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AGENDA ITEM 39 (continued)

Mr. GURINOVICh (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Three years have elapsed since, at the time of the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations, on the initiative of the Soviet Union the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. In this historically brief period of time major positive changes have occurred on the international arena which have confirmed the great significance of the Soviet initiative.

The major trend in the development of contemporary international relations has been the change-over from "cold war" to détente, from military confrontation to the stabilization of security and peaceful co-operation.

Since the middle of the 1940s there has been a danger hanging over the head of mankind of the outbreak of world nuclear war; this danger has begun to decrease and the prospects for the preservation of general peace have become better and more reliable than ever before. The principles of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems is winning ever wider recognition. These principles now have a much more concrete content and are becoming a generally accepted rule of international life.

The favourable changes which have been taking place testify to the great success of the peace programme put forward at the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1971, which marked the further active continuation of the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet State. The nature of the process of détente in Europe has assumed a definite, concrete character. The treaties between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany, the treaty between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany and the broad international legal recognition of the German Democratic Republic, as well as the whole complex of multilateral and bilateral agreements on West Berlin, have been the most important manifestations of the change for the better on the European continent.
All these treaties have proceeded from a recognition of the sound foundation and security of existing frontiers and contain obligations by the parties to renounce the use of force in the resolution of controversies and, by so doing, to stabilize territorial and political realities of contemporary Europe.

A concentrated expression of the positive changes which have been occurring in that continent was the successful beginning of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the second stage of which is now taking place in Geneva. With all the differences of opinion among the participants in the Conference, one common desire is to create conditions favourable to the development of peaceful co-operation among European States, and that of itself is of by no means negligible importance when we take into account the fact that Europe is the continent where both world wars began. Steps are being taken designed to supplement the political détente in Europe by a military détente which would promote disarmament. To that end talks began a month ago in Vienna on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

Progress has been achieved in the improvement of relations between Soviet Union and the United States, the two most powerful States in the world, with differing social systems. The visit of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, to the United States in June of this year and his talks with United States President Nixon have opened up new and favourable prospects for the development of Soviet-United States relations and for the strengthening of mutually advantageous co-operation between the two countries, and have made a major contribution to the further easing of tension and the securing of universal peace and security.

Of particular importance is the Agreement between the USSR and the United States on the prevention of nuclear war. It constitutes a major step forward towards the reduction and, in the final analysis, the elimination of the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war and towards the creation of genuine guarantees of international security.
The conviction that war, particularly nuclear war, as a means of solving European problems is now entirely excluded has formed the basis of treaties and other important documents which have been signed in recent years by socialist States with France, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western European countries. In proposing to the capitalist countries that they should found their relations with socialist States on the bases of peaceful coexistence, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have never compromised and never will compromise their class interests or the interests of revolutionary forces which are waging a struggle for national and social liberation. The competition of the two social systems on the world arena is continuing, but it should not be allowed to grow into an armed conflict or war between the countries which would include the use or the threat of the use of force in their relations.
The process of détente is becoming ever wider in scale and is beginning to embrace additional regions. A major victory of the heroic Viet-Namese people and of all countries of the socialist community and all peace-loving forces, was the end of the war in Viet-Nam. One of the most important and dangerous hotbeds of international tension was thus extinguished. A serious improvement has taken place in the situation in South Asia and Bangladesh has emerged as a fully fledged participant in the family of Asian nations. In the Far East new, positive changes have occurred in the situation on the Korean peninsula in connexion with the important initiative of the Korean People's Democratic Republic designed to bring about the peaceful, democratic unification of Korea. The elimination of a number of hotbeds of war, the first steps to limit the arms race, the widening of contacts between States with different social systems -- all that is evidence of the profound positive changes which have occurred in international life.

The change-over from hostile confrontation to ever more stable peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems has become possible because of a general change in the balance of forces in the world arena, a change which has been to the detriment of the supporters of the cold war and in favour of the forces of peace and progress. In this matter a great role has been played by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and by their growing power, their unity, their solidarity and their tireless struggle for the stabilization and guaranteeing of international peace and security.

Along with the socialist States, a constant standing army of peace in the international arena and in the arena of international relations is constituted by the peoples of the Asian, African, and Latin American States. That is shown by the results of the Fourth Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries. Thus we see the real progress achieved in the long drawn out and arduous struggle of the peoples for a stable peace and international security and against the outbreak of a new world war.
A striking expression of this was the World Peace Congress held in Moscow, which adopted a broad programme of action on the part of peace-loving public opinion in all countries to strengthen international peace and security. The forces of imperialism and aggression were in a corner and forced to renounce the more militant doctrines of the time of the cold war. But does this mean that we must relax our vigilance and content ourselves with the progress achieved? Does this mean that the tasks earmarked in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security have been performed? No, that is far from the case. The change-over to détente should not be allowed to weaken the efforts of peace-loving forces. We have a long way to go before we have put an end to wars and hotbeds of military tension. Acts of aggression in the world are still being engaged in, and not all peoples are in a position to feel themselves secure. The forces of imperialism and reaction have not renounced their aggressive designs. They have not laid down their arms. Aggressive circles of imperialism are still ambitious to go over to the counter-attack wherever they are able to do so, especially in those cases where the peace-loving and progressive forces are fragmented.

An example of this is the most recent events in the Middle East, where a hotbed of tension engendered by the aggressive extremist policy of Israel and by its annexation of the Arab lands it had seized led to a predictable outbreak of war. As a result of the valorous struggle of the Arab peoples, who have enjoyed the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and also the collective efforts of those who have striven to strengthen peace in the Middle East, it was possible in the circumstances of the existing international détente to achieve a cease-fire. But the situation in that area still remains explosive. There is only one way to solve the problem -- that is, the immediate implementation of the decisions of the Security Council, particularly resolution 242 (1967). The Israeli troops should be withdrawn from all occupied Arab territories. The rights of the Arab people should be fully guaranteed, as should the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. It is only on that basis -- on the basis of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial
integrity of all Middle East States -- that it will be possible to achieve a just and lasting political settlement of this conflict.

The forces of imperialism and reaction are operating in other parts of the world too. Because of the Saigon administration and its protectors, there are violations going on of the Paris Agreement on Viet-Nam. The fascist régime of Portugal, disregarding decisions of the United Nations, is waging colonial war against the peoples of Angola and Mozambique and is continuing its aggression against the independent State of Guinea-Bissau. The South African and Southern Rhodesian racists are cruelly suppressing the struggle of the indigenous African population of South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe for freedom and human dignity. The military fascist Junta in Chile is continuing its reign of bloody terror and putting down the working people of that country. The aggressive and military circles of the leading western Powers are still striving to intensify the arms race and increase military budgets. And irresponsible politicians and political leaders are attempting to use détente in order to intervene in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and are even daring to instruct the peoples of those countries on how they should pursue their domestic policies. Imperialism is continuing its economic plunder of the developing countries, which is increasing the gap between those countries and the developed capitalist countries and is creating instability and tension in the world.

The actions of the aggressive circles of the West which are operating against international détente fall objectively into line with the policy of those who are smearing any measure designed to ease international tension. This emerged strikingly at the time of the most recent events in the Middle East, when the leaders of one major Power boasted about their support for the Arab nations and called upon them to fight until final victory, but, at the same time, did not give them any real assistance and rejected any real possibility for a peaceful settlement. The calculations of these political leaders must be clear to everyone. What they are trying to do is to exploit any
hotted of war in order to fan military conflict for the sake of their
great-Power objectives.

From what I have said, it is quite clear that the tasks of strengthening
international peace and security are very great and have still not been
entirely accomplished. Neither peace nor security nor détente is automatic.
It can be achieved only as a result of a stubborn, tireless struggle on
the part of all peace-loving forces against those who are trying to resist
détente, threatening peace and creating the danger of war.

In the circumstances of the improvement of the international political
climate, we are witnessing a general intensification of the policy of dozens
of States, great, small and medium-sized, which are striving to make their
own contribution to the common cause of the strengthening of peace. Of
course, a constructive contribution on the part of any State deserves
whole-hearted support. To attempt, as some are doing, to contrast the great
Powers with the medium-sized and small Powers is quite harmful and unfounded.
The socialist countries are in favour of the equal co-operation of all States, regardless of their size, and of delivering all countries, great and small, from the threat of war. The Byelorussian delegation considers that the United Nations and all its Members should make their contribution to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and to the stabilizing of peace throughout the world. This process, as was stressed by our delegation in its speech in the general debate at this session, would be facilitated by the adoption by the Security Council of appropriate measures for the full implementation of resolution 2936 (XXVII) of the General Assembly, in which it, on behalf of the Member States of the United Nations, solemnly proclaimed the renunciation of the use of force or the threat of the use of force in all its forms and manifestations, and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

International détente and the strengthening of international security cannot be the privilege of individual regions. The world is indeed indivisible. The principles of peaceful coexistence and international co-operation should prevail everywhere. What we must do is adopt measures to strengthen regional security.

The question of creating a system of collective security in Asia is now most topical and is winning more and more support among the peoples of Asian countries. This is demonstrated by the results of the visit by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, to India. In the communiqué on the Soviet-Iranian talks in the course of the official visit of the Prime Minister of Iran, Mr. Hoveida, to the USSR from 6 to 12 August this year both sides:

"... expressed their intention to promote the idea of creating a system of collective security in Asia that will embrace all the countries of the continent."

I do not think anyone will deny the importance of the problem of general and complete disarmament for the strengthening of peace and trust among States. In the debate on disarmament in our Committee, all States spoke in favour of disarmament and the convening of a World Disarmament Conference, and that is entirely understandable. The further expansion of the arms race which is encouraged by aggressive circles of imperialism and the process of détente in
international relations which has begun are two conflicting courses and they cannot possibly run along the same path without a collision. We need to stop the arms race in order to stabilize peace. A certain amount of progress has been achieved along those lines. I have in mind the well-known international agreements connected with the limitation of nuclear weapons and also the Soviet-United States agreements on limiting strategic armaments and the numerous initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States on disarmament questions.

The same objectives are served by the proposals for partial steps towards that end, including a question discussed in the plenary Assembly on the proposal of the Soviet Union -- that is, the reduction of military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries.

It is true that within the United Nations we sometimes hear people claiming that the agreements concluded are unsatisfactory, since they do not thoroughly and conclusively solve the problems, that they are just half measures and that it would be better to come to an agreement right away on general and complete disarmament, on banning and destroying nuclear weapons, on the dissolution of military blocs, and so on and so forth.

Of course, it would be very nice to do all that, and it is something that the Soviet Union and other socialist States have been consistently fighting for. But, unfortunately, the Western Powers are not yet ready to take such a decision. So what are we going to do? Just wait and do nothing? No, I do not think the principle of "all or nothing" is very applicable here. What we have to do is try to make progress all the time, using any opportunity that offers itself to limit the arms race and to turn the wheel of armaments backwards. We are guided by the following principle formulated by the founder of our State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin:

"The fewer the general declarations, solemn promises and high-sounding, pompous formulas the better -- and let us have as many as possible of the simplest and clearest decisions and measures which can actually lead to peace."
The United Nations should try to see to it that all States consistently implement the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, so as to make the positive changes which have occurred in international life secure and irreversible, to extend the zone of détente to the whole world, and to confirm the principles of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems as an unshakable foundation of inter-State relations.

It is the duty of all States to take effective measures to eliminate hotbeds of war and tension which continue to exist in various parts of the world and to promote peaceful settlements in those areas on the basis of respect for the legitimate rights of peoples which have become the victims of aggression and colonial oppression.

The General Assembly must support the efforts of States to strengthen international security on a regional basis. We must call upon States to supplement political détente by military détente, to call a halt to the arms race and to take disarmament measures, which would free additional resources for promoting the economic and social development of all countries, including developing countries. All States are obliged to ensure the total implementation of United Nations decisions on the elimination of colonialism and racism.

As emerges clearly from the replies of States to the questionnaire of the Secretary-General of the United Nations -- and among these we find the answer of the Byelorussian SSR in document A/9129 -- and also from the results of the general debate on this item, which is now coming to a conclusion, the socialist and non-aligned States are pursuing a foreign policy which is totally and fully in keeping with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and they are fighting for the triumph of the cause of peace and co-operation among all States.

The General Assembly must constantly be vigilant about the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security because peace and security are one of mankind's invaluable assets. People should be able to live in the knowledge that blood is flowing nowhere and in the conviction that tomorrow bombs and shells will not fall on the roofs of their houses and that their children will grow up without suffering from the tragedies which have been experienced by the older generation.
Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): In its resolution 2993 (XXVII) the General Assembly expressed profound concern over the continuation of armed conflicts and other situations in different parts of the world which called for the urgent attention of the international community in order to strengthen international security.

One year after the adoption of that resolution we may be justified in wondering whether the Assembly still has reasons for feeling that same concern, and I am afraid that the answer would have to be in the affirmative. It is true that since then one of the armed conflicts that gave rise to that grave concern -- the war in Viet-Nam -- has yielded to a state we might term one of peace, at least theoretically speaking, although there still persists a grave situation which is the obvious result of a long and bloody confrontation. But on the other hand, and as tragic counterpoint to that relative improvement, we have again seen the flames of war burst out in one of the most sensitive regions of the world where the geopolitics of three continents meet, where the most powerful economic, commercial and strategic interests are concentrated, where we find the roots of the culture and the traditions of a major portion of the world, and, if that were not enough, where the most active and vivid feelings over questions of human rights are seen, where there is a conflict of international principles that cannot be settled or solved without grave decisions and sacrifices that are today difficult to foresee. I am speaking of the Middle East, a zone in upheaval whose problems are felt in the most distant corners of the world but which more directly affect those countries that lie in the immediate or near neighbourhood.

But history repeats itself. The problems among the small or medium-sized nations become enormously aggravated when the omnipresent shadow of the great Powers is cast upon them. I am not passing moral judgement, but we must look at the world today, a world in which interference and the consequences of conflict respect no one, regardless of how far away he might be, because the techniques of destruction have wiped out the age-old distinction between the actors, the spectators and the outsiders, between civilians and military personnel, between the vanguard and the rearguard.
We are speaking here of international security, whereas near that conflagration whose last flames were extinguished a few days ago the most enormous elements of destruction mankind has ever known are being stockpiled. On 11 November, on page 27 of The New York Times, in a report datelined Athens, it was stated that there were at least 300 warships in the Mediterranean and that of the 2,000 merchant vessels that daily ply it special precautions are required because of the density of that military presence in the Mediterranean Sea. Some of the units of those fleets are also carrying nuclear weapons. According to that same article, there are experts who expect an increase in the number of vessels in the Mediterranean. During the last episode of the chronic conflict that has envenomed the Middle East, we lived through some long hours of concern and worry over a possible confrontation between the great Powers. And that is a serious danger.

It would appear that the international community is not sufficiently aware of the danger inherent in this situation, since the sinister shadow of possible intervention can again appear at any moment and in any region of the world during the process of negotiation that is taking place with constant interruptions and stumblings. If something can calm our fears it is to know that the two super-Powers are maintaining bilateral contact and that neither of them wants the confrontation to go beyond controllable levels. Our calm is lessened when we see that in the line of communication between them there are also interruptions, surprises and mistrust which make that communication somewhat unsure in the light of the different questions at play.

In the reply Spain sent to the Secretary-General, mention is made of that fact in the following terms:

"... it is noted that important bilateral negotiations, the result of which affect the whole of mankind, are being carried out in an exclusivistic and to some extent arbitrary context. ... It would be advisable to study the possibility of devising a formula whereby bilateral conversations of general interest could be co-ordinated, at least at the consultative level, with the multilateral efforts which the international community has been making in favour of détente and disarmament." (A/9129, pp. 47 and 48)
In its operative paragraph 2, resolution 2003 (XXVII) expressed the hope of the Assembly that "the present favourable trends in bilateral, regional and multilateral relations, including the creation of zones of peace and co-operation in various areas of the world, will continue and that efforts to that end will be pursued and intensified, thus furthering the strengthening of international security".

Mine is a country having coasts on the Mediterranean, and when we think of zones of peace and co-operation we must obviously first think of that sea, to the point that my own Government has for some time endeavoured to contribute to the creation of a doctrine or, to use what is, perhaps, a better phrase, guidelines for the establishment of a doctrine for the Mediterranean Sea as a zone of peace. That Spanish position has erroneously been interpreted by some as a desire for exclusivism or such a form of exclusion of others as might be defined by the formula, "The Mediterranean for the Mediterraneans" or some other similar wording. Some have even had the unrealizable dream of immediate neutralization of the Mediterranean.

But on this matter let me cite a very recent declaration by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain, Mr. López Rodó. At this twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, speaking in the general debate, he stated: "The structure of security that exists at present in the Mediterranean is based exclusively on the confrontation between the great Powers, with the consequent loss of autonomy for the coastal States. Although the system is imperfect, we cannot today conceive of the possibility of demilitarizing or neutralizing the Mediterranean. It would, however, appear possible to combine the imperatives of a global strategy with an agreement between the Mediterranean countries which would enable them to participate in the shaping of their own security." (A/PV.2133, p. 42)

Perhaps the very essence of that doctrine lies in the word "combine", because much has already been said on the concert of the coastal States in different bodies, as also on the imperatives of a global strategy of super-Powers — of which, I may say, too much has been made, particularly with regard to the monologue each gives when defining its own position. But not so much is said — and
this is where we should like to place the stress -- on how we can make those two realities compatible and force them to converge. However different they may be, they are both real and they must both equally be borne in mind. We believe some very simple principles that underly our Mediterranean policy might be acceptable to both the great Powers and the other coastal States. Those principles are basically the four I shall now define.
First of all, Spain believes it an urgent matter to have the détente extended to the Mediterranean. The European Conference on Security and Co-operation, in which Spain has participated from the very beginning and in which it is at present taking an active part, is primarily intended to extend détente throughout the continental area of Europe. We have repeatedly pointed out that we cannot accept the principle of the displacement of tensions. We cannot agree to having certain States reach accord on achieving détente in those areas closest to home while, on the other hand, they increase tensions in more distant places, thus endangering the homes of their neighbours. This position of ours is shared by almost all the Mediterranean countries, and at the Helsinki Conference Spain fought to enable certain non-European countries of the Mediterranean to make known their respective views to the Conference.

Second, détente in the Mediterranean must be not only political but also military. As our Minister for Foreign Affairs said in his statement I mentioned earlier, it would be unrealistic at this time to expect the fleets of the Powers without coasts on the Mediterranean to withdraw from that sea. But there should be no difficulty in arriving, as a first step, at a stabilization at present levels of the air and naval units of the great Powers. It would be indeed a positive advance if a prompt agreement could be reached not to increase the military presence in the Mediterranean of Powers alien to that sea.

The third step would be a concerted action on the part of all the coastal States to establish a regional security system under whatever international guarantees may be necessary for maintaining its balance otherwise than through the brutal process alone of mutual threat among the big Powers. It is obvious that, to arrive at such an international system of security, there is a problem that must be resolved either in advance or perhaps at the same time, and that is the problem of the regional confrontation between the Arab States and Israel, which must find its solution through recognition and guarantee of the integrity and self-determination of all the parties involved including, naturally, the Palestinians.
This regional system would have to include both security and co-operation, as the Pan-European Conference is claiming for the continental countries. New ties of solidarity and co-operation would be established in the economic, social and cultural fields. As a number of United Nations resolutions have repeatedly stated, co-operation, development and disarmament are matters that are intimately related among themselves.

Finally, this Mediterranean solidarity should be institutionalized on the basis of the principle of the full and absolute equality of all States, without distinction and without discrimination against any because of ideological or racial reasons or because of differences in social or economic systems. In this context, what would be essential is the most scrupulous respect for all national entities existing in the area and possessing sufficiently differentiated personalities. Perhaps the first stage in such an institutionalization would be the holding of consultations and meetings, at an appropriate level, with the participation of all coastal States or of certain ones particularly interested in specific aspects or stages of the process of détente.

I am especially eager to point out that, in addition to Spain, a number of other Mediterranean countries have, on various occasions and in different forums, advocated similar principles, ones that are perhaps the same as those I have just set forth. But not to dwell on this too long, I shall mention only the working paper submitted by Algeria to the non-aligned States at their Conference in Georgetown in 1972. In that Algerian proposal were summed up the principles of solidarity among the Mediterranean States, the elimination of tensions, the promotion of common interests, and, as the ultimate aim, the need to remove foreign fleets from the Mediterranean region and eliminate foreign military bases from that area.

My statement would be incomplete were I not to stress an equally basic principle that complements all the previously mentioned ones, namely, the principle of the peaceful use of the Mediterranean Sea by all countries. We do not want a Mediterranean for the Mediterraneans alone. We want a Mediterranean for all peoples, one that will serve the peaceful and commercial interests of all countries, but on one condition, and that is that this right must not be used to endanger the security, order or integrity of the coastal States.
Within the context of Mediterranean security, the delegation of Spain wishes to point out to the First Committee, in the clearest and most unequivocal terms, the existence, in the Western area of that sea, of a focus of danger — danger primarily for the security of Spain, but as a consequence thereof, for the general security of the region. That focus lies in the existence, and in the activities taking place thereon, of the British military base of Gibraltar, under a colonial status which the United Nations has expressly and repeatedly rejected. The colonial and the military aspects of Gibraltar are so closely and indissolubly tied into one another that it is really impossible to explain why the British representatives claim that Great Britain is in Gibraltar because the inhabitants want it there, since they are all practically living at the expense of the military base and the installations and investments that always spring up in the vicinity of a military base. The British say that if the Gibraltarians were to change their mind, the British also would have no difficulty in changing theirs. This claim, however, will be believable only when Great Britain decides to dismantle that military base. Until that happens, the entire world will be forced to believe that the will of the Gibraltarians is nothing but a convenient disguise for an overriding strategic interest.
This is so true that in the last few months, coinciding with the increase of tension in the Mediterranean, there has also been an increase in the number of visits to Gibraltar by British nuclear-powered submarines. These visits increased from five in the first six months of 1973 to eight in the next four months. And that does not come from press reports but from more direct sources.

Spain rejects this military presence imposed upon it in violation of its territorial integrity and national security in order to serve interests alien to the Spaniards and regards the disappearance of this grave focus of tension as a basic condition for the security of the western Mediterranean. We are determined to make all the efforts and sacrifices necessary to ensure that this military enclave will never become an active element of warlike confrontation, at the cost of the basic interests of Spain.

Mr. JAZIC (Yugoslavia): The question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is again on the agenda of the General Assembly this year, which is quite justified when we bear in mind not only the undiminished importance of this Declaration but also the fact that the maintenance of international peace and security is the primary task of the United Nations. In this connexion we should never lose sight of the fact that the principles and provisions of the Declaration constitute an organic whole and that the aim towards which we are tending is the implementation of the Declaration in its entirety by all States without exception. Of course, the process of the implementation of the Declaration cannot amount to a short term ad hoc action but constitutes a continuing task requiring the constant involvement of the world Organization and of its Member States.

I wish to reiterate my delegation's firm conviction that the principles of the Declaration should be applied in relations among all States, regardless of their size and social system. Only in such a way will it be possible to achieve peace, security and international co-operation based on equal rights, whereby the causes of crises and tensions will be eliminated and the action of the forces of colonialism, imperialism and foreign domination will be checked.
When we consider the implementation of this Declaration, it is no doubt necessary to proceed from the international situation and the changes that are now taking place in it. On the one hand, it is obvious that considerable progress has been achieved in some areas of international relations. We have in mind here primarily the extension of the détente and peaceful coexistence in relations among a growing number of States, especially between the great Powers and in Europe. On the other hand, we note the existence of hotbeds of war and tension resulting from acts of aggression, the threat or use of force, foreign occupation of territory, interference in internal affairs, and the continued existence of colonialism, imperialism and racial discrimination, which constantly threaten the security and independence of many countries, and most often of non-aligned and developing countries. This contradiction in international developments has been most clearly illustrated by the fact that simultaneously with the détente and negotiations in Europe we also witnessed the resumption of war in the Middle East. In this regard the United Nations has played a prominent role in achieving a cease fire and in establishing the United Nations Emergency Force, which has emphasized again the topicality of the peace keeping function of our Organization.

The experiences gained from this crisis, as well as from other similar situations, constantly warn us that, when matters are viewed in the long term, it will not be possible to stabilize relations on a peaceful basis and in keeping with the principles of the Charter if such a contradictory course continues. Although the existence of the détente has facilitated the cease fire in the Middle East, it has become clear that there are no limited crises which could be strictly controlled and not jeopardize world peace and the positive results achieved through the joint efforts of many countries and peace-loving forces throughout the world. In our interdependent world, peace and security are indivisible. Therefore the only way to overcome the existing contradiction is to ensure that détente should encompass all regions of the globe and guarantee the legitimate rights of all countries. May I refer in this connexion to a paragraph of the Declaration of the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries which reads as follows:
The Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries emphasize that the strengthening of international security forms an integral part of the programme and actions for achieving peace and progress for all peoples and all countries. This aim can be reached only by constructing an international security which would cover all parts of the world and which would be equal for all peoples and all countries.”

When we speak of international security we always bear in mind that security is not limited to military and political aspects but that it encompasses economic aspects as well. Generally speaking, in addition to the classical forms of aggression, new forms of foreign influence and interference, which are not always easy to discern, are making their appearance. Let us take as an example the structural problems of the international monetary and trade system. The failure to solve such problems and the continuation of practices and relations founded on monopolistic privileges undoubtedly exercise a negative impact on the developing countries, constantly undermining their independence. Then we are faced with constant attempts at infringing the sovereign right of States to dispose freely of their natural resources. In some cases these rights are even openly violated.

For all those reasons we attach particular significance to the well known provision of the Declaration which establishes a close link between international security and development, as well as between disarmament and decolonization. Any attempt at depriving a State of its vital rights in the economic sphere constitutes also an infringement of the basic principles enshrined in the Charter upon which relations among States are founded.

My country is an active participant in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We attach great importance to this Conference, convinced that it will lead to the further strengthening of positive trends -- primarily the strengthening of peace and security, which would not be limited solely to Europe and to the promotion of equitable cooperation among European countries, which will have a beneficial influence in other regions too. As a non-aligned and socialist country Yugoslavia is, of course, specially interested in the overcoming of bloc divisions, which have been so characteristic of the post-war history of Europe.
Proceeding from the concept of universal and equal security, Yugoslavia will continue to strive to ensure that the European Conference will contribute to the strengthening of security and co-operation in the whole of Europe, which would at the same time be in the interest of the international community in its entirety.

At the same time my country fully supports the stand adopted by the Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Algiers to the effect that European security cannot be dissociated from security in the Mediterranean as well as in the Middle East. It is also known that the non-aligned countries have taken initiatives during the last few years for the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation in various regions. Initial results have already been achieved: the Indian Ocean has been proclaimed a zone of peace, and in the region of South East Asia efforts are being exerted with a view to creating a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality free from any form of interference by Powers from outside the region. We hope that foreign military presence in that region, including foreign military bases, will be eliminated.
An initiative has been taken also, primarily by non-aligned countries, to transform the Mediterranean gradually into a zone of peace and co-operation. The fundamental principle underlying the zones of peace and, in our opinion, all regional initiatives and undertakings aimed at strengthening security should be that relations among States within such regions as well as relations with countries outside the regions should be based on the principles of the Charter, with the provision that efforts should be constantly exerted for the development of equitable co-operation which would create conditions for the reduction and gradual withdrawal of the military presence of the great Powers, including military bases, from foreign territories.

The problems concerning the strengthening of international security are of a universal character, and -- no matter whether they are being solved also through bilateral and regional efforts -- the general interest of all States in their solution should be taken into account, because only through combining bilateral, regional and multilateral efforts and interests can we reach long-term solutions. As in the past, my delegation will support the draft resolution which -- as indicated in our statement -- expresses precisely such an approach.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is a significant instrument, chiefly as a thrust towards a more orderly and more secure world through a better and more effective implementation of the Charter. It embodies not only a solemn rededication by Member States to the Charter principles and purposes but also a new commitment to those principles and purposes as therein elaborated. The Declaration is based on an evaluation of the experience of 25 years of international life since the establishment of the Organization, with particular reference to the perception of needs resulting from such evaluation.

The Declaration is a carefully considered and studied document also in respect of the order of priorities of principles that is given in it, having regard to its main objective, that of bringing a direly needed degree of law and order under the Charter and also eliminating or reducing focuses
of permanent trouble, friction and war which threaten international peace and security and, more importantly, avoiding the repetition of errors of the past in the creation of conditions which inevitably resulted, and could not but result, in situations of perpetual war and trouble, as the experience of the past quarter of a century has demonstrated.

Thus, after a general reaffirmation of the Charter principles and the call for adherence to them, in paragraphs 1 and 2, the Declaration proceeds in a sequence of priority to deal specifically with those principles of the Charter on which emphasis should be laid in the promotion of the aims of the Declaration. Thus paragraph 3 reaffirms and stresses the primacy of the obligations under the Charter and states that they shall prevail over other obligations under any other international agreements. This provision has appropriately been given priority of place in the Declaration, for it forms the very basis for the development of modern international law under the Charter in which the basic legal maxim of *pacta sunt servanda* is supplemented and qualified by the prevalence of obligations under the Charter over those under any other international pact or instrument. This is a basic element in the development of international order.

The next in sequence, paragraph 4, emphasizing the sovereign rights of States to determine their own destinies without external interference, coercion or constraint, calls on all States to refrain from any attempt at the partial or total disruption of the unity and territorial integrity of any other State or country. This principle appropriately takes a place of priority as touching on the very core and origin of the most difficult and dangerous present-day problems -- those of partitioned countries. They constitute the most explosive situations of endemic war and human suffering, posing the greatest threat to international peace and security. A glance around the world today and the problems that bedevil it would vividly demonstrate this reality.

The Declaration, after reaffirming in paragraph 5 the duty of every State to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any other State, proceeds pertinently in paragraph 6 to deal with the peaceful settlement of disputes. It urges Member States to
seek methods of improved implementation of the means provided in the Charter, including mediation, conciliation and arbitration. This emphasis in the Declaration and the place it takes are particularly significant because the methods and procedural modalities for the peaceful settlement of disputes as provided in the Charter are not supplemented. The Charter provides the means. It merely enumerates them. They were to be supplemented by proper methodology and procedural measures. This emphasis in the Declaration is particularly significant because a great deal depends, as far as peace and security are concerned, on the peaceful settlement of disputes. The necessity for such modalities to be developed is beyond doubt, for they would render more practically accessible the means of peaceful settlement of disputes which are now lacking.

It would seem to my delegation to be appropriate if the General Assembly, in reviewing the degree of implementation of the Declaration, were to take account of this need. The Secretary-General might be requested by the General Assembly to prepare, with the assistance of expert consultants appointed by him, a report on the subject of such methods and modalities to be developed.

Next in order in the Declaration comes the question of peace-keeping operations. In this respect it may be recalled that when the necessity for United Nations peace-keeping operations arose in the recent Middle East conflict the necessary guidelines and systems for such operations under discussion in the relevant Special Committee of 33 had not been completed, making necessary last-minute improvisations to meet the situation. Therefore it is to be hoped that the aforesaid Committee will find it possible to expedite its work towards the completion of this task.

Subsequent paragraphs in the Declaration dealing with the implementation and enforceability of Security Council resolutions call for particular consideration and attention in a review of world developments; for this is a matter of great significance, having regard to recent cases of non-implementation. It may affect the authority of the United Nations and even the relevance of the decisions of one of its most important main organs. A number of resolutions that have been adopted, particularly in respect of African countries, are of great importance but have remained unimplemented.
Furthermore, the Declaration deals in its proper place with the question of disarmament measures, emphasizing the need to proceed more effectively in that direction and calling for the necessary measures towards disarmament. This is a subject that requires more specific attention in relation to international security, which, as members all know, is closely linked to and interdependent with the problem of the arms race and the problems of international security and the prospects for disarmament.
For many long years disarmament negotiations have been in progress without any parallel efforts, within the United Nations or outside it, towards the establishment of international security in a more orderly world. This lack of measures for international security has been commented upon by my delegation, as well as others, since 1965, and it has been emphasized in this Committee and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that there is a need to proceed to measures of international security. It has been said that we cannot expect progress on disarmament in a vacuum, nor can we demolish the machines of war without building the edifice of peace.

Since 1970 we have had the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security -- thanks to the initiative of the Soviet Union -- and, coincidentally with the Declaration, we have had during the last two years a climate of détente and an impressive improvement in relations and understanding between nations, which to a great degree has cut across socio-political or ideological boundaries in many fields. And we have furthermore witnessed great improvements towards peace in the cessation of war in the divided country of Viet-Nam and in Laos, in the significant amelioration in Indo-Pakistan relations, in the relations in Europe, particularly with regard to Berlin and the two Germanys, and even in the troubled situation in Ireland, and in a number of other respects. In the Middle East, on the other hand, the situation has erupted, involving a danger of escalation, but the positive way in which the two major Powers acted in containment of that war definitely shows the beneficent impact of the détente. There is, therefore, room for hope that the world is moving, however belatedly, towards a more peaceful era and towards a better and more logical understanding between the nations and peoples of the world.

However, we cannot overlook the sad reality that the armaments race continues in undiminishing progress, particularly in nuclear armaments and in the qualitative nuclear tests which, through ever higher levels of perfection and complexity, are nearing the point of uncontrollability. And all this preparation of nuclear weapons for war goes on as though there were no détente and as though we were in the very midst of the cold war.
We do not in the least underrated the significance of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and relevant negotiations towards improving the military situation. But as long as these talks leave the arms race unaffected, wholly or appreciably, the escalation to a nuclear conflagration, particularly with the advent of the "mininukes", remains a threatening danger no less than in the past. It appears that there is a theory that because the détente is based on a balance of power, and because there is no possibility, allegedly, of inspection and control, the armaments race has to go on, not only irrespective of the détente, but even as its shield. A strange theory indeed, but not an illegitimate child of the wrong premise of balance of power as the foundation of international security and peace.

Balance of power is a negative concept springing essentially from mistrust and antagonism and a spirit of domination which could only be checked by force and the balance of force. It is, therefore, a sister concept of the armaments race, and along the same lines. International security in our present-day United Nations and our nuclear era cannot rest on a balance of power, which is only temporary and transient and results in war, but only on positive progress towards international understanding, co-operation and peace. The present détente is intended to facilitate and promote international understanding, and certainly not to bolster the balance of power concept. Therefore, there is no way of amalgamating concepts of force and domination with international security and peace. There is thus no escape from the arduous task of building peace and international security through sincerity and co-operation and the common determination and common will of a free association of nations and peoples with mutual respect within the framework of the United Nations.

The requirements of an organized and secure world society, however, are the same as those of a national society. In a similar way, there must be effective restraint from the use of force other than for purposes sanctioned by the Charter of the United Nations. There must be applicable and effective means of peacefully settling disputes between nations, as within nations, over differences that will always arise. And there must also be respect and protection for the physical environment of mankind on this shrunken planet.
The environmental aspect is a matter that did not arise, of course, at the time of the drafting of the Charter because it did not exist -- in fact, it did not exist until very recently. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was drafted and adopted before the Stockholm Conference that, for the first time, alerted the world community to the dangers involved in pollution of the environment. We feel that international security, which means international protection of the enjoyment of life, of freedom, independence and all the other benefits deriving therefrom for all nations and peoples, cannot be unrelated to a growing threat to the very continuance of life and health through increasing pollution and deterioration of the environment. The essence, therefore, of international security must be taken to involve and include the environment, along with respect for national boundaries, freedom and human rights, as well as the protection of the physical environment of nations and peoples, as an inseparable part of our world in its present inexorable realities that cannot be ignored. In this sense of enlightened approach by all nations to the problems of our times, we may look forward hopefully to a determined move towards better prospects for international security, peace and survival.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded the general debate on item 39, Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. BAZAN (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): In the course of this debate on international security, once again the untempered voice of the Castro representative has been raised. He has used all sorts of calumny and scurrilous accusations against the Government of Chile, which I shall refute. But aside from that, he has also stated that his Government is determined to carry out a war to the death in those countries that, it believes, are in connivance with imperialism. This should surely constitute a warning to all Governments and peoples that are worthy and independent, since it constitutes the most bare-faced challenge and interference that the United Nations has witnessed.
The Castro representative's allusion to détente, at the beginning of his statement, in itself informs us that he has a distorted view of this noble peace-making effort to resolve international tension, an effort which by definition is multilateral and cannot be viable unless it is based upon good will.
For Castro, détente is a unilateral initiative and a unilateral accomplishment and, in fact, is only a deception to gain time and then to strike harder and in better conditions against those he wishes to beset. This is not détente that will lead to stable peace. This merely postpones the war. The Cuban Government's barefaced attempt to intervene in my country, where it divided the Chileans into two irreconcilable groups and supplied one of these groups with weapons surreptitiously brought into the country in order to quash the other, can be judged in its dangerous international repercussions and ramifications in the light of this Castro version of détente. The Cubans were in fact taking advantage of a momentary détente in order to force Chile out of its neutrality and thus gain strategic capital to back one of the super-Powers and oppose the other.

This behaviour on the part of the castrismo not only took my country to the very brink of a civil war, but at the same time was a threat to the security and peace of the entire region. The very words of the Castro representative openly and undisguisedly attests to that threat. Assuming a monitor's role that no one has granted and none could recognize, he stated here that his Government would carry out the battle against imperialism within the internationalist vision contained in the following statement by Che Guevara: "There are no frontiers in the battle to the death. We cannot be indifferent to events taking place in any part of the world".

Now this is a threat levelled against all peoples wishing to open their own road to progress and development, safeguarded from foreign pressure and influences. This is a threat levelled against all truly non-aligned nations that are determined to be equidistant from all the extremes and centres of power. This is a threat that, under the pretext of fighting imperialism, is an omen of another imperialism, the Cuban socio-imperialism designed to oppress the free peoples until Cuba autocratically decides whether those people are or are not under North American influence and therefore whether or not to unleash its battle to the death within our frontiers. This is a threat that, couched in
anti-colonialist words, has neo-colonialist purposes since it is intended to subject peoples that are free to the political domination of the Cuban Government. This is a threat that is an interventionist statement that violates the right of self-determination of peoples as contained in article 1 of the International Convention on Civic and Political Rights; that violates the principle of non-intervention contained in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. We are led to wonder whether the State making such a threat does or does not have a right to belong to our Organization.

With regard to the calumnious and libellous statements made by the Cuban representative against the Government of Chile, I am forced to repeat what for any objective observer is obvious. The change of Government that took place in Chile on 11 September was the result of a popular movement. It was a civilian and truly Chilean movement. It was upheld by the great national majority that for close to two months had kept the country paralysed in a supreme effort to safeguard and rescue its thwarted human rights. No foreign influence dictated to us this will to resist. The only explanation for that will was the desire to survive which has always been expressed by the Chilean people.

The policy followed today by the Government of Chile is intended only to reaffirm our independence within the process of return to democratic institutions. Its first act was to evict from the country the Castro Cubans who had thought that in Chile they would be able to carry out their fell designs with impunity. The Government of Chile will not accept, and cannot accept, any foreign pressures and orders. We retain and insist upon our sovereign right to utilize our natural resources restored to the country by a collective effort that was supported by the entire Chilean people. The social conquests made by the workers not only have been respected and will continue to be respected, but will be made more effective and will be increased. We support and will continue to support the struggle of all peoples to achieve their independence and their self-determination, to achieve full enjoyment of their natural resources, and once and for all to quash colonialism and neo-colonialism, to deliver themselves from the pressure of any imperialism, and to extirpate and eradicate apartheid and racism.
This policy of the Chilean Government, which is consistent with our position as a non-aligned State, opens the road to peaceful co-operation with all countries and is placed at the disposal of international peace. We shall, however, be unyielding in our defence of our independence. The interventionist threats made at the outset by the Cuban representative in general terms and addressed to all Governments that Cuba does not find to its likings were later on concentrated on the Chilean Government, calling for material and political support from the forces that he termed progressive in order to bend them against the Chilean Government. But I must vehemently inform him that he will not find scorched earth in Chile, that the castristas will not set their foot on Chilean soil, and that if they do try it for the second time, they will be evicted.

Mr. WESTON (United Kingdom): I regret that the references made by the representative of Spain to the question of Gibraltar compel me to exercise my right of reply. First, since the representative of Spain has again claimed that the existence of a British colony in Gibraltar is in violation of Spanish territorial integrity, I must again state on behalf of my delegation that my Government has no doubts whatsoever as regards its sovereignty over Gibraltar. It seems to my delegation that the Gibraltar question has been brought into this debate on somewhat artificial grounds. The plain fact is that, as history has repeatedly shown, the existence of a British military presence in Gibraltar is not a threat to the security of any peace-loving country, least of all Spain.
That is really all I wish to say. I am sorry that the Spanish delegation saw fit to drag this question into our debate on the strengthening of international security because, being a colonial question, a question about people, it is one which is properly a matter for discussion in the Fourth Committee. Instead of saying more, I would refer representatives to the statement made by my delegation in that Committee.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In the light of the threadbare and worn reply of the representative of the fascist clique, I shall tell him that the statement that we made on this matter was not a new one but one that has been repeated frequently by our Government in different international instances.

Cuba is at one with all the movements of national liberation in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In this very building, a number of resolutions have been adopted supporting and backing that legitimate struggle for freedom.

The Chilean representative has said that the intervention of Cuba on this subject belied the détente existing in the world and was intended to create a new focus of disturbance, that Cuba had a barefaced desire to interfere in the domestic affairs of Chile.

Well, I will ask the Chilean representative whether he considers that Cuba has assumed the role of mentor and if he is disquieted. If so, it is because the fascist junta is the one that is daily violating the implementation of this Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security that was approved at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

It has not only been the Cuban delegation; the very press of this country, and the international community as a whole, has showed its concern over what is taking place in Chile because of the violations in Chile of almost all the precepts of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.
A few weeks ago, three eminent international jurists -- they were not Cubans -- Michael Blum, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Human Rights, Leopoldo Torres, Secretary-General of the International Movement of Catholic Jurists and Joe Norman, Secretary General of the International Association of Democratic Jurists, carried out a fact-finding mission on the violation of human rights by the military junta in Chile.

These three eminent international jurists submitted a report to the Secretary-General of this Organization. The three jurists informed newspaper correspondents that all the means at the disposal of the international community should be placed at the disposal of those who are trying to stop the violations of the elementary rules of international morality and justice. They took eye-witness reports from the victims. They saw dead bodies floating in the Mapocho River or buried in common graves or left to rot on the fields of execution in order to increase terror.

It is these three international jurists, and not the Cuban delegation, that reported on assassinations of prisoners, presumably trying to escape, torture of foreign exiles, concentration camps, and prisoners on Dawson Island close to Tierra del Fuego.

Regarding the fact that there is no fascism in Chile, what can the Chilean representative say regarding the pillage and the sacking of the house of Pablo Neruda, of the laboratories of the Technical University of Santiago, of the Scientific Institute of Valparaiso, of libraries, and so on? Freedom of expression and association are also now legally restricted.

The representative of the fascist military junta of Chile seemed extremely concerned over the statements made by Cuba. Cuba has never dissembled; Cuba has always spoken frankly and openly about its support to all just movements, wherever they take place in the world, and that support has been made manifest and tangible in all aspects. We have given scientific and technical assistance; and if our life has to be given for a people that is fighting for a just cause, we are ready to lay down that life, too. I wonder, and I ask the Chilean representative himself -- he who is so concerned over Cuba being able to do something in Chile, that Cuba might interfere in Chile, as he says -- what would happen in Chile if the workers were to be armed.
Mr. BAZÁN (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall not continue this polemic, particularly as it is dealing with matters that are completely alien to the subject before us.

I do not need again to press the charges I have levelled against the delegation of Cuba. They flow from the very words, the untempered and challenging words that it has spoken. It is sufficient to analyse and think of those words calmly to realize the threat inherent in them, but a threat made against all worthy and independent peoples. The verbal juggling that the representative of Castro has just indulged in in order to excuse herself will convince no one.

The allusion to human rights in Chile is an accusation against Cuba rather than against Chile. Chile is open to be visited by any who wish to go there. Our doors are wide open because we have nothing to hide. No humanitarian organization, on the other hand, has ever been able to get through the steel walls of Cuba, where there are 400,000 political prisoners in concentration camps, and from which more than a million Cubans have had to escape as refugees to foreign lands.

Who speaks against imperialism with socio-imperialistic intentions? Who speaks against colonialism with neo-colonialist intentions, and who speaks of self-determination of peoples with interventionist intentions? Who speaks of détente and uses it for warmongering purposes? And who does all this is morally disqualified to issue disquisitions on international peace and security, because it is obvious to all that the double-dealing and the deception in those words are the great threat to international peace and security.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has not been unaware of and untouched by this subject. The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security does touch upon the entire gamut of international affairs that go from the sources of aggression to human rights. That Declaration is known to all. I do not need to spell it out. So the representative of Chile is completely wrong when he says that my delegation has gone beyond the subject before us. In this very debate, many delegations when speaking on this subject stressed the positive aspects, the
achievements and the progress achieved by the international community that have strengthened international peace and security in different regions. But, by the same token, all the delegations that have spoken on this subject have also touched on points that concerned flagrant violations of that international peace and security, and that is why, in the statement it made on the subject, my delegation was constrained to refer not only to the different problems that still exist, such as sources of tension in the world, but also to the problem of what is taking place in Chile.

Hence, my delegation made that statement regarding the events in Chile, regarding the violation in Chile of this Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and when I am accused of speaking on subjects that do not fall within the purview of the item, when I speak of human rights, I would suggest that the Chilean representative study the Declaration itself, and he will find that my comments were most germane.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.