourselves to living in perfect peaceful coexistence with all our neighbours - and first amongst them Viet Nam - as with all other countries which respect us, no matter what their political and social systems may be ...

"We proclaim solemnly before this Assembly, in conformity with United Nations resolutions, that as soon as Viet Nam has totally withdrawn its troops from Kampuchea all will be possible in friendship between our two countries.

"We are ready to sign with Viet Nam a treaty of peace and non-aggression implying recognition and respect for the territorial integrity of the two neighbouring nations within their present frontiers." (A/37/PV.11, pp. 12-15)

That statement was heard and strongly supported by the General Assembly, which on 28 October last adopted by an overwhelming majority - 105 votes to 23 - resolution 37/6, which reaffirms earlier resolutions on Kampuchea and the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea of 17 July 1981.

It is by deeds and not by hollow words that we judge the sincerity of people and of States. Those who have since 1969 taken the initiative in the debates on the strengthening of international security have used all their resources and all their rhetoric to try to convince us of their good faith and their sincere desire for peace and respect for the Charter of the United Nations. However, the international community has noted that

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic
Kampuchea)

so far their only action has been to increase their arsenals of conventional, chemical and nuclear weapons for use in aggression and expansion, which destroy peace and security in all the continents of the earth. It is indeed high time they spared us their rhetoric, which no longer convinces anyone, and tried to reconcile their deeds with their words. To do that, they must first implement the relevant United Nations resolutions on Kampuchea and Afghanistan by withdrawing all the Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea and all the Soviet forces from Afghanistan. It is incumbent on our Organization to compel them to respect the Charter and the decisions of the United Nations and also the established rules of international law. To that end it is important to take specific and effective measures to strengthen the authority of the United Nations in its principal task of maintaining international peace and security. My delegation trusts that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.73 will constitute a first forward step in that direction.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): We are taking up the consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted 12 years ago on the initiative of the Soviet Union, in very complicated conditions. The forces of imperialism and reaction have intensified their efforts and are endangering world peace and security in various parts of the world. Current international relations are encumbered by the escalation of dangerous actions by imperialist circles, primarily the United States, which strive to disrupt international stability and to gain military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty countries, which would enable them to dictate their conditions from a position of strength in all fields of international activity. To camouflage these efforts, they are brushing up or further developing theories of the so-called Soviet threat and the aggressiveness of the socialist States. At the same time it is precisely these forces which, through their policies of force, threats, diktat, the delimitation of spheres of influence and interference in the internal affairs of States

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

and by means of feverish armament are undermining the very foundations of international security and are the cause of the complicated international situation.

They are trying to pursue their ambition to rule the world by constantly enlarging their military forces and by an unprecedented growth in their military expenditures. These are primarily channelled to the intensive development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Particular emphasis is being placed on offensive nuclear weapons, on the production of the neutron bomb and on the rapid development and manufacture of chemical weapons - their binary modification in particular - but also of other types of weapons. These steps are directly aimed at undermining international security and disturbing the process of détente and stability throughout the world. At the same time, all States that are genuinely interested in the continued peaceful development of their countries, as well as of international co-operation in all fields, should convince themselves of the advantages of the process of détente. The only ones it does not suit are those whose continued undisturbed development of new and more and more dangerous military technology it would hamper. That is why they have decided to subvert that process and to bury it. However, international détente has taken deep roots and has far from exhausted all its possibilities. Sooner or later its dimensions will again grow, because it is the only reasonable way of continued peaceful development on our planet.

Particularly dangerous, in our view, is the fact that the forces which abhor détente, regarding it as a thorn in their side, ignore completely the most important requirement of the present time, as expressed by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nation, namely the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe. Their course of action contrasts sharply with the historic assumption of the obligation by the Soviet Union, announced at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that the USSR will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. Is their approach to this question not indicative of their true intentions? If we juxtapose

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

that approach with their military doctrines, then the picture we get is completely clear. If a State adopts as an official premise the possibility of waging not only a limited but even a protracted nuclear war with the intention of winning it, one can only deduce that such a policy is sharply at variance with the efforts of the socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and all peace-loving mankind aimed at preventing a nuclear apocalypse. The most recent proof of this orientation of United States policy is the decision to build a network of launching silos for the strategic MX missiles, which in fact constitutes a violation of the spirit of the strategic arms limitation agreements.

The foreign policy of Czechoslovakia and the other socialist countries is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous co-operation among States with different social systems. The preservation of peace throughout the world is its basic objective. That is why, together with other peace-loving States, the socialist countries are untiringly and actively struggling against the aggravation of tension and for the preservation and further development of détente and for stimulating the disarmament negotiations, achieving concrete results in them, and eliminating hotbeds of tension.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

At the October meeting of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Warsaw Treaty countries, it was declared with the utmost clarity that members:

will continue to exert maximum efforts in order to halt the process of the aggravation of tension in the world, to avert the danger of war and to reach progress in the limitation and reduction of armaments, the nuclear ones in particular.

It is generally known that the socialist countries do not engage in mere rhetoric in that respect. Their statements are substantiated by concrete, realistic proposals, proposals that are not aimed at gaining military superiority - for which, by the way, they have never striven nor will they ever strive.

For Czechoslovakia, as for other fraternal socialist countries, the Peace Programme for the 1980s adopted by the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and complemented in the course of further developments by new and timely proposals in the most important fields, became a platform upon which to proceed in this decade. However, negotiations on outstanding problems must not merely be initiated; they must also be conducted seriously, or there could be the danger that the particular problem will elude the international community and the possibility of its solution thus be lost. This applies all the more strongly in the field of disarmament, where the race to perfect weapons systems is reaching ever higher and ever more dangerous levels.

That is why we consider the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe to be a problem of the first priority for the security of today's world. In this, we base ourselves on the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, which condemned the inhumane war-like doctrine of the first use of nuclear weapons as

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

the gravest crime against humanity. The Soviet Union, guided by the basic idea of that Declaration, led the way and showed the correct direction towards its practical implementation when, at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it denounced the first use of nuclear weapons. That was a truly historic step, and now the other nuclear Powers that have not yet done so should be encouraged and persuaded to follow that example.

Two other important Soviet proposals for the immediate halting and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and for intensified efforts to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and ensure the safe development of nuclear energy, which are reflected in draft resolutions adopted by our Committee, further develop this basic idea and take it another step forward. These proposals represent a valuable basis for further deliberations on these problems within the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. Speedy implementation of both proposals would contribute decisively to the strengthening of international security.

On the initiative of socialist and non-aligned countries, our Committee again this year adopted a number of important draft resolutions, the majority of which deal with the most crucial issues of the present time, particularly in the field of the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and the prevention of nuclear war. In the final analysis, these documents pursue the same objective, namely, the strengthening of international security. After all, international security cannot be built on stockpiles of weapons, but only on the basis of a high degree of responsibility and political will on the part of States to reach concrete agreements on topical disarmament issues, on the basis of refraining from all endeavours aimed at gaining military advantage and on the basis of strict observance of generally recognized principles and norms of international law and of already concluded treaties and agreements. The draft resolution on international co-operation for disarmament adopted by this Committee on the initiative of Czechoslovakia and a number of other States strives to facilitate

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

these efforts. In particular, its central idea concerning the need for political goodwill on the part of States and their constructive co-operation in reaching the goals of disarmament represents in our view a necessary prerequisite for any progress in this field.

We attach great importance to the Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States of America on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe and on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons. The achievement of progress in these talks and the adoption of relevant agreements based on the principle of equality and equal security -- as the Soviet Union untiringly strives to realize through its constructive proposals -- would contribute considerably to the elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, strengthen peace and, to a decisive degree, enhance the security of all States, both nuclear and non-nuclear. Security would undoubtedly be strengthened, the political climate improved and confidence and the development of good-neighbourly relations on the European continent enhanced if the countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) gave up their plans for the deployment of new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

In our view, the successful conclusion of the negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in the spirit of the draft convention that is now on the negotiating table at the Geneva Committee on Disarmament is of extraordinary importance.

Czechoslovakia, together the other socialist States, is taking an active and action-oriented part in all measures aimed at improving the international climate and strengthening international peace and security. Since 1976 we have been striving for the conclusion of a world-wide treaty on the non-use of force in international relations which would undoubtedly become an important instrument for the strengthening of collective security on a world-wide scale. Unfortunately, it is the NATO countries, primarily the United States, which have from the very beginning opposed substantive talks on this important

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

issue. In the European context, we strive for the successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting of States signatories of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe with the adoption of a substantial and balanced final document that would reaffirm the firm commitment of the States parties to the European Conference to the strict observance and implementation of all the principles and provisions of the Final Act and which would include agreements on their further implementation. In our view it is particularly important for the Madrid meeting to adopt the decision to convene, within the all-European process, a conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe, and to reach agreement on its mandate. We are convinced that the holding of that conference would greatly contribute to the strengthening of security on the European continent.

The over-all strengthening of the process of détente and of international security would surely be enhanced by the achievement of progress in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe to which, together with our allies, we have repeatedly contributed through numerous constructive proposals. Progress in the Vienna talks could be achieved all the sooner because a basis exists on which we could proceed with the practical preparation of the relevant agreement. That basis is provided by the latest proposal by the socialist countries made last February. We therefore expect a constructive approach by our Western partners to this proposal which would open the way to the achievement of an agreement.

Together with many other States, we support measures for the enhancement of international security on other continents. That is why we are attracted to the idea of Asian security, as well as to the proposal by the Mongolian People's Republic for the conclusion of a treaty on non-aggression and non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific. We encourage the establishment of a zone of peace and good-neighbourliness in Asia and the Pacific, just as we welcomed the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. We advocate the implementation of the same measures in Africa, in the Middle East, in the Mediterranean, in Scandinavia and in the Balkans. Of particular timeliness is the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and the convening of an international conference on that question which, to our regret, has been the subject of constant delays.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The development of peaceful co-operation between States and the strengthening of international security and peace throughout the world would also be encouraged by implementation of the efforts of developing countries aimed at the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, and by the establishment of a new economic and information order, which we fully support.

We must also note that manifestations of discriminatory economic policies towards socialist countries and attempts at various forms of interference in the internal affairs of the Polish People's Republic and other socialist countries are in no way in keeping with the ideas of international security and co-operation. These attempts are in sharp contravention of the Charter and the basic norms of international law, as well as the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. We most resolutely condemn those phenomena. For our part, we reiterate the unchanging nature of our policy of comprehensive development of equal and mutually advantageous co-operation among all States and the policy of peaceful coexistence of States with differing social systems. We are convinced that there is no other path today that is reasonable and worthy of mankind.

International security is also threatened by persisting hotbeds of tension throughout the world, which bear the seal of the forces responsible for feverish armament and the growing danger of nuclear war.

In that context, we condemn with particular vehemence continued Israeli acts of aggression in the Middle East, shielded by the political, military and economic support of the United States, which culminated in the brutal armed intervention in Lebanon, the illegal occupation of its territory, the killing of members of Lebanon's civilian population and the genocide carried out against the Palestinians. The Israeli aggressor must be called upon to answer for its deeds and must be compelled to fulfil the resolutions of the Security Council.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

These unlawful acts of violence by Israel are evidence that the policy of separate agreements embarked upon at Camp David merely plays into the hands of the instigators of continuing Israeli aggression. We reiterate our conviction that a responsible, just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem can only be brought about by multilateral collective efforts based on the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the eastern part of Jerusalem; on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Arab Palestinian people, including their right to the establishment of their own independent State; on the safeguarding of the right of all States in the region to a life in security and independence; on the termination of the state of war and the restoration of peace between the Arab States and Israel and on the adoption of international guarantees of such a settlement. In this context, we reaffirm our support for the proposal to convene an international conference on the peaceful settlement of the situation in that region with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. A just and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis would decisively contribute to the strengthening of international security.

We also denounce the practice of declaring various regions in different parts of the world to be spheres of so-called vital interest. A manifestation of this relapse to the grossest form of imperialist and colonialist practices is the interference of the United States in Central America and in the Caribbean, which leads to increased tension, destabilization and threats to peace in that region. Threats addressed to Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada and other States directed against their right to decide independently on their fate, the pressure exerted on progressive Governments and people in these States, the instigation of counter-revolution and the fostering of economic disruption surely represent a grave jeopardy to security in that part of the world.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

We are, furthermore, concerned about the continuing armed intervention by South Africa against Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States, as well as the attempts to connect the implementation of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination with the departure of the Cuban troops that are in Angola at the request of the legitimate Government of the People's Republic of Angola and which are helping the Angolan people to resist armed aggression against South Africa and imperialist interference. We consistently support the speediest possible solution of the question of Namibia on the basis of the full implementation of relevant United Nations resolutions. We are in solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, for independence. We condemn the brutal policy of apartheid of the South African régime, which is incompatible with the basic principles of humanity. We also denounce the support provided by some Western States and their monopolies to the Pretoria régime in the implementation of its policies of apartheid, aggression and disregard for international law and the will of the international community.

We are fully and unequivocally in favour of the liquidation of the remnants of colonialism, which represent a permanent potential source of danger to world peace. The armed conflict in the South Atlantic documented most graphically the urgent necessity to put a definitive end to colonialism. We fully support the consistent application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, including all small territories and Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. In our view, the continuing colonial status of Puerto Rico is also incompatible with the ideas of that Declaration.

It is beyond doubt that the interests of international security are not served by the unlawful consideration in the forum of this world Organization of the so-called questions of Afghanistan and Kampuchea; this constitutes flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States - the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

Similarly, the waging of an undeclared war against these States is in direct contradiction to efforts aimed at strengthening international security. The constructive proposals by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan of May 1980 and August 1981 for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, on the other hand, are fully in keeping with such efforts, as are the efforts by the United Nations Secretary-General to contribute to the peaceful solution of that question, which have already brought certain positive results in the course of the Geneva Afghan-Pakistani negotiations.

We furthermore support the proposals by the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, originating at the sixth conference of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of those countries and subsequently developed further, including their proposal for the convening of an international conference to consider the situation in South-East Asia and their initiative aimed at transforming South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation.

The withdrawal of a part of the Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea is welcomed by us as an expression of good will to resolve the situation in that region by peaceful means - a situation which was created by the interests of imperialist and hegemonistic forces. We see it as a step towards strengthening understanding and security in that part of the world.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

We resolutely support the efforts of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for a peaceful reunification of Korea and the withdrawal of United States troops from the southern part of the country. There is no doubt that the source of tension and the cause of the current situation on the Korean Peninsula is nothing but the continuing interference by the United States in Korean affairs.

We have followed with concern the continuation of the Iraqi-Iranian conflict and we speak out in favour of its settlement by peaceful means on an equal basis and with respect for the legitimate rights of both sides. We support the efforts by non-aligned countries to mediate in a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

It is our belief that the key to resolving the question of Cyprus is also in reaching a peaceful settlement. We support a settlement of the question in the spirit of United Nations resolutions which would guarantee the restoration of sovereignty and territorial integrity to the Republic of Cyprus and its independence and non-aligned status, and which would protect it against interference in its internal affairs. We are in favour of the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus and the liquidation of foreign military bases, and we welcome the proposal for the demilitarization of the island.

As a socialist State, a member and firm component part of the defensive alliance of the socialist community -- the Warsaw Treaty Organization of States -- Czechoslovakia remains unswervingly true to its peaceful ideals. It stands for a consistent peaceful solution of the most pressing current as well as possible future problems of the international situation. Our place is in the ranks of those who not only strive with all their strength for the peaceful settlement of conflicts in the world but also for the creation of conditions excluding the very initiation of conflicts. This motivation underlies the numerous proposals by the socialist countries which not only strive peacefully to resolve conflicts throughout the world, but also for the creation of conditions preventing the very inception of conflicts by means of strengthening international security and peace. It is our firm belief in this context that however complex the disputed issues among States, they can and must be resolved

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

by political means alone, by negotiations, in keeping with the principles of the Charter and norms of international law. Precisely this kind of approach, if adopted by all States, would result in the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, in the continued development of détente, constructive dialogue, mutually advantageous commercial, economic, scientific, technical and other peaceful contacts, and would represent the greatest contribution to the strengthening of international security and the establishment of relations of good-neighbourliness among States.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): History shows that the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States .. agenda item 58 . is of unquestionable importance in the life of States. These relations have often determined events that have proved to be of primary importance for one particular region, if not for the human race as a whole. Wars between neighbouring States have sometimes brought other States into the same conflict and have had effects on still more countries. Today, bearing in mind the expansion and ease of communications and the increased mobility of persons and goods, relations between neighbouring States have become more complex and their impact on the life of peoples more significant.

For reasons of geographical proximity and other historical factors, neighbouring States have formed among one another a number of ties of co-operation and friendship. Many neighbouring States have established machinery for the joint exploitation of certain economic resources, while others have established more complex mechanisms for co-operation, for example, in the economic field.

However, although good-neighbourly relations can lead to peoples being open-minded and co-operative one with another, they can also lead to conflicts of interest which can become a source of armed confrontation if they are not settled in time in a spirit of justice, equity and respect for the sovereignty of States.

(Mr. Tavares Nunes, Portugal)

The importance of these relations in the more general framework of the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security would thus seem to be clearly illustrated and fully justified, in the view of my Government, and we feel that the international community should indeed consider these relations in order to determine the essence of the relationship and define its content.

This exercise offers favourable prospects which could usefully be availed of by States in their relations with neighbours.

In view of the particular significance that my Government attaches to good-neighbourly relations, we feel that the development and strengthening of such relations should be one of the main goals of State policy. After all, if all States had good relations with their neighbours, then clearly there would be no place for any threat to international peace and security.

Efforts to attain this objective must cover all aspects of life in society, for good relations among States must be comprehensive so as to come close to perfection.

The basis for such good relations is respect for the fundamental principles of international law. In particular, the principles of respect for the sovereignty of States and the non-use or threat of use of force are of primary importance in this context.

Good relations between States exclude pressure or discriminatory methods contrary to the legitimate interests of other States. The spirit prevailing in these relations must be co-operation, open-mindedness and frank and constructive dialogue.

The political will of States is thus an indispensable element in establishing good-neighbourly relations. In particular, they must demonstrate these qualities in order to settle peacefully all conflicts of interest through negotiations and conciliation; co-operate in good faith to attain common objectives including the exploitation or use of common economic resources; refrain from any unilateral action that could be significantly prejudicial to a neighbouring State, including the exploitation or use of such common natural resources as seas, lakes or rivers; co-operate to protect the environment; and provide information on military activities, particularly those that might be interpreted by another State as a threat to its legitimate interests.

(Mr. Tavares Nunes, Portugal)

The establishment of procedures and mechanisms for effective consultation is one useful method of enabling States to exercise their political will and to develop and strengthen their good-neighbourly relations. The negotiation of agreements, the carrying out of studies and holding consultations are methods that could promote this objective.

I should not like to conclude my comments on this item without expressing my delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General for the report he submitted to this Committee. As a compilation of the views of States, it is a useful basis for spelling out the essential elements of good-neighbourliness. Of course it does show that there are a number of different points of view expressed, which is not surprising, because it is simply a preliminary approach to the topic. However, what is remarkable is that it shows how many countries there are whose ideas in some aspects of the content of good-neighbourliness are very close or, indeed, coincide with one another. We feel that this is a good beginning.

Mr. STRULAK (Poland): The connection between disarmament and international security has been extensively studied and well established by the United Nations. These are interdependent phenomena and it is an axiom now to say that the progress in disarmament goes hand-in-hand with the strengthening of international security. Likewise, one speaks about the world's growing armaments and diminishing security. Indeed, these latter, negative developments in both disarmament and international security were emphasized by most speakers in the disarmament debate in this Committee when they evaluated the present deteriorating world situation.

We believe also that there is one and the same root cause for the stalling, slowing down and breaking off of disarmament dialogue, as well as for endangering international security. This cause is, without any doubt, the present day imperialist policy of confrontation and striving for supremacy, through increasing reliance on the element of unrestrained military power, without regard for the security or well-being of individual nations, or the larger interests of world peace. Its lamentable manifestations, so critically

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

affecting the state of international security in various parts of the world, are too well known and have been referred to at length in this Committee and in the plenary general debate during this session. These are more and more frequent readiness to use force, or threats of force, in international relations, decreasing or abandoned international efforts to prevent and settle conflict situations, even acts of political and military adventurism. Needless to say, these policies tend to undermine the principles of the United Nations Charter and the very foundation of international security that it provides for.

They also tend to destroy the fabric of international political, economic, cultural and human contacts, so painstakingly constructed in the past decade across the lines of political and ideological division in the contemporary world - in other words, the fabric of détente. Yet it was this expanding network of international dialogue and co-operation that provided the best and the most reliable support for a durable system of international security.

For the Polish People's Republic the idea of building and strengthening an effective system of international security in the world, primarily in divided Europe, the continent to which we belong, has always been and remains basic to our foreign policy, perceived as an essential factor of national development. We have pursued and developed this idea in its various aspects, both individually and jointly with our Warsaw Treaty allies and through bilateral and multilateral European dialogue.

Suggesting first that the questions of military security be solved through measures of disarmament and arms control in Central Europe, we later went on to develop a comprehensive notion of security in Europe, involving parallel efforts for consolidating security and for broad peaceful co-operation, and then for the institutionalization of these efforts. This was how the idea of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) grew and became a reality through the common interests and contributions of all its 35 participating nations. Founding a structure of security and co-operation on our continent, the CSCE Final Act, which can be called the landmark of détente, also started a process of its constant improvement and consolidation. The beneficial effect of this process for world peace and security was evident.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

This process, too, however, has for some time now been seriously hampered and threatened by confrontational policies that do not hesitate to misuse some principles of the Helsinki Act and to infringe upon others, to undermine the very structure of European security and co-operation.

Poland has profound reasons to be deeply concerned by this continuing deterioration of the European and world security situation. It is no exaggeration to say that this situation is now fraught with threats to the very existence of our nation, primarily the immediate threat of an unbridled nuclear arms race in Europe. This, of course, is the danger hanging over all European nations.

The diagnosis of the critical state of international security today, the highly unsatisfactory implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, makes it essential for us to point out and condemn policies that are principally responsible for it - policies of forceful armament and confrontation. But certainly the most important task of our debate here, as we understand it, is to find a way to overcome and reverse these policies, to restore normalcy to international relations, and thus stop the constant deterioration of international security and to start improving it. We cannot achieve that by merely giving an outlet to our alarm, anger or frustration, understandable as these may be.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

Poland, together with its socialist allies, has never had any hesitation as to how to improve international security and what policy to follow in the face of the present serious challenge to world peace and to our security. That course was unambiguously reaffirmed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty at their October meeting in Moscow. The communiqué of the meeting, which has already been quoted in this Committee, states that the meeting's dominant feature was "the general determination of their States" -- that is, the socialist States represented at that meeting -- "to pursue consistently a policy of peace, détente and international security". (A/C.1/37/7, p.8) The objectives of this policy are then listed in the communiqué. They are the elimination of the threat of a nuclear holocaust; the improvement of relations between States; the development of constructive dialogue and mutually advantageous commercial and economic, scientific and technical and other peaceful relations. Indeed, in the present international situation, which is overwhelmingly overshadowed by the nuclear threat and burdened with so many open and latent conflicts and so many vital problems facing various nations, there can be no way to improve international security other than a return to the policy of broadly understood détente and restoration and maintenance of its so far unquestionable achievements and their further consolidation and development. This of course involves full compliance with the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter, the Declaration on Strengthening International Security, and, in the European context, the Final Act of Helsinki.

In this connection the meeting now taking place in Madrid of States signatories of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) is of major importance. Aware of the difficulties it faces as a result of the above mentioned damage inflicted on the CSCE process, we note the prevailing interest of many States -- which reciprocates ours -- in saving and further developing this process in a successful conclusion of the meeting. As has recently been stated by Poland's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Stefan Olszowski, common sense and realism will finally get the upper hand at the meeting and businesslike relations of partnership among CSCE participants will be restored. This is necessitated by the common international interest.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

Minister Olszowski stressed that the Polish delegation in Madrid stands ready to contribute to producing at the current round of the CSCE meeting decisive momentum for the reaching of important and lasting results and thus for ensuring proper continuity for the CSCE process.

A major constructive result expected of the Madrid meeting is the convening of a conference on confidence and security building measures and on disarmament in Europe.

In view of its interest in the restoration of the whole wide spectrum of contacts and co-operation with the CSCE participants, as provided for in the Final Act, Poland attaches great importance to the economic sphere of that co-operation. This is understandable in view of the economic difficulties through which we, like many other nations, are living, as well as the discriminatory practices of some States to which the Polish economy has been subjected contrary to the letter and spirit of the Final Act, the United Nations Charter and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. We believe these questions have extra-European and indeed world-wide import.

In the Helsinki Act international co-operation has been laid down as a basic principle of European security. Just as we all agree on the need for confidence-building measures pertaining to military aspects of security in order to strengthen it, so also Poland considers that economic confidence-building measures should protect and help develop economic co-operation among States in the interest of promoting international security. By preventing the transfer of political tensions to the sphere of economic and trade relations, such measures would help to build a material foundation for the process of détente and at the same time to ease political strain. Our concept of economic confidence-building measures comprises both injunctions, such as the prohibition of the application of unlawful economic restrictions, and positive actions - for example, active policies by Governments to induce economic units to fulfil their obligations undertaken in relevant international agreements or to adopt large-scale projects of international economic co-operation. This concept is based on the observance in inter-State economic relations of the principles of equality, sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

We believe that, when elaborated and developed in the world-wide context, economic confidence-building measures would also contribute to the implementation of the objectives of the New International Economic Order, establishment of which figures among the important goals in the strengthening of international security.

Having for many years been actively engaged in regional European efforts in the field of disarmament, military détente and security, Poland has a full understanding of initiatives and actions aimed at the strengthening of security and co-operation in other regions of the world, the elimination of aggressive imperialist and racist policies from those regions, and the stability of those regions.

As participants in the CSCE, we have taken an active part in the discussion of the questions of security in the Mediterranean, and we support the efforts to strengthen both security and co-operation in that region in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act and the recommendations of the Valetta meeting of 1979.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

Together with the question of international security, we are discussing in this Committee that of good-neighbourly relations. We cannot but commend this initiative. Good-neighbourly relations in the broad sense form an integral and indispensable element of the policy of détente, and we should like to see their wide adoption as a step towards restoring and strengthening détente and, thus, international security.

We also understand, and largely share, the views of those States which, in the face of deteriorating international security and the parallel decrease of United Nations effectiveness in the domain of security, would like to stem those processes by stressing and, if possible, restoring the primary statutory role of the Security Council in that domain. In our view, this question, being connected in the first place to the relationship among and the policies of the permanent members of the Council, is largely dependent on a sense of political responsibility and goodwill on the part of them all, and on their taking a concerted constructive approach.

The complexity of the great many problems of international security makes it impossible for me to discuss all of them. Of necessity we have focussed the Committee's attention on matters which are of closest interest to our country, but which in our view are of vital significance also to the world at large. Of such importance is, first of all, the restoration of the policies of peaceful coexistence and détente, both political and military, as the only way to improve international security.

Because it is so closely tied to and affected by the vicissitudes of détente, and because it is fully aware of that fact, Poland is determined further to do everything in its power to make détente in Europe return and succeed.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.