

## EUROPEAN POLITICAL COOPERATION

### STATEMENTS OF THE FOREIGN MINISTERS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

1980

The Community's reactions to the invasion of Afghanistan	January 1980
Declaration on Afghanistan	15 January 1980
Position on the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan	19 February 1980
Joint statement by the ASEAN and the Community on political issues	7-8 March 1980
The Community and the Member States and the events in Iran, various statements	10, 16, 22, 28 April 1980. 18 May 1980
Statement on Zimbabwe	18 April 1980
Statement on UNIFIL's position in southern Lebanon	22 April 1980
Joint statement on the conclusion of the 1 <sup>st</sup> Ministerial Meeting between the Andean Council and the European Communities and their Member States	5 May 1980
Declaration on Iran	18 May 1980
Declaration following the ASEAN Ministerial Conference	2 July 1980
Stand taken by the Community on the Palestine issue before the United Nations General Assembly	24 July 1980
Statement on the Code of Conduct	28 July 1980
Joint Statement on the situation in Turkey	15 September 1980
Statement on Lebanon	15-16 September 1980
Statement on the Iraq/Iran	23 September 1980
Speech by the Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, 35 <sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the United Nations	23 September 1980
Joint statement on Cambodia at the 35 <sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the United Nations	15 October 1980
Speech, Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, in the opening debate of the Madrid Follow-up Meeting of the CSCE	13 November 1980
Annual report to the European Parliament on political cooperation	19 November 1980

The European Council issued other statements. See the conclusions of the Luxembourg (17-18 April 1980), Venice (12-13 June 1980) and Luxembourg (1-2 December 1980) meetings.

Citation "Bull EC" is the Bulletin of the European Communities.

# 1. The Community's reactions to the invasion of Afghanistan

Afghanistan

1.1.1. The events in Afghanistan have provoked reactions of various kinds on the part of Community and political cooperation bodies.

1.1.2. On 11 January the Italian representative at the United Nations made a statement on behalf of the nine Community countries at an emergency session of the General Assembly.

Meeting in Brussels in the political cooperation context on 15 January, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine adopted a declaration condemning the Soviet intervention, while on the same day the Council took a number of economic decisions concerning the USSR and humanitarian measures to help the Afghan refugees.

These were presented to Parliament the following day by Mr Ruffini, the President of the Council, and were the subject of a debate followed by a resolution.

Throughout January the Community authorities took steps in different areas (agricultural exports, development aid, etc.); on 31 January Mr Jenkins gave Parliament's Political Affairs Committee an account of what had been done.

## Statement by the Member States of the Community at the UN

1.1.3. On 11 January Mr La Rocca, Italy's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement on behalf of the Community countries at an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly on the following lines. The Nine were convinced of the need for the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet troops and reaffirmed the Afghan people's right to have their country's sovereignty, independence and territorial

integrity respected and to decide on their own form of government, without any foreign interference whatsoever. The Nine therefore urged the Soviet Union to observe the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter and to bring its military intervention in Afghanistan to an end forthwith. On 14 January the Nine voted in favour of the Assembly Resolution condemning the Soviet action and requesting the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan.

## Declaration by the Nine (political cooperation)

1.1.4. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine adopted the following declaration at their political cooperation meeting on 15 January:

'The Foreign Ministers of the nine countries of the European Community have focused their attention on the Afghan crisis, in the light of its dramatic developments, the debate in the Security Council and the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The nine Ministers have reaffirmed their grave concern with regard to the crisis created by the military intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, which represents a serious violation of the principles of international relations enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

They have emphasized that the explanations given by the Soviet Union to justify its intervention in Afghanistan are unacceptable. They take the view that the Soviet intervention constitutes a flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a non-aligned country belonging to the Islamic world and constitutes furthermore a threat to peace, security and stability in the region, including the Indian sub-continent, the Middle East and the Arab world.

It is with great concern that the Foreign Ministers of the nine countries of the European Community have noted that despite the almost universal protests against the Soviet military intervention, the

Soviet Union has vetoed a Resolution on the Afghan crisis sponsored by non-aligned countries and supported by a considerable majority of members of the Security Council.

They urge the Soviet Union to act in conformity with the Resolution on the Afghan crisis adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations with an overwhelming majority, which calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan.

The nine countries of the European Community have devoted continuous efforts to the cause of *détente* and they remain convinced that this process is in the interest of all members of the international community. They are, however, convinced that *détente* is indivisible and has a global dimension. They therefore urge the Soviet Union, in conformity with the standards and principles of the United Nations Charter, to allow the Afghan people to determine their own future without foreign interference.

In formulating their position on this important question, the Foreign Ministers of the member countries of the European Community have also been keenly aware of the sufferings borne by the Afghan people as a whole as a result of the crisis, including those Afghans who are being forced to leave their country.'

## Conclusions of the Council

1.1.5. The press release published after the Council met—also on 15 January—included the following conclusions:

'The Council decided to cancel the 1979 Community food aid programme for Afghanistan.

The Council also agreed to take a decision at the earliest opportunity on the proposals which the Commission would submit to it very shortly on emergency aid to be provided via the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees for Afghan refugees. This aid would be combined with such national aid as Member States might grant for this purpose.

Following the measures decided on by the United States concerning deliveries of agricultural products to the Soviet Union, the Council laid down the principle that Community deliveries must not replace, directly or indirectly, United States deliveries on the USSR market. With this in mind, the Council requested the Commission to take the necessary measures as regards cereals and products derived there from and to propose other possible measures for other agricultural products while respecting traditional patterns of trade. A consultation procedure was being instituted with the other main cereal-exporting countries in order to avoid disturbances on the world market.'

## Parliament debate

1.1.6. Opening the debate in Parliament on 16 January, Mr Ruffini, the President of the Council, commented on the line that was being taken by the Nine in the light of the discussions in Brussels the previous days.

Stating that there was nothing about the situation in Afghanistan which justified foreign intervention and that such intervention was a threat to *détente*, Mr Ruffini went on to say:

'We are gravely concerned for the future of *détente*. We know—and the Nine have always had this firm conviction—that there is no alternative to *détente*. We are also aware that *détente* must, by its very nature, be global and therefore indivisible... We have consistently followed the line of not giving up the gains of *détente* in our international dealings, and whenever possible we have tried to promote talks on the control and limitation of troops and arms... In the present international situation, if *détente* is to develop naturally, the obstacle represented by the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan must be removed... The people of Afghanistan must be left to decide their own future, with a government of their own choice and the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their country must be respected. It follows that the Soviet Union must withdraw its troops from Afghanistan... The Nine issued a statement reiterating their deep concern at the situation in Afghanistan resulting from the

USSR's military intervention, which constitutes a serious violation of the principles of international relations enshrined in the United Nations Charter. They emphasized that the explanation given by the Soviet Union to justify its intervention in Afghanistan was unacceptable. The Soviet intervention constitutes blatant interference in the internal affairs of a non-aligned Islamic country and a threat to peace, security and stability in that region, including the Indian sub-continent, the Middle East and the Arab world.<sup>1</sup>

Following the debate, in which a large number of speakers took part,<sup>1</sup> Parliament adopted a Resolution condemning the Soviet intervention and requesting the Commission to reconsider immediately all economic, trade financial and credit relations between the USSR and the European Community.

#### Measures taken by the Community

1.1.7. The events in Afghanistan provoked immediate, concrete measures by the Community affecting agriculture, food aid and humanitarian aid, and commercial policy.

1.1.8. The Council and the Commission took steps to ensure that US agricultural exports to the USSR would not be replaced, directly or indirectly, by supplies from the Community.<sup>2</sup>

1.1.9. The Council cancelled implementation of the 1979 food aid programme since it was impossible for the Commission to monitor allocation of the aid.<sup>3</sup>

A decision was taken, on the other hand, to grant exceptional emergency aid, comprising financial assistance and emergency food aid, to the Afghan refugees.<sup>3</sup>

1.1.10. Lastly, the Council decided that other possible measures should be examined concerning trade, with particular reference to export credits.

#### Mr Jenkins' address to Parliament's Political Affairs Committee

1.1.11. The whole range of Community measures was described by Mr Jenkins at a public meeting organized by Parliament's Political Affairs Committee on 31 January, more particularly, Mr Jenkins rehearsed the measures taken in agriculture, stressing the coordination of the positions of the Community and the United States on exports of foodstuffs. Mr Jenkins referred in this context to his visit to Washington and the positive reaction in the United States to the steps taken by the Community.

Mr Jenkins pointed out that the Community's action should not be confined to negative measures: these should preferably be accompanied by positive steps such as the strengthening of links with the countries in the region, notably Turkey, Pakistan, India and other Asian countries; action should also be taken with regard to the European continent (Yugoslavia). He ended his statement by stressing the fact that the current political situation called for increased cohesion and solidarity on the part of the Community. Everything possible should be done to prevent a rift between the United States and the Community; the USSR, for its part, should realize that the events in Afghanistan constituted a profound change in world politics.

<sup>1</sup> Points 2.3.10 to 2.3.12.

<sup>2</sup> Point 2.1.36.

<sup>3</sup> Point 2.2.23.

## European political cooperation

### Ministerial meeting

2.2.72. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine met in Rome on 19 February to discuss political cooperation. The meeting was chaired by Mr Ruffini, Foreign Minister of Italy, President of the Council and of European political cooperation, while the Commission was represented by Mr Jenkins and Mr Haferkamp.

At a press conference given after the meeting Mr Ruffini issued the following text:

#### *Position of the Nine on the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan*

'1. The Nine focused their discussion mainly on the situation created by the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

2. They noted their agreement on the analysis of the situation and its implications. In this connection they took the view that their declaration of 15 January' is still completely valid.

3. They stressed in particular that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan remains their objective and that they will endeavour to establish the conditions for this.

4. It is also their desire to seek out ways and means of restoring a situation in line with the Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of 14 January, which appeals to all States to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan and to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of that country.

5. They take the view that, in this spirit, the crisis could be overcome constructively through an arrangement which allows a neutral Afghanistan to be outside competition among the powers.

6. Accordingly, they have decided to go into this point more thoroughly and to concert their position on the subject with all allied and friendly countries and with all countries having an interest in the equilibrium and stability of the region.'

## European political cooperation

### Joint statement by the ASEAN and the Community on political issues

2.2.66. At the second Community-ASEAN ministerial meeting held on 7 and 8 March in Kuala Lumpur, the Foreign Ministers of both ASEAN and Community Member States approved the following statement:

#### *Joint statement on political issues*

2.2.67. '1. On the occasion of the second ASEAN/EEC ministerial meeting in Kuala Lumpur on 7-8 March 1980,<sup>1</sup> the Foreign Ministers of the

Member States of the European Community held informal meetings during which they conducted an intensive exchange of views on regional and international problems and developments since the meeting in Brussels in November 1978.<sup>2</sup> They reaffirmed their commitment to world peace, international cooperation and understanding, economic development, social justice and human rights.

They further emphasized the need for all States to observe strictly the following principles: respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence of States; non-resort to force or threat of the use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. They agreed that these principles are of vital importance to inter-State relations. The discussions took place in a spirit of great cordiality and mutual friendship.

2. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community, having analysed current international developments, expressed deep concern over the emergence of new and dangerous sources of tension, at a time when no solutions have been found for other serious difficulties already posing formidable problems. They noted that the tension and the difficulties are focused mainly in regions of the Third World where a climate of peace and international cooperation is indispensable to the achievement of progress in the economic and social fields. They urged the international Community, especially the United Nations and its Secretary-General, to work actively for the resolution of problems in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

3. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community expressed great concern over open armed interventions by foreign powers against two non-aligned countries in Asia, namely the continuing Vietnamese intervention in Kampuchea and the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan. They strongly

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 89 of 10.4.1980.

<sup>2</sup> Point 2.2.60.

<sup>3</sup> Bull. EC 11-1978, points 1.4.1 to 1.4.5.

deplored the armed interventions against these two countries, which have as a common denominator the imposition of will on small independent States by foreign powers through the use of force in open violation of international law, thereby threatening international peace and security. They called for an early implementation of United Nations General Assembly Resolutions No 34/22 of 14 November 1979 and No ES-6/2 of 14 January 1980 including total withdrawal of foreign forces from Kampuchea and Afghanistan.

4. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community deplored the denial of self-determination to the peoples of Kampuchea and of Afghanistan who should be allowed to decide their political future without foreign interference, coercion or intimidation. They further expressed their deep concern for the suffering of the Kampuchean and Afghan peoples, who have been forced to leave their countries on account of external aggression and for whom material assistance is now essential for their survival.

5. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community, taking into consideration the results of the Meeting of the Nine in Rome on 19 February 1980<sup>1</sup> and the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers in Islamabad on 27-29 January 1980, appealed to all States to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan. In this context, they took the view that the crisis could be overcome constructively through the emergence of a neutral, non-aligned Afghanistan, outside competition among the powers.

6. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community noted with deep concern that the peoples in the Indochinese Peninsula, after many years of war and suffering, have yet to find peace and that this dangerous situation may be aggravated and spread to neighbouring countries. They agreed that peace and stability in South-East Asia are essential. However, this and the establishment of friendly and cooperative rela-

tions among all the States of the region depend upon a political solution to the Kampuchean question on the basis of the withdrawal of foreign forces from Kampuchea, and self-determination for the Kampuchean people. They called for the early establishment of an independent and neutral Kampuchea with a genuinely representative government, free of all foreign military presence and maintaining friendly and peaceful relations with all countries in the region. They also emphasized the necessity of strict observance of non-interference in all forms in the internal affairs of States in South-East Asia. They strongly urged the parties involved, and all countries in a position to bring influence to bear on them, to exert utmost efforts in order to avert the possible spill-over of hostilities into neighbouring ASEAN countries and widening the area of conflict.

7. To solve on a political basis the Kampuchean problem the Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community appealed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to explore all possibilities contained in the Resolution on Kampuchea adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 November 1979. These possibilities include the convening of an international conference on Kampuchea and the Foreign Ministers strongly urged all parties concerned to work for it. The Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community expressed firm support for the ASEAN proposal for a greater international presence on the Thai-Kampuchean border in order to defuse the explosive situation, pending an overall political solution to the Kampuchean problem. Together with the Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States, they appealed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and other parties concerned to give strong support to increase the number of personnel of the United Nations and of relief agencies along the critical border areas and to consider the stationing of United Nations observers on the Thai side of the border. The Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community expressed their appreciation that in calling for a political solution to the Kampuchean problem, the

---

Bull. EC 2-1980, point 2.2.72.

ASEAN member countries were motivated by the desire to ensure that all countries of the region can enjoy peace and stability, based on the respect for the principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and freedom from subversion or coercion by outside powers, and the desire to secure South-East Asia as a region free from interference by outside powers.

8. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States further urged the international community to mobilize additional resources for increased quotas and speedier resettlement of Indochinese "land" and "boat" cases in order to relieve the political, economic and social pressure being created by these refugees on ASEAN countries. Noting the generous international response at the UN Meeting on Refugees and Displaced Persons in South-East Asia, held in Geneva in July 1979,<sup>1</sup> and the United Nations Pledging Conference for Emergency Relief of the people of Kampuchea in November 1979, the Foreign Ministers of the European Community reaffirmed the intention of the European Community and of its Member States — which have contributed to the international efforts to solve the problem—to pursue further their action towards this goal and appealed to other States and organizations to continue their efforts in that direction. They expressed their appreciation that the ASEAN countries and other territories of first refuge in the region have admitted refugees/displaced persons from the Indochinese peninsula on humanitarian grounds. They noted that the ASEAN countries deemed that the extension of first refuge depends on commitment of resettlement in third countries and the avoidance of residual problems in the area. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States welcomed the cooperation of the European Community and of its Member States in the solution of such a grave and tragic problem. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community noted that at the UN Meeting on Refugees and Displaced Persons in South-East Asia, held in Geneva in July 1979, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam made pledges relating to the departure of refugees. They expressed the hope that Vietnam will adhere to these pledges. The Foreign Ministers of both sides

agreed that a durable solution must be urgently found to resolve this refugee problem of both "land" and "boat" cases.

9. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community stressed the urgent need to ensure that the international efforts being made to bring humanitarian assistance to the stricken people of Kampuchea are successful. In this context, the Foreign Ministers appealed once again to all parties in that country to do everything in their power to ensure that the relief supplies urgently needed do in fact rapidly reach those suffering hardship, without discrimination of any kind. They urged them, in this connection, to give full support to the humanitarian work being carried out in this area by the United Nations and by other international, national and private relief organizations.

10. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community viewed with great concern the situation of the refugees along the Thai-Kampuchean border. They appealed to the parties in conflict in Kampuchea to refrain from any action which might endanger the refugees.

11. The Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community reaffirmed their support for the vigorous endeavours of the ASEAN Member States and of ASEAN as a whole towards greater self-reliance through their internal efforts and through their increased cooperation with other countries. They recognized that ASEAN has achieved increased political cohesion in addition to its goal of economic and social development and cultural cooperation. Accordingly, they reiterated their belief that the unity of ASEAN, especially in the present difficult circumstances, is and continues to be an important element in the maintenance of peace and stability in the South-East Asian region. They expressed their keen appreciation of the efforts of the ASEAN Member States to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 7/8-1979, point 2.2.32.



### 3. Institutional and political matters

#### Political cooperation

South-East Asia, as a positive contribution to regional peace and stability.

12. The Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Member States appreciated the role played by Europe of the Nine as a factor of economic and political stability and as an element of balance in international relations. They especially noted the intensification of the Community's constructive relations with the Third World in general and with the ASEAN countries in particular. They expressed their appreciation of the Community's positive contributions to the solution of critical problems between developed and developing countries. They also expressed their keen appreciation of the unfailing efforts which by its very nature should be global and indivisible, and stability in international relations.'

2.2.68. On 14 March Parliament adopted two resolutions<sup>1</sup> on matters of political cooperation: one concerned the situation of the hostages in Iran following the failure of the UN mission, and the support to be given following the elections in Zimbabwe.

---

<sup>1</sup> Point 2.3.18; OJ C 85 of 8.4.1980.

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 11-1979, points 1.5.1 and 1.5.2.

<sup>2</sup> Bull. EC 2-1980, point 2.3.1.

<sup>3</sup> Bull. EC 10-1979, points 2.3.4 and 2.3.35.

## 2. The Community and the Member States and the events in Iran

Iran

1.2.1. Earlier stands<sup>1</sup> by the Nine on the serious situation caused by the occupation of the US Embassy in Tehran, the detention of the hostages and subsequent events were followed by further statements, resolutions and decisions throughout April.

These came from the Foreign Ministers of the Nine on 10 April,<sup>2</sup> Parliament on 16 and 17 April in a debate<sup>3</sup> during which statements were made by the President of the Council<sup>4</sup> and a Member of the Commission<sup>5</sup> and a resolution was passed,<sup>6</sup> the Foreign Ministers again at a further meeting on 22 April when a number of decisions were taken on Iran<sup>7</sup> and lastly, the European Council in the Declaration by the Heads of State or Government and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.<sup>8</sup> At the close of an informal meeting held in Naples on 17 and 18 May the Foreign Ministers of the Nine adopted a further declaration on Iran.<sup>9</sup>

### Declaration by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs

1.2.2. While attending a meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in Lisbon, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine met informally on 10 April and made the following declaration on the hostages in the US Embassy in Tehran:

'The Foreign Ministers of the Nine in Lisbon on 10 April considered the situation created by the continued detention of the hostages in the US Embassy in Tehran. They expressed their solidarity with the United States and its people and their grave concern at this serious and prolonged infringement of the ground rules of international law. They agreed on the following declaration:

1. The nine Foreign Ministers recall that on 25 November and 4 December 1979 the United Nations Security Council demanded that the Iranian

Government free immediately the US Embassy staff detained in Tehran. They deeply regret that these resolutions have so far had no effect.

They also recall that on 13 January 1980 the Security Council voted on a draft resolution stating that the continued detention of the hostages was a threat to peace and approving the application of sanctions in view of the intolerable conduct of the Iranian authorities. Only a veto by one of the permanent members of the Security Council had prevented this resolution from being adopted.

2. The nine Foreign Ministers deeply regret that the negotiations begun on the initiative and under the auspices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations have failed to secure the expected release of the hostages.

3. The Foreign Ministers emphasized that the attitude of the Iranian authorities is intolerable and contrary to the principles upheld by the nine countries of the European Community, on which the international community is founded.

4. The nine Foreign Ministers instruct their ambassadors to make immediate representations to the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran requesting the release of the hostages and seeking information and assurances from the Iranian authorities about the date and method of release.

5. The nine countries of the European Community will determine their position in the light of the Iranian authorities' response to this call, on which they will request their ambassadors to report in their respective capitals.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 11-1979, points 1.1.14, 2.2.59, 2.2.63 and 2.3.17; Bull. EC 3-1980, points 2.2.68 and 2.3.18.

<sup>2</sup> Point 1.2.2.

<sup>3</sup> Points 1.2.3 to 1.2.6.

<sup>4</sup> Point 1.2.4.

<sup>5</sup> Point 1.2.5.

<sup>6</sup> Point 1.2.6.

<sup>7</sup> Point 1.2.7.

<sup>8</sup> Point 1.2.8.

<sup>9</sup> Point 1.2.9.

<sup>10</sup> Unofficial translation.

## Debate in Parliament

1.2.3. In the course of its 14-18 April part-session, Parliament debated the problems created by the plight of the American hostages in Iran. This debate, featuring statements by Mr Colombo, President of the Council, and by Mr Davignon for the Commission, ended with a resolution being passed expressing solidarity with the Government and people of the United States.

### Statement by Mr Colombo, President of the Council

1.2.4. The following are extracts from Mr Colombo's statement to Parliament on 16 April:

'... From the very beginning the Nine have been striving for an end to the crisis between Iran and the United States by supporting any development which might lead to a solution.

The countries of the European Community coupled the request that this situation should be terminated as soon as possible with two essential considerations which constantly guide us in our actions. First of all, there is our total respect for the Iranian people in its efforts to build a society in conformity with its historical, religious and cultural heritage. We are also deeply convinced of the need for Iran to play its part and take on the considerable responsibilities which fall to it in maintaining stability and security throughout the Gulf.

In the past few days Iran has decided not to take the step that was seen as the beginnings of a solution to this serious crisis: the placing of the hostages under Government control. The fact that law and, more important, reason have not prevailed after so long is extremely serious.

The Nine regard the continued detention of the American hostages in Tehran as completely unacceptable. They fully support the American people and deeply appreciate the dignified patience with which they have borne such a clear affront to their country.

The failure to place the hostages under Government control prompted the United States to announce sanctions against Iran in the hope of persuading the country's authorities to desist from their unacceptable behaviour and release the hostages. The United States Government immediately notified its many friends and allies, including all the countries of the European Community, of these steps, emphasizing that the American people expected that they too would take appropriate action to secure the release of the hostages.

Following an emergency meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Nine held in Lisbon,<sup>1</sup> where they were attending a meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the Ambassadors of the Member States of the European Community in Tehran made immediate representations to the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran requesting the release of the hostages and seeking information and assurances from the Iranian authorities about the date and method of release.

The Ambassadors of the Nine in Tehran have been recalled to their respective capitals for consultations and to report to their Government on the Iranian response to the Nine's requests.

It should be made clear that the decisions of the Nine respect the Iranian people's search for a way of expressing their own particular conception of nationalism—a search fraught with difficulties. There is also a desire not to do anything which would aggravate what is already a difficult situation and to safeguard our legitimate personal and property interests. However, the most important remains our complete solidarity with the Government and people of the United States.

Nevertheless, it is our firm resolve that, by adopting a common policy in the appropriate international, multilateral and bilateral forums, the Nine should help ensure that the instruments of international law are used to secure the safety and release of these unjustly detained hostages. Therefore, speaking on behalf of the Nine from the rostrum of this House, I make a friendly but firm appeal to the Iranian authorities for appropriate action on their part.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Point 1.2.2.

<sup>2</sup> Unofficial translation.

### Statement by Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission

1.2.5. Speaking in the debate on behalf of the Commission on 17 April, Mr Davignon said that Commission fully agreed with the decisions taken by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine at Lisbon on 10 October 1979. He recalled the 'declaration on the European identity'<sup>1</sup> adopted by the summit meeting of Heads of State or Government held in Copenhagen on 14-15 December 1973 containing the principles which are to underlie the Community's actions, and then went on as follows:

"... The Commission is concerned about what should be the role of Europe in view of all the responsibilities it has to bear, the whole network of relationships it has established and the usefulness of what it wishes to achieve. This presupposes, first of all, that common action and solidarity be maintained because this is the only way of increasing the influence the Nine are able to exert. The Commission will do all in its power in Parliament, at political cooperation meetings and in the Council, to promote this cohesion. Secondly, I believe that, for action to be effective, what is required is not a timorous, cautious approach but a certain amount of discretion because the lives of individuals are at risk. This is why we are at a critical point. The Nine have outlined a course of action, recalled their ambassadors for consultations and it is now necessary to decide during this week and next what further steps should be taken. Here I should like to make it as clear as possible that the Commission shares responsibility for the implementation of whatever measures are agreed at the political level. I do not believe that this is the right moment to draw up a list of all the steps that could be taken to obtain the assurance we require and which is our goal—namely that compliance with the law should become a reality and not something which is merely talked about and not enforced. In this connection, I should like to point out that Article 224 of the Treaty of Rome provides for common action by the Community in the event of the threat of war and is of fundamental significance.

In conclusion, I should like to say three things: the first is that today the Commission pledges to this Parliament that, in the days to come, it will undertake the responsibility incumbent upon it of implementing a policy that will achieve the goals on which we all agree. The second is that the Commission will add its voice to those of the Council and Parliament in demanding compliance with international law and the release of the hostages. Finally, I would say that Parliament today has a special responsibility for ensuring the success of the European strategy, based on the fact that the type of society which Europe represents leads it to support a fearless and immaterialistic foreign policy, seeking to ensure that the rule of law is not merely a statement of principle but a statement of reality. It is therefore vital that the representatives of the people of Europe should share the desire to make this operation a success.

It is not usual for the Commission to make appeals to Parliament but I should like to do so today because it is important that in the outside world—Iran, the United States—but above all in Europe people should know that, despite differences in emphasis or shades of meaning, the vast majority of this Parliament has reaffirmed its desire that compliance with the law on which the whole of our society is based should not be a pious wish but a reality.<sup>2</sup>

### Parliament's position on the issue

1.2.6. Two motions were submitted to Parliament. One was tabled on behalf of the European Democratic Group, the European People's Party and the Liberals and Democrats by Mr Ferguson (*ED/UK*), Mr Blumenfeld (*EPP/D*), and Mr Berkhouwer (*Lib/NL*), and the other was put forward on behalf of the Socialists by Mr Glinne (*Soc/B*).

The debate, which centred mainly on these two motions, showed a large measure of agreement in condemning the taking of hos-

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 12-1973, point 2501.

<sup>2</sup> Unrevised text in unofficial translation.

tages. There were, however, differences of opinion about the usefulness of breaking off diplomatic relations between Iran and the Member States as the first motion required. The Socialists attacked such moves, which would, according to Mr Glinne, lead to unworkable and excessive measures. The political groups should not indulge in trying to outbid each other and diplomatic channels ought to remain open. Other Members, particularly from the Communist Group, emphasized the uselessness of economic and diplomatic sanctions, which would merely indicate the Nine's subservience to US policy.

At the end of the debate Parliament adopted the resolution tabled by the European Democratic Group, the Liberals and Democrats and the European People's Party, having rejected the proposed amendments. One of these amendments, tabled by the EDF Group, invited the Governments of the Nine, *Inter alia* to meet the United States Government to reach an agreement on appropriate measures to secure the release of the hostages. The resolution tabled by the Socialists was also rejected. The text adopted was as follows:

'The European Parliament,

(i) recalling its resolutions of 16 November 1979 and 14 March 1980 requiring the Iranian authorities to effect immediately the release of the hostages held in the Embassy of the United States of America in Tehran,<sup>1</sup>

(ii) further recalling the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations requesting the imposition of economic sanctions on Iran if the hostages continue to be held captive,

(iii) welcoming the statement of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation on 10 April 1980 in Lisbon,

(iv) recognizing the danger that prolonged violation of international treaty obligations can lead to the use of force in the pursuit of just objectives,

(v) anxious that traditional friendly relations between Iran and the countries of the European Community be restored as soon as possible,

(vi) expressing its deep sympathy with the hostages and with their families in the United States of America,

1. renews its condemnation of the Iranian authorities for permitting the illegal detention of diplomatic personnel;

2. calls again, therefore, on the Iranian authorities to contrive the speedy release of those hostages, giving a specific date for this release;

3. urges the Nine:

(i) to take all necessary and practicable steps, acting in full consultation with the United States of America and other members of the Atlantic Alliance, to oblige the Iranian authorities to release the hostages,

(ii) to formulate a common policy in this regard and with due consideration for the critical political conditions in the region, so that they can act in concert,

(iii) to contemplate, in the event of the hostages not being released, the suspension of diplomatic relations between Iran and the Member States of the Community;

4. expresses, in countering this grave threat to peace and to the rule of international law, its support for the United States of America as the principal victim, at present, of this outrageous breach of the normal conduct of peaceful relations between States;

5. instructs its President to forward this resolution to the European Council, to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, to the Council and Commission, to the Secretary-general of

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 309 of 10.12.1979; OJ C 85 of 8.4.1980.

the United Nations and to the Ambassadors of Iran in the capitals of the Nine.<sup>1</sup>

### Declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine

1.2.7. While in Luxembourg for the Council meeting on 21 and 22 April, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine held a special European political cooperation meeting on 22 April, at the end of which they adopted a declaration on the measures to be taken concerning Iran, both immediately and in the very short term (17 May) if no decisive progress was made towards the release of the hostages. The text of this declaration, which was endorsed by the European Council on 27 and 28 April, is as follows:

1. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine Member States of the European Community meeting in Luxembourg on 22 April discussed the implications of the recent events in Iran in the light of the reports by their Ambassadors following the *dé-marche* to the President of Iran decided upon by the Foreign Ministers at their meeting in Lisbon on 10 April.

2. The Foreign Ministers expressed the solidarity of the Nine with the Government and people of the United States at this time of trial.

3. While welcoming the visit by the ICRC to the hostages on 14 April and noting the assurances given by President Bani Sadr as to the living conditions of the hostages, the Foreign Ministers expressed their profound regret that the Iranian Government has been unable to give precise assurance about the date and methods by which the hostages would be released. The Iranian Government continues to ignore the clear call of the UN Security Council and the International Court of Justice to bring to an end a flagrant violation of international law and release the hostages.

4. Since the hostages were first detained, the Nine, fully respecting the independence of Iran and the right of the Iranian people to determine their own future, have insisted that they must be

released. The fact that after six months they are still detained, despite the efforts of the Nine and the clear condemnation by the Community of Nations, is intolerable from a humanitarian and legal point of view.

5. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine, deeply concerned that a continuation of this situation may endanger international peace and security, have decided to seek immediate legislation where necessary in their national parliaments to impose sanctions against Iran in accordance with the Security Council resolution on Iran of 10 January 1980, which was vetoed, and in accordance with the rules of international law.

They believe that these legislative processes should be completed by 17 May, date of the Foreign Ministers' meeting in Naples. If by that time there has not been any decisive progress leading to the release of the hostages, they will proceed immediately to the common application of the sanctions. Steps will be taken within the Community in order that the implementation of the measures decided upon should not obstruct the proper functioning of the common market.

The Ministers consider that, as of now and pending the entry into force of the measures mentioned above, no new export or services contract with persons or organizations in Iran should be concluded.

6. The Foreign Ministers decided meanwhile to put into effect without delay the following measures, to the extent that they are not already in force:

- (i) Reduction in embassy staffs in Tehran;
- (ii) A reduction in the number of diplomats accredited by the Government of Iran in their countries;
- (iii) The reintroduction, where not already in force, of a visa system for Iranian nationals travelling to member countries of the Nine;
- (iv) The withholding of permission for the sale of export of arms or defence-related equipment to Iran.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 117 of 12.5.1980.

7. The Foreign Ministers instructed their Ambassadors to return to Tehran in the interval in order to convey the present decision to the Iranian Government, to follow the situation, and to undertake all possible efforts to alleviate and improve the living conditions of the hostages pending their release.

They expressed the hope that the Iranian Authorities would act along the lines suggested in this statement.

8. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine, believing that this situation should be a matter of concern to the whole international community, call upon other governments to associate themselves with these decisions.

9. The Foreign Ministers decided immediately to contact the Government of the United States through the Presidency and to inform it of the decisions taken by them.'

### **Declaration adopted at the meeting of the European Council**

1.2.8. The declaration by the Heads of State or Government of the Member States of the European Community meeting as the European Council<sup>1</sup> at Luxembourg on 28 April also contains a paragraph about Iran, which reads as follows:

'... Since the occupation of the United States Embassy in Tehran and the seizure of its staff as hostages, the Nine have repeatedly condemned this inadmissible violation of international law. They reaffirm their solidarity with the Government and people of the United States in their present time of trial.

They consider that the situation created by this violation opens the door to developments fraught with serious consequences. A return to a state of legality is the only way to ensure peace and security.

The European Council reaffirms the decisions taken by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine on 22 April in Luxembourg.

The Nine declare their full support for the steps which the Secretary-General of the United Nations intends to take to secure release of the hostages.'

### **Declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine on Iran**

1.2.9. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine held an informal meeting, at which the Commission was represented by Mr Jenkins, in Naples on 17 and 18 May. At the end of this meeting, they adopted the following declaration on Iran:

'1. The Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the European Community, meeting at Naples on 17 and 18 May, re-examined in accordance with their declaration of 22 April the situation resulting from the detention of the American hostages in Iran, an act constituting a flagrant violation of international law.

2. The Ministers reviewed the information emanating from Iran. While noting certain developments which could contribute to the release of the hostages, in particular the completion of the second round of parliamentary elections and the forthcoming convocation of the Majlis, they had to conclude that there had been no significant progress towards the release of the hostages since 22 April.

3. They therefore decided to apply, in concert and without delay, the measures provided for in the draft Security Council resolution of 10 January. In particular they agreed that all contracts concluded after 4 November 1979 would be suspended. They will remain in close consultation in accordance with Article 224 of the Treaty of Rome.

4. The Ministers were pleased to note that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had charged Mr Ajib Daoudy, a member of the United Na-

<sup>1</sup> Point 1.1.15.

## Iran



tions Commission of Enquiry, with the task of securing the Iranian Government's permission for the Commission to resume its work and put an end to the crisis. They gave their full support to the Secretary-General, with whom they will remain in constant contact so that the measures taken with regard to Iran can be suspended rapidly if the UN mission makes satisfactory progress.

5. The sole object of these measures is to hasten the release of the hostages. The Ministers reaffirmed their desire to respect the independence of Iran and the right of the Iranian people to determine their own future.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Unofficial translation.

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 12-1973, point 2317.

<sup>2</sup> Bull. EC 3-1980, point 2.2.62.



## 27. Statement by the Nine on Zimbabwe (Rome, 18 April 1980)

On Zimbabwe's entry into the community of nations as an independent and sovereign State the Member Countries of the European Community extend their most cordial congratulations to the people and the Government of the new State, adding the sincere wish that Zimbabwe will be able to set out on the road of economic and social progress in a climate of national reconciliation.

This historic event, which is the result of co-operation among all Rhodesian parties, the persistent efforts of the British Government and the constructive attitude of the neighbouring countries, is the materialization of the hopes expressed in the statement issued by the Nine on 20 November 1979.

The countries of the Community declare their readiness to contribute to the economic and social progress of Zimbabwe both bilaterally and within the framework of the Lomé Convention if the new State decides to participate in it. They hope that Zimbabwe's example of the peaceful settlement of conflicts for the benefit of the nations of the region will lead to the solution of the problems still existing in southern Africa.

Source: European Political Co-operation, fifth edition, Press and Information Office, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, 1988.

## European political cooperation

### Ministerial meetings

2.2.59. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine, in Lisbon for the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, met on 10 April to discuss political cooperation. They adopted a further statement on the detention of the hostages in the United States Embassy in Iran.<sup>1</sup>

2.2.60. At the end of a special political cooperation meeting in Luxembourg on 22 April, the Foreign Ministers issued a statement on the same subject specifying measures to be taken in respect of Iran.<sup>2</sup> This was confirmed at the European Council on 27-28 April<sup>3</sup> and was followed by another statement at an informal Foreign Ministers meeting in Naples on 17 and 18 May.<sup>4</sup>

2.2.61. At the 22 April meeting the Foreign Ministers also adopted the following statement on UNIFIL's position in southern Lebanon.<sup>5</sup>

#### *Statement on UNIFIL's position in southern Lebanon*

<sup>1</sup>1. The Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the European Community meeting in Luxembourg on 22 April considered recent developments in relation to the United Nations peace-keeping force in southern Lebanon (UNIFIL).

2. They expressed their profound revulsion at the recent killing of soldiers of the force and especially at the brutal and cold-blooded murder on 18 April by the irregular forces of Major Haddad of two unarmed soldiers of the Irish contingent.

3. The Ministers recalled their statement on 11 September 1979 reaffirming their support for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and calling on all parties to give full assistance to the UNIFIL operation and to respect the decisions of the Security Council.<sup>6</sup>

They expressed very serious concern that armed attacks continue to be made on the UNIFIL troops, installations and equipment and that obstacles continue to be placed in the way of the force in its efforts to carry out effectively, and throughout the whole of its area of operation, the peace-keeping mandate it received from the Security Council.

4. The Nine believe it is vital that steps be taken to ensure that UNIFIL is permitted to carry out fully the tasks assigned to it and they support the efforts of the troop-contributing countries to ensure that this will now be done. They note that it is the intention of the Security Council, as stated on behalf of its member states by the President of the Council on 18 April "to take such determined action as the situation calls for to enable UNIFIL to take immediate and total control of the entire area of operation up to the internationally recognized boundaries".

5. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine call strongly on all concerned to give their fullest support to the measures decided on by the Security Council so that UNIFIL may be in a position to carry out in full the important peace-keeping mission with which it has been entrusted on behalf of the international community.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Point 1.2.2.

<sup>2</sup> Point 1.2.7.

<sup>3</sup> Point 1.2.8.

<sup>4</sup> Point 1.2.9.

<sup>5</sup> UNIFIL: United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

<sup>6</sup> Bull. EC 9-1979, point 2.2.55.

60. Joint Statement at the Conclusion of  
the 1st Ministerial Meeting between  
the Andean Council and the Euro-  
pean Communities and their Member  
States  
(Brussels, 5 May 1980, excerpts)

...

6.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Andean Group and of the Member States of the Community held discussions on international affairs reaffirming their commitment to cooperation between European organization and the process of Andean integration, understanding and peace in the world and the promotion of international social justice, economic development and respect for human rights. The discussions took place in an atmosphere of great cordiality and mutual friendship.

198

Source: European Political Co-operation, fourth edition, Press and Information Office, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, 1982.

7.

They also stressed the need for all the States to observe strictly the following basic principles: respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, refraining from using or threatening to use force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

8.

They reaffirmed their support for systems of government based on pluralist democracy and emphasized the dynamic processes of democratization currently under way in the Andean subregion, this being regarded as the most effective and most suitable means of consolidating a climate of stability and co-operation.

9.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Community were pleased with the favourable development of the activities of the Andean Group and the democratic character of this subregional integration process. They recognize the efforts of the Andean Group for economic promotion and growth, social progress and cultural development in the context of co-operation and a growing international political prominence. They acknowledged that the Andean Group was a factor for stability and balance and expressed their support for the efforts of the Andean Group countries to promote co-operation and peaceful relations between all the countries of Latin America and the international community.

10.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Andean Group acknowledged that the work for European unity and the rôle played by the Nine contributed towards economic and political stability and introduced an element of balance in international relations.

11.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Community and of the Andean Group stressed the importance they attached to maintaining and developing their relations and reaffirmed their joint resolve to enlarge the

scope of their co-operation on the basis of equality, respect and mutual advantage.

12.

They also stressed the importance, for the harmonious development of integration, of the rôle that has fallen to Andean institutions and European institutions.

13.

In this context, they were pleased that negotiations would soon be opening on the signature of a co-operation agreement between the European Communities and the Andean Group.

14.

They expressed their deep concern at the persistence of unresolved conflicts in the world and at the existence of centres of tension which were jeopardizing international peace and security. In this connection they expressed their resolve to promote the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and they agreed on the need to continue the efforts made towards complete general disarmament under effective international control, which would make available vast resources to facilitate economic and social progress.

15.

They stressed their concern at the growing wave of international terrorism and condemned the attacks on diplomatic missions and on the physical safety, freedom and dignity of diplomats.

16.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Andean Group and of the Community acknowledged the importance of the dialogue between the European Economic Community and Latin America for bringing the two regions closer and the need to restructure it on dynamic and effective foundations.

17.

As a corollary to the important talks which had taken place, they acknowledged the advisability of continuing this con-

structive dialogue. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Andean Group extended to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Community a most cordial invitation to meet again in one of the capitals of the Andean subregion...

## 61. Declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine on Iran (Naples, 17/18 May 1980)

...

1.

The Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the European Community, meeting at Naples on 17 and 18 May, re-examined in accordance with their declaration of 22 April the situation resulting from the detention of the American hostages in Iran, an act constituting a flagrant violation of international law.

2.

The Ministers reviewed the information emanating from Iran. While noting certain developments which could contribute to the release of the hostages, in particular the completion of the second round of parliamentary elections and the forthcoming convocation of the Majlis, they had to conclude that there had been no significant progress towards the release of the hostages since 22 April.

3.

They therefore decided to apply, in concert and without delay, the measures provided for in the draft Security Council resolution of 10 January. In particular they agreed that all contracts concluded after 4 November 1979 would be suspended. They will remain in close consultation in accordance with Article 224 of the Treaty of Rome.

4.

The Ministers were pleased to note that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had charged Mr Ajib Daoudy,

201

Source: European Political Co-operation, fourth edition, Press and Information Office, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, 1982.

a member of the United Nations Commission of Enquiry, with the task of securing the Iranian Government's permission for the Commission to resume its work and put an end to the crisis. They gave their full support to the Secretary-General, with whom they will remain in constant contact so that the measures taken with regard to Iran can be suspended rapidly if the UN mission makes satisfactory progress.

5.

The sole object of these measures is to hasten the release of the hostages. The Ministers reaffirmed their desire to respect the independence of Iran and the right of the Iranian people to determine their own future.



## European political cooperation

### Declaration by the Nine following the ASEAN ministerial conference

2.2.66. On the occasion of the political cooperation meeting in Luxembourg on 2 July the Presidency released the following statement concerning the conference of foreign ministers of the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, which took place in Kuala Lumpur on 25 and 26 June:

'The nine governments of the European Community, bound to the ASEAN governments by deep and growing ties of friendship and cooperation, have followed with close attention and interest the outcome of the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the ASEAN countries held in Kuala Lumpur from 25 to 26 June.

The nine governments of the European Community wish to express their support for the principles which inspired the work and the results of that international meeting. They consider that these principles are in keeping with those contained in the joint statement on political issues which was approved by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the EEC and ASEAN in Kuala Lumpur on 8 March 1980.<sup>2</sup>

On this basis, the nine governments of the European Community intend to reaffirm their joint commitment with the ASEAN countries for world peace, international cooperation and understanding, economic development, social justice and human rights and their joint conviction that all governments should base their international conduct on principles embodying the respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, the independence of States, the non-resort to force or threat of the use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

Therefore the nine countries of the European Community, together with the ASEAN countries, have repeatedly expressed their deep concern caused by the Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia and warned against the danger that the conflict in that country might spread to other countries in the region. They join the ASEAN governments in deploring the violation by Vietnamese troops of the

territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Thailand, which has resulted in an increase in tension, may constitute a threat to the stability of South-East Asia as a whole and causes still further grief and suffering to populations already tried.

The nine countries of the European Community subscribe to the appeal launched by the United Nations Secretary General for the re-establishment in the area of the peace and stability necessary for the continued implementation of humanitarian aid programmes which recently received new impetus from the international meeting in Geneva of relief assistance to the Cambodian people.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 204 of 9.8.1980.

<sup>2</sup> Bull. EC 3-1980, point 2.2.66.

**Stand taken by the Community  
on the Palestine issue before  
the United Nations General Assembly**

*Address by Mr Thorn*

2.2.69. Speaking on 24 July at the UN General Assembly special session on the Palestinian problem, Mr Thorn, President of the Council and of European political cooperation, made the following statement on behalf of the Community:

'The nine member countries of the European Community, on whose behalf I have the honour to address you today, have watched with distress the developments taking place in this tormented region. They deeply regret the hardening of positions on both sides, whereas only dialogue and a spirit of understanding can clear the way to peace.

They have frequently made known their views before this Assembly through a joint spokesman or the heads of the individual delegations.

They consider today that it is more important than ever that Europe should make itself heard and work in a more concrete way for a return to peace. That is the aim of the declaration issued on 13 June<sup>2</sup> by the nine countries of the European Community after the European Council meeting at Venice.

Quite clearly—and I should like to stress this point—the statement by the nine member countries of the European Community is fundamentally rooted in their concern to promote and encourage a comprehensive solution to the Israel-Arab conflict. In this connection the Nine are determined to encourage all positive initiatives whatever their sources.

But they consider that the close traditional ties and common interests binding Europe to the Middle East compel them to enter the search for a peaceful solution.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bull. EC 5-1980, point 2.2.4.

<sup>2</sup> Bull. EC 6-1980, point 1.1.6.

Too much passion, suffering and hate has accumulated in a land which had seemed promised a future of concord and fraternity between its peoples. It is time for an end to the language of violence and for all the parties to start talking to one another as equals. And it is time to move from rhetoric to the negotiation of terms and arrangements for restoring peace.

It is in this context that the declaration issued at Venice is to be regarded. There must be an end to ambiguities and a coming to terms with the realities which we have been only too inclined to fudge hitherto. Those realities are the State of Israel and the Palestinian people. The solution to the Middle Eastern problem lies in reconciling these two essential realities and enabling them to coexist.

In the view of the nine member countries of the European Community, two fundamental principles rule the search for a comprehensive peace settlement:

- the right to existence and security of all States in the region, including Israel;
- justice for all the peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

Everything follows logically from this basic requirement. Firstly, as set out in the Venice declaration, "all the countries in the area are entitled to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed borders. The necessary guarantees for a peace settlement should be provided by the UN by a decision of the Security Council and, if necessary, on the basis of other mutually agreed procedures. The Nine declare that they are prepared to participate within the framework of a comprehensive settlement in a system of concrete and binding international guarantees, including (guarantees) on the ground".

Secondly, "a just solution must finally be found to the Palestinian problem, which is not simply one of refugees. The Palestinian people, who are conscious of existing as such, must be placed in a position, by an appropriate process defined within the framework of the comprehensive peace settlement, to exercise fully their right to self-determination".

The negotiations which are to lead to a comprehensive peace settlement will be based on the

recognition and implementation of Israel's right to existence and security and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. Within the framework of the settlement Israel will have to put an end to the territorial occupation which it has maintained since the conflict of 1967. Under such a settlement it will also be possible to define frontiers for the State of Israel which will be internationally recognized and guaranteed.

The Nine are convinced that no comprehensive and lasting peace settlement is possible in the Middle East if the occupation of territories by force continues.

They are also convinced that the Israeli settlements constitute a serious obstacle to the peace process. Likewise recognizing the special significance of the question of Jerusalem for all the parties concerned, they will not accept any initiative designed to change that city's status, and stress that any agreement on its status should guarantee freedom of access to the Holy Places for everyone.

The Nine consider the renunciation of violence a precondition for constructive negotiations. It is necessary to create a climate of trust, which is vital if a just and equitable solution is to be found to the conflict in the Middle East.

Those are the bases and principles upon which the member countries of the European Community will endeavour to seek a peace settlement. These principles apply to all the parties concerned, and that includes the Palestinian people and the PLO, which will have to be involved in the negotiations.

The Nine have decided to establish the necessary contacts with those parties to find out how they stand and to determine, in the light of the outcome of the consultations, what form an initiative on their part might take.

The day before yesterday the foreign ministers of the European Community approved the detailed arrangements for the round of contacts which I am to have the privilege—and also the grave responsibility—of conducting personally in my capacity as current President of the Council. I will be setting off shortly, and the Nine are aware that the contacts with all the parties concerned will be imbued with the feelings of friendship and cooperation which characterize the traditional links between Europe and the Middle East.

I have just indicated the standpoint and concerns of the nine member countries of the European Community on the conflict in the Middle East. It is on that basis that those countries will be participating in this session. Unfortunately they do not feel that the draft resolution which has been distributed contributes to the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution which they advocate.

As you are aware, the Nine have always supported Security Council resolution 242, and continue to do so vigorously. They recognize that the resolution has shortcomings, particularly with regard to the Palestinian people, and they have made their attitude on that point known several times. Nevertheless, despite that failing, the basic principles set out in resolution 242 remain fundamentally relevant to any settlement of the conflict. It would therefore be essential for any resolution adopted during this session to refer explicitly to resolution 242 and not to contradict it, as would be the case if Israel were simply exhorted and invited to negotiate without being offered the necessary guarantees for its existence.

The Nine will determine their votes in this session in accordance with the general criteria I have just indicated. But I should like to express the hope that the results of this session will ultimately contribute to pacification rather than confrontation.

The Nine are convinced that only through negotiation can peace be restored to a region which has suffered all too greatly from bloody strife.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize the will of Europe, as an independent, unanimous and committed political force, to work in a concrete way for a return to peace, and to do this we must create a climate of trust, in other words abandon all extremist positions. I shall be calling upon all those I meet to show understanding and engage in dialogue, in the conviction that this will pave the way towards peace.'

*The Nine abstain  
in the vote on the resolution*

2.2.70. On 30 July the Nine abstained from voting on the resolution submitted to the UN

General Assembly special session on the Palestinian question. Luxembourg's Permanent Representative to the United Nations made the following statement:

'Only a few days ago Mr Gaston Thorn put to this Assembly the position of the Nine,' and in particular described the general criteria set down in the Venice Declaration of 13 June as indispensable to a comprehensive, just and equitable peace in the Middle East, to which the countries of the European Community attach vital importance.

Since the resolutions, by virtue either of what they contain or of what they omit, are not in accordance with the Venice Declaration or Security Council resolution 242, they obviously cannot be accepted as they stand by the Governments of the Nine.

The Nine intend to put their whole weight behind this difficult task, and they feel that their traditional ties of friendship with all the countries of the Middle East justify an initiative on their part. The nine member countries of the European Community did not wish to prejudice in any way the round of contacts to be undertaken shortly by their current President.

The Nine abstained from the vote because they did not wish to pass judgment on the substance of the resolutions. Their position, I repeat, was stated in the Venice Declaration. By voting as they did, they wished to demonstrate clearly their intention not to pass judgment on the eve of the talks which the head of their delegation is to hold with all parties in a full and friendly manner.'

### Ministerial meeting

2.2.71. On the occasion of the UN General Assembly session the Foreign Ministers of the Nine met in New York on 26 August for a political cooperation meeting to discuss the situation in Poland among other items.

---

<sup>1</sup> Point 2.2.69.

## 65. Statement by the Nine on the Code of Conduct (Luxembourg, 28 July 1980)

The Nine held an extensive exchange of views on the first results achieved in the implementation by the European companies concerned of the Code of Conduct adopted on 20 September 1977 within the context of political co-operation...

They welcomed these first results as an encouraging sign testifying to the sense of social responsibility of the South African subsidiaries of the European companies concerned. They are convinced that further progress could be recorded in the coming years.

The Ministers of the Nine reaffirm their commitment to observance of the Code of Conduct by European companies and their conviction that it constitutes an important instrument for promoting a far-reaching and peaceful development of South African society towards greater justice and freedom...

Source: European Political Co-operation, fourth edition, Press and Information Office, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, 1982,

## Political cooperation

### Ministerial meeting

2.2.59. Meeting in a political cooperation capacity on the occasion of the Council meeting held on 15 and 16 September in Brussels, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine adopted two statements concerning Turkey<sup>1</sup> and Lebanon, the second of which is reproduced below.

#### *Lebanon*

2.2.60. 'The Nine consider it necessary to voice publicly their deep concern at the situation in Lebanon. They warn against any action which might interfere with the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon and thereby entail the gravest consequences for both Lebanon and the entire area. They urge all parties to demonstrate the greatest restraint and abstain from taking any action or stand likely to prejudice the chances of a return to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East or obstruct UNIFIL's efforts to maintain peace and security in southern Lebanon.'<sup>2</sup>

#### Turkey

2.2.38. The Foreign Ministers of the Nine, meeting within the framework of political cooperation on 15 September,<sup>2</sup> also adopted a statement on the situation in Turkey, reproduced below:

'The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nine held an exchange of views on the situation in Turkey and expressed concern at the turn of events in that country.

They took note of the assurances given by the military authorities concerning the rapid re-establishment of democratic institutions, the

observance of human rights and the guarantees regarding the treatment of those politicians currently under house arrest.

They are deeply anxious that these assurances should be fully and speedily put into effect.

It is in this spirit that the Community will pursue its cooperation with Turkey.'<sup>3</sup>

# 1 The Community and events in the Middle East

1.1.1. The conflict which broke out between Iran and Iraq on 22 September has been closely monitored in the Community, as in the rest of the world, because of its political repercussions in an area which has been troubled for several years and the effects it might have on oil supplies and the economic situation in general.

In addition to the stands taken by individual Member States on the conflict, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nine have issued a joint statement on the subject in the political cooperation framework.

## The pattern of events

1.1.2. The open conflict that has been raging between Iraq and Iran since 22 September has been described by observers as the latest manifestation of an age-old rivalry. Relations between the two countries really began to deteriorate in the early seventies, with the Iranian Government supporting Kurdish rebels in Iraq, until Baghdad and Tehran signed what was called the 'Reconciliation Agreement' in Algiers in March 1975.

In fact, relations failed to improve, particularly with the advent of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the confrontations got progressively worse from the beginning of this year.

In mid-September the Iraqi Government denounced the Reconciliation Agreement of 1975; on 22 September Iraqi armed forces were ordered to attack Iranian military targets, and during the night of 22/23 September they went into Iran.

The immediate effect of the conflict was to interrupt oil supplies from both Iraq and Iran. Tanker traffic continued in the Gulf, but oil companies were afraid that the Straits of Hormuz, through which 40% to 50% of

world crude oil supplies pass, would be blocked.

## The position of the Nine

1.1.3. While the governments of a number of countries were expressing their fears and making their points of view known, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine, meeting on 23 September in New York in the European political cooperation framework,<sup>1</sup> adopted the following statement:

'1 — The nine Member States of the European Community express their deep concern at the military confrontation between Iraq and Iran.

2 — Noting the bilateral nature of the current conflict, they emphasize the need to avoid any action which could lead to its escalation. In this connection, they trust that other States, notably the major powers, will continue to show restraint.

3 — They endorse the appeal by the Secretary-General of the Islamic Conference for an immediate ceasefire and, with reference to the consultations initiated by Mr Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, declare their willingness to support any international initiative that could lead to a political settlement of the dispute.

4 — They emphasize the vital importance for the entire international community of freedom of navigation in the Gulf, with which it is imperative not to interfere.

5 — They intend to continue monitoring the situation very closely and remain willing to assist in the search for a solution.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Point 2.2.62.

<sup>2</sup> Unofficial translation.

68. Speech by M. G. Thorn, Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, at the 35th General Assembly (New York, 23 September 1980, excerpts)

...

Since Luxembourg is President of the Council of Ministers of the European Community and the Political Co-operation Council for the second half of this year, I have the honour of addressing this Assembly on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community.

The general debate in this Assembly is an opportunity for all delegations to define their positions in the present situation of the world as compared with the past, and also as it relates to what awaits us in the future.

Sometimes, we may have a tendency to prefer clear-cut change to vague, slow-moving evolution.

The year that has gone by since the autumn of 1979 has certainly not been lacking in important events. Yet international relations in the world were probably not marked in a decisive way by isolated events. The basic characteristic seems to us to be the need to provide appropriate responses to new problems that arise, both in the political field and in the economic and social field. That process, although not without its difficulties, is nevertheless an inevitable one.

There is an increasingly widespread perception of the interdependence of States in the world, and of their vital need to increase and improve their co-operation.

In the face of this interdependence, which must be taken into account in the everyday reality of international relations, we can adopt one of two paths. The first, a brutal one unworthy of civilized man, consists in freeing ourselves from our own dependence by making others even more dependent upon ourselves, that is, upon our goodwill. The history of the world since the Second World War has taught us that this path is a dead end and that it should no longer be seen as applicable to the future.

The other path is that of the search for negotiated solutions with the aim of reconciling in respect for the principles of the



United Nations Charter, the essential and legitimate interests of all parties. Freely accepted by them, this is the path that we are attempting to follow within this Organization.

It is also the path which the Nine have chosen to take within the European Community...

I should like to tackle a subject that is particularly dear to the Nine, that of the defence of human rights. In the States of the European Community, citizens enjoy a political system that guarantees fundamental freedoms. It is natural, therefore, that the citizens should have an interest in the lot of those who are still denied these liberties. Human rights, in our view, embrace at once and indissolubly the right to the integrity of the human person and the right to enjoy civil and political liberties, as well as economic, social and cultural rights. We are convinced that human rights are an important element in international relations. Peace and stability in the world are, indeed, better safeguarded once they are based on respect for the rights of individuals and once the necessary changes and adaptations are brought about through the expression of the will of those most directly concerned. The right to self-determination certainly is an essential factor in international life, and the Nine would wish to reaffirm their commitment to this principle.

The Nine regret therefore the numerous violations of human rights, whether they be wrongful imprisonment, torture, actions resulting in the disappearance of persons or persecution of the very defenders of human rights. I should like to lay particular stress on one of the fundamental rights of the human person, namely, the right of persons to live normally in their own country. Unfortunately, this right has often been trampled on and the need to seek refuge outside one's country has always existed, despite the efforts of the United Nations. The creation of the post of High Commissioner for Refugees illustrates this grim reality. But in the course of the recent history of international relations, we have witnessed the phenomenon of mass exodus, which affects whole groups of the population which we constrained to emigrate. We cannot justify such exoduses on the pretext that the departure of thousands of citizens is a voluntary act when we know that it is the intolerable conditions of life imposed on a minority or out and out repression that underlie that departure.

In the view of the Nine, these events constitute a violation of the most fundamental human rights. Furthermore, such a policy violates the rights of neighbouring countries by often imposing on them an overwhelming burden which imperils their own balance and thus prejudices their sovereignty.

The Nine continue actively to oppose these practices because they believe that this means of pursuing a policy should be stopped and eliminated.

Not content now with condemning this state of affairs, the Nine have exerted considerable efforts to come to the assistance of these uprooted populations. This assistance has been given both on an individual basis and out of the budgetary resources of the European Community. The Nine hope that as many Governments as possible will make their own contribution to this effort, which can, of course, at best only be a palliative. It is incumbent above all on the Governments responsible for these human tragedies to put an end to them.

The Nine remain committed to *détente*, which they consider as global and indivisible. The events in Afghanistan, as well as the repeated violations of human rights by certain countries, have inevitably had a negative effect on the situation of *détente* and, therefore, on the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which the Nine continue to consider extremely important.

The Madrid meeting, a new stage in this process after that in Belgrade in 1977—1978, is going to begin its work within six weeks in an international climate which, unfortunately, will be far from propitious. This fact will not, of course, discourage the Nine from doing everything in their power to contribute to its success, which will, in their view, depend on the following two conditions: all signatory States must be ready to participate in a frank and profound discussion of the respect accorded with the principles of the Final Act and the implementation of its provisions; these same States must also demonstrate genuine political will to take part in the examination of proposals designed to improve concretely and substantially the application of the provisions of all the baskets of Final Act.

In the view of the Nine, the tasks of nuclear disarmament as well as those of conventional disarmament must continue to figure among the highest priorities of our Organization.

In this regard, the consensus which has emerged with regard to the results of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978 has constituted a positive factor. The Final Document adopted on that occasion must continue to guide us in our work.

The deliberations of the Disarmament Commission are of undeniable interest from this standpoint. The recommendations adopted by this Commission will certainly provide a useful contribution to our work.

The Nine are gratified, furthermore, at the agreement that was worked out in Geneva during the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament on the creation of four working groups. We think that the work of those groups should enable the Committee to make progress in negotiations, in particular in regard to the important and difficult question of banning the manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Furthermore, the Nine wish to welcome the conclusion of the work of the Group of governmental experts whose task it was to assist the Secretary-General in the study of all aspects of regional disarmament, the results of which will be submitted to the General Assembly at this session.

The spring of 1981 will mark the beginning of the process of preparations for the second special session that our Assembly has decided to devote to disarmament. Here, on behalf of our Community, I should like to stress that we will spare no effort in seeing to it that this session makes a positive contribution to peace and security, which is something that all Members expect of it.

The African continent during the past year has been the scene of some remarkable events.

The international community fortunately has been able to note that certain African countries have made real progress towards democracy. Furthermore, recent history demonstrates that Africa is confronting with growing confidence the complexity of the problems that that continent has to face. The Nine note this evolution with satisfaction, because they are convinced that the best way of ensuring peace in Africa lies in the action of the African countries themselves, and in particular in their co-operation in the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Therefore, the Nine are convinced that only a

debate free of outside interference can bring about lasting stability in Africa.

In the same spirit, the European Community welcomes the willingness manifested by the African countries to set up systems of continental or regional co-operation and integration. The most recent initiative in this context was that recently decided upon by the nine African countries at Lusaka.

The settlement of the Zimbabwe crisis constitutes a particularly positive element. Thanks to the joint and tenacious action on the part of all those concerned, it was possible to bring about a peaceful solution. The Nine once again convey their congratulations to that country on its admission into our Organization, an admission that was awaited with impatience for some years. They are convinced that the process embarked upon in Zimbabwe shows that it is not utopian to conceive of a multiracial State in southern Africa based on the equality of all its citizens. We express the hope that this solution will serve as an example, in particular with regard to the establishment of the independence of Namibia and the abolition of *apartheid* in South Africa.

Despite these encouraging developments, it is appropriate to note that, unfortunately, the search for a greater measure of political stability has given rise to clashes and, indeed, acts of actual warfare often involving the exodus of large masses of the population. In sub-Saharan Africa, vast regions have furthermore once again fallen victim to drought. These combined phenomena exacerbate even further the tragedy of the refugees in Africa.

With regard to Namibia, the Nine continue to be concerned at the slow rate of the search for a peaceful solution that should lead to the independence of that country, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976).

Taking note of the South African recent response to the letter from the Secretary-General of our Organization, they regret very much indeed the delay in the application of the United Nations plan, adopted under Security Council resolution 435 (1978), a delay for which South Africa cannot deny that it has a certain responsibility. In the view of the Nine it is essential to sustain the efforts of the Secretary-General and of the contact group of the five Western Powers and the

Front Line States so that the plan worked out within our Organization may be applied.

The Nine stress the unacceptable nature of an internal settlement that would not guarantee lasting peace in the region. Furthermore they wish to remind the Assembly that they do not recognize the body known as the "Council of Ministers" set up at the beginning of July, which has no legal basis and is incompatible with the United Nations settlement plan.

The policy of *apartheid* pursued in South Africa is a matter of profound concern to our Community. The Nine vigorously condemn that system based upon institutionalized racism and regret that it should be maintained in an authoritarian way in spite of clear-cut disapproval and opposition. They regret that the internal debate, which they followed with interest, has not made it possible so far to bring about real progress towards creating a more just society. The Nine stress that the persistence of that situation will entail a growth of tension, thus jeopardizing the chances of an equitable and lasting solution.

In their statement of July 1980, the Nine publicly expressed their satisfaction at the encouraging nature of the initial results of the implementation by European companies of the Code of Conduct adopted by the States of the European Community in September 1977. They have no doubt that progress can still be made in defining and applying that instrument within the framework of the struggle against racial discrimination. The Nine recall their commitment as a European Community to the promotion of positive and peaceful development in South Africa that would put an end to the policy of *apartheid* in that country.

The democratization process requires courage and determination on the part of the countries of Latin America also. The Nine attach value to that process and also to the elimination of violence from political life. In that regard, it is to be regretted that there has been an absence of significant progress in many cases and also that obstacles have been placed on the road to democracy when the establishment of democracy seemed assured.

In the face of those events, the Community welcomes the path chosen by Peru and also the encouraging attempts at regrouping on a regional basis. The assistance of Europe,

itself committed to a similar process, will not be lacking, in particular for the democratic States members of the Andean Pact.

Europe is aware of its traditional ties with Latin America and we are therefore keenly interested in seeking ways and means of strengthening our economic and political relations with it.

In Asia the situation continues to deteriorate seriously. While only last year that region was the scene of just one major hotbed of tension, that is to say the Indo-Chinese peninsula, we now have to add a second, Afghanistan. Underlying the two conflicts we find the flagrant violation of the principles contained in our Charter, which is the basis of our Organization, that is the right of peoples to self-determination and the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of another State. Those rules of international life have been and continue to be violated unacceptably by States which take advantage of their military superiority in order to establish their spheres of influence, even at the risk of jeopardizing peace and stability.

Such a policy stems from concepts which the community of nations had believed obsolete. Unfortunately, the lessons of history seem not always to have been understood by everyone.

At the thirty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly, following an initiative by the ASEAN countries, a resolution was adopted by a very large majority condemning the invasion of Kampuchea and calling for the withdrawal of all foreign occupation forces from that country. That resolution was not complied with in any way, and if the food situation of the Khmer people inside the country or on the frontier with Thailand has slightly improved over the last few months, the political situation, as we know, has not changed.

The Nine recall their determination to see a continuation of international assistance by sea, air and land. They encourage the Secretary-General of the United Nations to persevere in his contacts with international aid organizations in order to ensure that food is provided to the peoples that have so shamefully been uprooted and left to starve. The Nine are convinced that only a political solution can bring about stability in the region and they appeal to all parties to

the conflict to make possible a solution along the lines of General Assembly resolution 34/22. In that regard the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops occupying Cambodian territory is an indispensable condition. In the view of the Nine such a solution should be based upon the existence of an independent and neutral Cambodia, with a genuinely representative government that would have friendly relations with all countries in the region.

In Afghanistan, nine months after the Soviet invasion resistance continues. Fierce fighting is going on between under-equipped patriots and a foreign army equipped with highly sophisticated material. In spite of the disproportion of forces, it does not seem likely that there will be an early end to the conflict. Last January the United Nations General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution calling for the cessation of the invasion of Afghanistan. In order to permit the re-establishment of a situation in accordance with that resolution which has not yet been complied with, the Nine, it will be remembered, put forward the concept of a neutral and non-aligned Afghanistan outside the competition among the great Powers. To that end, the great Powers and the neighbouring States should undertake to respect the sovereignty and integrity of Afghanistan, to abstain from interference in its internal affairs and to refrain from establishing any form of presence or military association with it.

Further efforts to promote a solution to the conflict have been undertaken by the Islamic Conference, particularly following the creation by it of a special commission to explore the possibilities of bringing about a political settlement with all the parties concerned.

The Nine express once again the hope that it will be possible to avoid the indefinite continuation of this particularly cruel war through a solution in keeping with the resolution by our Assembly providing for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and the free exercise by the Afghan people of their right to determine their own future.

The Nine have frequently repeated that they fully respect the independence of Iran and the right of the Iranian people to determine their own future. I repeat that before this Assembly: the Nine are definitely motivated by the sincere desire to achieve good relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran which has embarked upon a new phase in its history.

I regret, however, to have to add that unfortunately the major obstacle to such relations is still constituted by the problem of the hostages.

On behalf of the Community of the Nine it is my duty to say before this Assembly of the United Nations, one of the major goals of which is to promote peace and to create the necessary conditions for the maintenance of justice and respect for the obligations engendered by treaties and other sources of international law, how much the Nine are concerned by the continued detention of the American hostages in Iran. The Iranian authorities persist, unfortunately, in ignoring the unambiguous appeal issued by the Security Council and the decision by the International Court of Justice.

In the face of the continued detention of the hostages, the Nine, like other countries, have felt prompted to reflect in concrete measures their profound disapproval of this flagrant violation of international law.

At a time when the Islamic Republic of Iran has established democratic institutions and the new Government has taken office, the Nine and, I believe, the whole international community hope that this question will be resolved, that the hostages will be freed and that Iran will respect all obligations of international law, particularly those ensuring the protection of foreigners residing in that country.

Is there any need for me to state that the immunity of diplomatic personnel is the very basis of secure and normal relations among the peoples of the world community?

Furthermore, the general respect for human rights in that country too remains a subject of concern in Europe. Unfortunately, the recent acts of war between Iran and Iraq can only serve to aggravate tension dangerously and make the normalization of the situation even more difficult.

Since the last regular session of the General Assembly the situation in the Middle East has deteriorated dangerously. In the last few months problems relating to that situation have been dealt with by the Security Council eight times and have been the subject of a special session of the General Assembly. The steady increase in tension and the hardening of positions on all sides make it all the more necessary and urgent to find a global solution to the Israeli-Arab conflict. The time has come therefore to abandon the language of



violence and replace it by that of dialogue, a dialogue among all the parties concerned on the conditions and modalities for the restoration of peace.

A year ago the Irish Foreign Minister speaking, on behalf of the Nine, noted with satisfaction the progress achieved in the improvement of relations between Egypt and Israel following the signing of the Camp David agreements. So far those agreements—and we recognize their great merit with regard to Egyptian-Israeli relations, particularly in that they have made it possible for the bulk of Sinai to be evacuated in compliance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967)—have nevertheless not yielded the desired results, particularly with regard to the promotion of a just, lasting and global peace settlement involving all the parties concerned, which is, after all, our ultimate objective.

For years now the Nine have persistently recalled at this rostrum and elsewhere that such a settlement must be based essentially on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), applied in all their parts and to all the parties concerned, as well as on the basis of the principles which they have stipulated on various occasions.

Disturbed at the development of the situation in the region and aware of the particular rôle imposed upon them by the traditional ties and common interests which link Europe with that part of the world, the Heads of State and Government of the Nine published in Venice, on 13 June last, a declaration bringing their position up to date and stating their intention fully to fulfil the particular role incumbent upon them and to work more specifically for peace.

As is stated in our Venice Declaration, the time has come to promote the recognition and implementation of the two principles acknowledged by the entire international community—namely, the right to existence and security of all States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all peoples, which entails recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

From that twofold requirement flow logically all the consequences, including the right of all countries in the region to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed frontiers. The guarantees of a peace settlement must be provided by our Organization on the decision of the Security Council and, if necessary, on the basis of other mutually

agreed upon procedures. The Nine declare their readiness to participate within the context of a global settlement in a system of concrete and binding international guarantees, including guarantees in the area itself.

Furthermore, the Palestinian problem, which is not a mere refugee problem, must finally find a just solution. The Palestinian people, which is conscious of its existence as such, must be enabled by an appropriate process defined within the global framework of the peace settlement, to exercise fully its right to self-determination.

The solution of the Middle East problem consists in reconciling and bringing about the coexistence of two essential realities: the State of Israel and the Palestinian people. Consequently, recognition of Israel's right to exist and implementation of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination will be the very basis of negotiations which should lead to a global peace settlement.

Israel must therefore put an end to the territorial occupation that it has maintained since 1967. In this regard, the Israeli settlements represent a serious obstacle to the peace process. The Nine consider that those settlements and the demographic modifications and I would even say changes in property ownership in the occupied Arab territories are illegal under international law.

Similarly, in view of the particular importance of the question of Jerusalem for all the parties to the conflict, the Nine will accept no unilateral initiative aimed at changing the status of that city and stress that any agreement on the subject must guarantee freedom of access to all Holy Places.

Finally, anxious to put an end to violence, the Nine consider that only the renunciation of the use or threat of use of force by all the parties can create a climate of confidence in the region and constitute a fundamental element in a global settlement of the Middle East conflict. Such a settlement presupposes, of course, the adherence and assistance of all the parties concerned. The principles to which I have just referred are incumbent upon all the parties concerned, without exception, including the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which should be associated in the negotiations.

That is the position of the countries of the European Community, and it is on that basis that they will strive to contri-

bute actively to the search for a peace settlement in the Middle East.

According to the Venice Declaration, the nine Governments of the European Community have decided to make the necessary contacts with all the parties concerned. Those contacts should be aimed at securing information on the position of the various parties vis-à-vis the principles laid down in the declaration of 13 June and, in the light of the results of those consultations, determining the form which a European initiative should take.

The contact mission on which I have just embarked in accordance with that declaration has taken me to the following countries: Tunisia, where I met the authorities of that country and the Secretary-General of the Arab League; Israel; Lebanon, where I was in touch with the Lebanese Government, Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Council of the PLO, and representatives of the different communities; Syria, Jordan, Kuwait, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Egypt.

Furthermore, I have also had talks with the Palestinian side, with the Cardinal Secretary of State of the Vatican and with the United States Secretary of State.

At the end of this month—in a few days' time, that is—I hope to meet some local Palestinian representatives in the occupied territories.

I should like to thank all those who have received me—the governmental authorities and the representatives of the various organizations and communities—for their courteous and even warm welcome, the interest which, without exception, they have shown in the European mission and their appreciation of the rôle that Europe is playing in that part of the world.

There is no need for me to say that the principles enumerated in the Venice Declaration, which underlie the contact mission, are only partially and unequally accepted throughout the world. But the Nine are confident that the sincerity of their intentions and their determination to contribute to a solution of the conflict will be recognized and appreciated by all those concerned.

The conclusions of the European contact mission can only be drawn when it comes to an end. However, it is possible now to make a certain number of comments.

First, I have noted the concern, even the distress, of those with whom I have spoken at developments over recent months. This has led most of the leaders whom I have met to insist on urgent and decisive action in favour of peace.

In Israel the need for security is clearly more than a strictly military concept and is in keeping with an aspiration which is profoundly resented by the Arabs in the immediate vicinity and continues to be denied. However, that need for security is not exclusively an Israeli concern; it is something which is very much felt throughout the region, in particular by the Arab countries which are neighbours of Israel and among the Palestinian people in the occupied territories.

Secondly, I have noted that all the Arab countries and the Palestinians unanimously consider Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories and the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people to be two fundamental principles. This requirement, I feel, is part of a deeply-felt demand for justice. That is why the creation of settlements and the recent law passed by the Israeli Parliament declaring Jerusalem the capital of Israel are particularly resented by the Arabs.

Each of the parties directly concerned categorically rejects an imposed solution prepared without its participation. That, of course, applies particularly to Israel and the Palestinians.

I should like to inform this Assembly of a personal reaction. The sight of so much human suffering and so much effort wasted on war, and thus lost to the cause of peace, should encourage us to work even harder for a solution of the conflict.

The indications which I was able to garner in the course of my mission confirm the line which the Nine hitherto have been following. It has seemed more than ever true that only a global settlement can bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. This means that all parties concerned must be associated in the negotiation but also, as everyone must concede, that the problem of Israel and that of the Palestinian people are indissolubly linked.

There is no point in trying to solve those two problems independently of each other. That is why the Nine believe it to be necessary for Israel clearly to manifest its intention to put an end to the territorial occupation which it has main-

tained since the conflict of 1967. The conditions in which this evacuation would be brought about and the guarantees with which it would be accompanied should be the subject of negotiation. In the meantime Israel should refrain from creating any faits accomplis by installing further settlements which could only serve to erect new obstacles to the search for an agreement.

At the same time the Arab countries and the Palestinians must explicitly recognize Israel's right to exist. Within the framework of a peace settlement the Palestinian people should be placed in a position to take an unhindered decision, through the exercise of its right to self-determination, as to its future national identity.

I shall conclude by stressing the keen concern of the European countries in the face of the situation prevailing in Lebanon, particularly in southern Lebanon.

As the Nine stressed in their Venice Declaration on Lebanon, they wish to reaffirm their total and unswerving solidarity with this friendly country, the balance of which remains dangerously threatened by confrontations in the region, and wish to repeat their urgent appeal to all countries and parties concerned to put an end to any act which may jeopardize the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the authority of its Government. The Nine will support any action and any initiative likely to return peace, security and stability to Lebanon, essential factors for balance in the region.

It has emerged from the contacts which I have had with the Lebanese authorities and with the other parties that the problem of Lebanon is directly connected with the problem of the Middle East, taken overall, and particularly the Palestinian problem. The international community cannot, however, refrain from reacting right now, regardless of the overall Israeli conflict, to the prejudice which has been done to the very existence of the Lebanese State in its internationally recognized frontiers.

Following the recent events in southern Lebanon, the Nine thought it necessary to state publicly their profound concern and to issue a warning against any endeavour which might be prejudicial to Lebanon's sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity and which would entail the gravest consequences for that country and the entire region.

These events have hindered the rôle of UNIFIL to which four countries of the Nine have been making an appreciable contribution. In their Luxembourg Declaration on 22 April 1980 the Nine stressed the need for all parties concerned to make it possible for UNIFIL to perform fully the tasks which have been entrusted to it, including the carrying-out of monitoring work right up to the international frontier. These events also have contributed to an aggravation of the situation in the region and are contrary to the efforts undertaken, by the European Community in particular, to restore peace in the Middle East.

The Nine wish to call on all parties to demonstrate the greatest restraint and to refrain from any action or any position which is liable to negate the chances of a return to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

These efforts, in conclusion, are going on and will continue. The contacts which I have had so far have been very positive and provide us with some very useful indications. We are studying them most attentively in the desire to take some effective action for peace. The objective today is for the Nine countries of the European Community, on the basis of these reflexions, to 'work out orientations and concrete proposals which will mark the rôle of Europe in the search for the implementation of a peace settlement in the Middle East.

In the meantime we appeal to all parties concerned to refrain in the months to come from any acts or statements which may serve to inflame a situation which is already very disturbing and which may serve to destroy the minimum of confidence and tranquillity which we the members of the United Nations need so much in the search for peace.

Another problem which affects the Community of the Nine is the Cyprus conflict. It was therefore with great satisfaction that we learned that the inter-community talks resumed in Nicosia in the presence of the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Nine wish to express the hope that the conversations will lead to a just and lasting settlement in keeping with the needs and aspirations of the parties. I have personally had an opportunity to express to the highest leaders of the two communities Europe's desire finally to see these negotiations making substantial progress. We should like to thank Mr. Waldheim for his efforts to

this end. We also believe that, pending a final settlement of the dispute, it is indispensable for calm to be maintained in the island.

Permit me now to deal with certain questions concerning the functioning of our Organization.

The Nine are of the view that the representativeness of our Organization is a primary question. The authors of the Charter constantly are at pains to take into account at the same time the principle of the universality of our Organization, the needs for equitable geographic distribution and the maintenance of a balance among its organs.

The Nine are profoundly convinced that we should be particularly cautious and careful before doing anything to affect these balances, and it is in the interest of all Members of the United Nations to weigh most carefully the advantages liable to follow from an institutional reform against the disadvantages which it might entail. They think that it will be essential in the future to avoid anything which may do damage to the foundations of our Organization.

Furthermore, an independent and effective Secretariat, in accordance with Articles 100 and 101 of the Charter, is indispensable. It is necessary, therefore, to give considerable thought to ways of bringing about a genuine and lasting consensus before effecting any changes in the Secretariat, particularly those which may touch upon its effectiveness.

In the face of the economic difficulties engendered by the world crisis the problem of allocating funds to the United Nations is one faced by all Member States. The Nine think that the United Nations should react positively to this climate of austerity by avoiding duplication and identifying activities which have now become outmoded with a view to eliminating them as far as possible. A real increase in the budget might not even be necessary. It goes without saying that strict respect for the financial rules of our Organization should be assured.

Peace-keeping operations constitute a particularly important task of the United Nations. The Nine declare themselves ready to support efforts of the United Nations in this field and to participate in these measures to the extent that they are able. They appeal to all the parties concerned to see to it that they permit effective functioning of these operations according to the directives laid down in our resolutions. In

this regard it is appropriate to mention once again the difficult position of UNIFIL to which four States Members of the European Community provide selfless contributions.

I have just set forth at some length the common positions of the Nine members of the European Community on major world problems. I do not wish to add to this any national considerations, essentially because Luxembourg is fully within the European Community and fully supports its activities. I feel it important, however, to state two personal points of view.

A month ago I carried out a contact mission in the Middle East in the course of which I collected a mass of information and impressions about the Israeli-Arab conflict. I did so as emissary of the European Community and I spoke as such. I now wish to express a pressing appeal for reason and to call on all the parties concerned to demonstrate a spirit of conciliation. Time is not in favour of anyone. Those who believe that the consolidation of illegitimate territorial gains will ensure their security are seriously mistaken. Also mistaken are those who believe that preconditions or refusal to discuss with the adversary may be an advantage to them. Either of these ways will inevitably lead to confrontation, in which we shall all be the losers. I address a pressing appeal to all to contribute to this climate of confidence which alone will make it possible to emerge from the circle of violence and make progress toward a solution based not only on justice and law but also on mutual understanding. All those outside parties too would be mistaken if they believed that any possible advantage could be derived from deliberately maintaining tension. They run the risk of ending up like the sorcerer's apprentice.

Fundamentally, the security of all parties depends much less on a square kilometre more or less or the conquest of any strategic positions than the acceptance by all of the crucial fact that in the future the two communities will be living together in peace and confidence in this part of the world which is so important in history...



69. Joint Statement by the Nine on Cambodia at the 35th General Assembly of the UN  
(New York, 15 October 1980)

Speaking on behalf of the nine Member States of the European Community, I cannot but express our deep concern at the continuing serious situation in Cambodia. Hardly a year has passed since we drew the attention of the Assembly to the immense suffering of the Khmer people which, after having suffered the atrocities of the barbarous Pol Pot régime, was deprived of its independence by the invasion of its territory by Viet Nam. At that time the General Assembly made an urgent appeal to all States to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and to contribute to the search for a political solution to the problem.

Now what do we see today? In substance nothing has changed in Cambodia. In spite of General Assembly resolution 34/22, Viet Nam continues its military occupation of the country and the Khmer population, which wishes only to live in peace, continues to be deprived of its inalienable right to self-determination and of the exercise of the other rights recognized by the Charter and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Because of the continuing conflict, the suffering of the civilian population has hardly diminished. Furthermore, as has recently been noted, there is a risk that the conflict may at any moment spill over the borders of Cambodia.

At the ministerial meeting held on 7 and 8 March of this year at Kuala Lumpur, the countries of the European Community and of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) stated, in their joint communiqué, the concerns aroused by the situation in Cambodia. The proposals made at that time are still valid. This is why the nine member countries of the European Community support the initiative of the ASEAN countries reflected in draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1.

I do not wish to dwell at length on the humanitarian aspects of the problem in Cambodia. I should like, however, to say

that our Governments, as well as the European Community as such, consider the fate of the civilian population of Kampuchea and of the South East Asian refugees to be one of our major concerns. We have again demonstrated this by our concrete support at the Geneva conference in May 1980, for the international programme of humanitarian assistance.

The nine Member Countries of the European Community would like also to take advantage of this opportunity to declare from this rostrum how much they appreciate the attitude of the Government of Thailand faced with a human tragedy such as this. The Association of South East Asian Nations, and especially Thailand, deserve the full support of the world community: they can count on that of the European Community.

If we wish to reduce international tensions and relieve human suffering in the South East Asian region, if we wish to lay the basis of real co-operation in the region, let us seek a solution in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, a solution which should of necessity include the following elements: the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops; the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Kampuchea; and the recognition of the right of the Kampuchean people to live in peace and freely to determine its own future without any outside interference.

In the opinion of the Nine, a solution including these principles would guarantee the existence of an independent and neutral Kampuchea, led by a representative Government and maintaining friendly relations with all neighbouring countries.

30. Speech by M. G. Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council and Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, in the opening debate of the Madrid Follow-up Meeting of the CSCE (Madrid, 13 November 1980, excerpt)

The Madrid Meeting, after Belgrade, is the second stage along the long path which was inaugurated on 1 August 1975 in Helsinki, through the signing at the highest level of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in which I had the honour of participating. The fact that the latter was able to bring together around the same negotiating table almost all European States as well as those of North America, has constituted in itself already a turning-point in the history of post-war Europe. It was clear, however, from the outset that the translation into reality of this work of *rapprochement* among our States and among our peoples would be less dependent upon the texts of the Final Act than upon the way in which each of the 35 signatory States would implement them vis-à-vis their own nationals as well as in their relations with the other States. Please allow me to mention within this context two sentences I pronounced

132

Source: European Political Co-operation, fifth edition, Press and Information Office, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, 1988.

at the time of the signing of the Final Act as a Head of Government at that time: "Our actions only will show the determination of our will. The real test of the value of our work will be the will shown in our actions."

Since Helsinki undeniable and encouraging progress has been made in the implementation of the Final Act. I am thinking in particular here about the fields of circulation of persons, business contacts, cultural exchanges. This progress, however, in the period elapsing between the Meetings of Belgrade and Madrid, has been followed by serious steps backwards which only stress the present limitations of détente as well as a certain lack of confidence among our States. Is this a reason to be pessimistic now even before our Meeting actually starts its work? Indeed, the proceedings of the Preparatory Meeting as we all know have been extremely difficult. I think, however, that if we show now, and continue to show, some realism concerning the future possibilities offered by the process to which we are all attached and if our judgment of the past will be guided by sincerity and objectivity and not by a complacency which hides realities uselessly, then concrete results can still be achieved here at Madrid. At no time in our future work must we forget that our peoples for the month to come will have their eyes fixed upon us hoping legitimately that the outcome of our Meeting will give them new hope.

Mr. President, our Meeting of Madrid is opening in an international climate which, and let us be frank about this, has done nothing but deteriorate for over a year as also the relations among the participating States. This unfavourable climate is due to a very large degree to initiatives and attitudes contrary to the spirit and to the letter of the Final Act. In the first place, at the end of last year there was the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, a country which is traditionally neutral and non-aligned. This act violates the principles of the Final Act, which clearly expresses in its preamble the "close link between peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole". Moreover, the second of the ten Principles declares that the participating States refrain from the use of force or the threat of force in their mutual relations as well as in their international relations in general. My country at the

beginning of this year together with its Community partners had denounced this intervention and launched an appeal to the parties concerned to accept an equitable settlement. Unfortunately, we must conclude that to date no solution is in view for this part of the world.

This grave situation has had inevitable repercussions upon the state of détente in Europe and upon the relations between the 35 signatory States of the Final Act in view of the fact that détente is indivisible and global. Indivisible to start with: this means détente in our view is incompatible with a policy which exploits foyers of tensions outside the European Continent. A détente which were considered as being divisible at will according to the regions of the world would lose all credibility with our public opinions. Détente is also global, in other words we cannot make an arbitrary distinction between its political, military and humanitarian aspects. Détente as we see it must develop and progress harmoniously. Therefore we cannot admit that the debates on the military aspects of security can be used by some parties to reorientate the CSCE process and make us lose sight of the need to ensure the implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act, in particular those concerning the respect for fundamental freedoms and contacts among persons.

Within this latter context, Mr. President, the Nine States of the European Community deeply deplore that since the Belgrade Meeting the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, which is an essential factor of détente and to which all States represented here have subscribed at the time their supreme authorities signed the Final Act, suffered much too numerous and serious violations for it to go by unnoticed. The fact that five years after the Helsinki Conference citizens are still harassed and even persecuted and banished in some of our States only for having wished to further the effective exercise of all the rights mentioned in Principle VII of the Final Act with their own respective Governments seems to us indeed incomprehensible and certainly inadmissible. These acts contrary to the commitments undertaken on 1 August 1975, seriously and, we have to notice this, persistently weigh upon the work of *rapprochement*

among the States and peoples of Europe and North America which we all started together in Helsinki. We dare to believe, Mr. President, that the Madrid Meeting, in spite of these hardly reassuring premises that I have just outlined, will give us the opportunity to re-establish, or re-establish at least to a certain extent, this mutual confidence which has been so deeply shaken by the events and acts I have just mentioned. In order to achieve this objective, we feel that we must have the will, each one of us, to proceed to as complete as possible an evaluation of the present situation in which the CSCE process and in particular the implementation of the Final Act with all its provisions happens to be. In our opinion this review should be undertaken in all objectivity without polemics, without confrontation but without complacency. This means that all States must accept justified criticism if any of us have failed to comply with the commitments we have undertaken in Helsinki. Furthermore, we must take advantage of this Meeting to further the implementation of the Final Act and give a new impetus to the process under way since 1975 by taking concrete steps in all the fields of this document. In view of the fact that this document, which should always be at the centre of our work at Madrid, is one whole, the delicate balance of which was achieved only at the price of arduous negotiations, the proposals we will have to discuss will have to respect this balance and not unduly privilege one part of the Final Act to the detriment of others. I believe, when I say this, I am thinking in the first place of the military aspects of security which are part of the first Basket and which will play at Madrid, according to a generally held view, a more prominent rôle than at Belgrade without however being intended to turn our Meeting into a disarmament meeting. The Final Act expressly foresees that the experience gained during the implementation of the confidence building measures might permit the development and enlargement of these measures at the price of new efforts. It is taking into account this evolutive clause, among others, that the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the member States of the European Community decided, on 20 November 1979, to support an approach to adopt in Madrid, according to the French proposal for

a Disarmament Conference in Europe, a mandate laying down the conditions on which negotiations could be opened in order to agree by common accord on meaningful confidence building measures in the military field, verifiable, applicable on the scale of the whole European Continent and such that by contributing to the improvement of the security of States they will create conditions leading later to a process of arms control and reduction within the same geographical framework. The new confidence building measures which will be negotiated within the framework of this Conference will have to contribute also to give true transparency to the military activities in Europe and to reduce the risks of a surprise attack ...

Annual report to the European Parliament  
on Political Cooperation

Debates of the European Parliament  
November 19, 1980

*Annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities No. 1-163*

(Applause)

**President.** — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-593/80) by Mr Albert and others: Uganda.*

I call Mr Michel.

**Mr Michel.** — (*F*) Madam President, I beg leave to speak in support of this motion. There are three reasons which I should quickly like to outline.

The matter is very urgent because the elections are due to be held on 10 December. The country is under military occupation and is in the unhappy situation of being troubled by Amin's armed gangs which, especially in the north, are still plundering the population. There is a need — and this is my second point — to ensure compliance with the aim of this motion, which is to have a team of OAU or Commonwealth observers sent, as happened in Zimbabwe, to see that the elections are properly conducted in December.

The third point I want to make is that we of course realize that, in accordance with the Lomé Convention, we do not want to interfere in the domestic affairs of any country, especially an ACP country. But in view of the serious situation in this country which is emerging from one of the bloodiest dictatorships in history and which now needs stability, it is essential that democratic elections can be held and that in connection with this there can be a form of international intervention, not in the election itself, but in supervising that everything is done in a proper manner.

The December elections will therefore mark a decisive step in the life of the new Ugandan State. International solidarity and cooperation must be swift in the response to the Ugandan people who wish to see their country free again and to see it progress without any foreign occupation and without any interference in the proper conduct and fair result of their democratic elections

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

5. *Political cooperation — Situation in Turkey*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on

- statement on political cooperation by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation;
- oral question with debate (Doc. 1-507/80), tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Lady Elles on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Nord on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli and Mrs Bonino to the Commission, the Council and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, on the situation in Turkey.

I call Mr Thorn.

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as you know, political cooperation is not at the present stage among the subjects covered by a proper treaty between the Member States of the European Community. It is simply based on a political agreement, on the Nine's affirming their determination to consult together on all major foreign policy questions and wherever possible to seek joint positions. This is still not a common foreign policy, but it is a sincere attempt, with due regard for national sovereignty, to arrive at attitudes which all the Member States can share.

On the other hand, however, political cooperation is not divorced from the Treaties of Rome, as some people fear. Indeed, our activities have always been based on the principle of a correlation between membership of the Community and taking part in the work of political cooperation. We cannot have one without the other. This being so, Greece, which is to become a Member of the Community on 1 January 1981, is already present as an observer at the main



## Thorn

political cooperation meetings, in order to be able to join in fully and effectively from the beginning of next year. Conversely, it is out of the question to admit other countries, however important they may be or however interested we may be in maintaining close links with them. For those who are destined to become Members of our Community, transitional arrangements will provide for increasingly close harmonization of our points of view; for the others, normal consultations via the Presidency of the Nine will, I think, ensure the coordination which is so essential.

The Member States of the Community have now become accustomed to working together, along the lines I have just indicated, on all the outstanding questions of international politics. I propose now to give you a report, as you expect, on the essential points of their work over the past year.

The Middle East situation, and more particularly the Arab-Israeli conflict, has always been a central preoccupation of our Community and has continued to be over the past year. Although it is the view of all the Nine that the Camp David agreements and the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt were a correct application of the principles of Resolution 242 and lessened the threat of war in the region, we are still unfortunately very far from the comprehensive settlement which is the only way to peace.

Being conscious of the tensions which continue to affect this part of the world and of the consequent threat to peace, the Heads of State or Government meeting at the Venice European Council considered that the traditional ties and common interests which link Europe to the Middle East oblige them to work in a more concrete way towards a settlement. Their governments have frequently expressed their national positions, which are based in particular on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. On this basis, the time has come to put into effect two principles universally accepted by the international community, i.e. firstly the right to existence and to security of all the States in the region, including Israel, and secondly justice for all the peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. The Palestinians in particular, who are conscious of their existence as a people, must be placed in a position, by an appropriate process defined within the framework of a comprehensive peace settlement, to exercise fully their right to self-determination.

You are familiar, ladies and gentlemen, with the text of this Venice Declaration, from which I have just quoted the essential points. The European Council, anxious to do something effective, decided to contact all the parties concerned with a view to ascertaining their respective positions with regard to the principles we laid down in our Venice Declaration. It is in the light of the findings of this consultation process that the Heads of State and Government will in due course decide the form of any initiative on their part.

In my capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, I was given the task of making these contacts with all the parties concerned. As you know, I thus went to the Middle East, where I had meetings at the highest level in Israel, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. I also met the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization since, as you know, the Nine take the view that this organization must 'be associated with negotiations for a peace settlement'.

There were other contacts with officials of the Arab League in Tunis and the Tunisian authorities, with the Vatican, particularly on the question of Jerusalem, and of course with the United States.

The results of my mission were communicated to the Member States on various occasions, and their Foreign Ministers, with the help of expert advisers, are still deliberating on the report to be transmitted in a few days' time to the European Council on 1 and 2 December. It will be up to this Council to draw the necessary conclusions.

At this stage, I shall confine myself to putting to you a few considerations I also had the occasion to put forward at the United Nations. I noticed the anxiety, or even anguish, felt by all those I spoke with at the way the situation had developed during the summer and over the past few months. This means that most of the leaders I met stress the urgency of decisive action to achieve peace — I am talking now about the period when I made this trip, in other words the period up to the beginning of October.

In Israel, the need for security clearly goes beyond a strictly military concept and reflects a deep-felt yearning to be accepted finally by the Arab world, but unfortunately this is still largely beyond their reach. However, I must underline the fact that this need for security is not an exclusively Israeli preoccupation. It is strongly felt in the whole region, and particularly in the Arab countries adjacent to Israel, as well — need I add — as among the Palestinian population of the present occupied territories.

The second thing I found was that all the Arab countries and the Palestinians are unanimous in regarding Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and consequently the right of the Palestinian people to adequate self-determination as two fundamental principles. It was my impression that this demand corresponds to a profound desire for justice. That is why the creation of settlements, as well as the law recently adopted by the Israeli parliament proclaiming Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, arouses particularly intense feelings on the part of the Arabs.

Each of the parties directly concerned categorically rejects any imposed solution worked out without their participation. This of course applies more particularly to Israel and the Palestinians.

### Thorn

Lastly, I should like to tell this House of a thoroughly personal reaction. The sight of so much human suffering, so much effort wasted on war and thus lost for the cause of peace, should be an additional incentive for us to work for a solution to the conflict.

The information I was able to gather in the course of my mission confirms the line the Nine have followed up to now. Indeed, more than ever it is now apparent that only a comprehensive settlement can lead to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. This means that all the parties concerned must be associated with the negotiations and also, as everyone must accept, that the problem of Israel and that of the Palestinian people are inextricably linked.

Apart from this major initiative undertaken by the European Council in Venice, the Member States have been led on various occasions to make pronouncements on aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, particularly at the United Nations and in other international assemblies. They have always supported Israel's right to existence and security, as well as its consequent right to participate as a full member in international organizations. They have also made known their serious concern at certain Israeli measures which are bound to present obstacles in the way of a settlement, such as the creation of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, the expulsion of local leaders from the West Bank and the law on Jerusalem.

The Middle East unfortunately contains other centres of tension. The Nine thus continue to follow with great anxiety the situation in Lebanon. They are committed to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and have appealed at the highest level to the countries and parties concerned to put an end to any actions which would be detrimental to these principles. They stress the essential role of the UNIFIL, to which several Member States have sent contingents and which must finally be put in a position to carry out in full the tasks assigned to it, including controlling the territory of Lebanon up to the international border.

A more recent conflict is that which has broken out between Iran and Iraq. The Ministers of the Nine deplore this military confrontation and have expressed the hope that other States, particularly the Great Powers, will exercise the greatest restraint and see that the conflict does not spread. To date, it is as if this appeal has been heeded, although unfortunately we are still very far from the settlement which the Member States are prepared to help achieve. They have also stressed the extreme importance, for their countries and for the whole international community, of maintaining complete freedom of navigation in the Gulf. Here too, the fact is that the conflict has not really interfered with navigation as we feared at the start, although its broader consequences for oil supplies to Europe may still present us with some unpleasant surprises.

So far, the European Community has not felt that more direct intervention on its part in the form of mediation between the belligerent parties would have any chance of success. Over a year ago now, one of these belligerents, Iran, committed a flagrant violation of the elementary rules of international law in the form of the taking of diplomats as hostages with the backing of the highest authorities in the State. Such behaviour was bound to call forth the most vigorous condemnation on the part of the Nine, who have expressed their complete solidarity with the people and the Government of the United States. They made very forceful representations to the Iranian Government, via the usual diplomatic channels, for the immediate and unconditional release of the hostages. When efforts in this direction proved futile, our Community imposed sanctions on Iran in accordance with a draft resolution which would have been adopted by the United Nations Security Council but for a Soviet veto. These measures, which were applied at national level by each Member State, came into force on 17 May. They served to severely restrict relations between the Nine and Iran in all fields and definitely contributed to making that country more fully aware of the severe disapproval its barbaric action had provoked throughout the world.

As you know, the question now seems to be moving towards a solution. The Nine, who appreciate the positive features in the Iranian revolution, hope that the release of all the hostages will make it possible for them then to normalize their relations with Iran.

Another exceptionally grave situation, I am sorry to say, is the result of the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Forces. The Member States have condemned this invasion, as have an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. They have on several occasions — in particular at the highest level in the European Council — declared emphatically that the Afghan people has the right freely to determine its own future. In their opinion, a formula should be found for a solution which would allow Afghanistan to remain apart from the rivalry between the super-powers and to return to its traditional status of a neutral non-aligned country. Both Afghanistan's neighbours and the Great Powers should agree to forego all forms of intervention, whether military or otherwise, in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and respect its sovereignty and integrity. Up to now, despite the more or less universal reprobation it has encountered, the Soviet Union has maintained and even, we fear, increased its military presence, thereby inflicting grave suffering on the Afghan people, which is putting up valiant resistance with the means at its disposal.

A more positive note is provided by the revival of the Euro-Arab Dialogue. At the Venice European Council, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance they attach to this dialogue at all levels and the need to develop at all levels its political dimension.

## Thorn

In order to give effect to this policy, intensive contacts between the Presidency of the Nine and our Arab partners made it possible to organize, on a limited scale, an initial meeting of a political character in Luxembourg on 12 and 13 November. At this meeting the two sides, the Arabs and the Europeans, underlined the desirability of holding a Euro-Arab meeting at Foreign Minister level. Any such meeting should be very carefully prepared, so that it could be held before the summer holidays next year.

Before talking about the problems facing us in Europe, I should like very briefly to touch on the burning issues in South-East Asia, Southern Africa and Latin America which the Nine have discussed in the course of the past year.

We have to admit that there has been little change in the situation in Cambodia. The effect of the Vietnamese aggression against this country is to impose by force an illegitimate, oppressive government which replaces, it must be said, a government of tyranny. The efforts of the Nine must be directed essentially at relieving the suffering of the innumerable refugees driven from their homes. In increasingly close cooperation with the five countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, ASEAN, they are watching developments extremely closely and are assuming their part of the burden of aid to the people driven out of Cambodia.

In Africa, one extremely positive development deserves to be highlighted. Thanks to the determined and persistent efforts of the United Kingdom authorities, and most particularly of my opposite number at the Foreign Office, Lord Carrington, and as a result of the willingness to compromise on the part of all the parties concerned, Zimbabwe has at last been able to gain its independence, and has done so in peaceful fashion. This country, scarred by bloody internal conflicts, now has a democratically elected government. It has been admitted to the United Nations and was recently able to become a party to the Lomé Convention. Such a positive outcome . . .

(Applause)

. . . to a particularly difficult question is too rare an occurrence not to deserve the acclaim of this Community.

This is all the more important since in Namibia we are still far from a settlement which would be in accordance with the aspirations of the people and the requirements of the United Nations, despite persistent efforts by the group of five Western countries, to which the Nine have always given their full support.

South Africa, which maintains the same odious system within its own territory, thereby incurring almost universal reprobation, has still not understood that only an arrangement which fully takes account of the aspira-

tions of human beings of all races will ultimately be acceptable to the international community and thus viable. The Member countries of the Community are using their individual and collective influence to induce South Africa to open the way to applying Security Council Resolution 435 in Namibia and to reform its own internal arrangements as soon as possible, with a view to recognizing the equal rights of all men.

As regards Latin America, the Nine are particularly concerned at violations of human rights in a number of countries with which they are linked by traditional ties of a personal and cultural nature. Desiring as we do to strengthen these ties, we are particularly concerned at the practice of torture and the disregard for human rights in this continent. I can assure you that representations through diplomatic channels, often made with discretion, have brought relief in a large number of individual cases. In certain countries, however, the situation in this field remains extremely grave. It is especially deplorable that in Bolivia a democratic regime has had to give way to a military dictatorship. This means that the Nine are currently having to re-examine their links with the countries of the Andean pact, of which Bolivia is a member — while taking care, of course, not to harm the interests of the other Members of the Pact, which are governed by democratic regimes.

As to the Cyprus problem, this has always been a source of concern to you, and to us all, because of the close links our Community has developed with the island and with the other parties immediately involved. It is therefore, ladies and gentlemen, with some satisfaction that we have heard of the decision to restart the inter-community negotiations, which had been suspended for so long, under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General. I myself was able, on the spot, to inform the leaders of the two communities of the Nine's support for these negotiations and of their hope that they will be carried out in a realistic and constructive spirit so that a solution can finally be worked out.

The Community Foreign Ministers have also had an exchange of views on developments in Turkey following the military *coup d'état*. Any attempt to put democracy into cold storage, particularly in an associated country of the Community with ambitions to become a Member, obviously gives rise to some apprehension. The Nine therefore express the hope that the Turkish military authorities will honour in full the assurances they have given concerning the rapid restoration of democratic institutions, respect for human rights and the treatment of political prisoners. On this basis the Community will, as it stated publicly on 15 September, continue its cooperation with Turkey.

Relations between the 35 countries involved in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I have already mentioned, entered a new phase

### Thorn

with the opening, on 11 November, of the much-discussed Madrid meeting. As they have from the beginning, starting at the first preparatory meeting for Helsinki in 1973 and continuing through all the phases of the CSCE process, the Nine have closely coordinated their positions, in accordance with your wishes, in preparation for the Madrid meeting. I can assure you they will continue to do so during the meeting itself.

I myself had the occasion in Madrid to present the objectives which the Community proposes to pursue and the spirit in which the Member countries intend to take part in the Conference.

As you know, firstly as full an assessment as possible will have to be made of the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act with regard to all its provisions. This examination will have to be free of dogmatism and confrontation, but must also be carried through without indulgence. All the States — and I mean all — must accept fair criticism if they have failed to honour the undertakings formally given in Helsinki.

Secondly, it will be important to provide fresh impetus by taking specific initiatives in all the fields covered by the Final Act. This Act forms a whole, and its balance must be respected, so that the proposals put to the Madrid meeting do not unduly emphasize certain parts of the Final Act to the detriment of the others.

It is in the light of these general criteria that the Nine have defined their attitude to the three baskets of this Helsinki Final Act.

To go briefly over the essential points, as regards Basket One the Foreign Ministers of the Member States decided on 20 November 1979 to support an approach aimed at the adoption in Madrid, in accordance with the French plan for a Conference on Disarmament in Europe, of a mandate laying down the conditions under which negotiations could be started to reach agreement on militarily significant confidence-building measures which would be open to verification, applicable on a continental scale to the whole of Europe and capable of creating the conditions, by helping to give the States improved security, for proceeding at a later stage to a process of arms limitation and reduction in this same geographical area.

As regards cooperation in the fields of economics, science and technology and the environment, the Nine attach importance, among other things, to improving the administrative and technical arrangements for the exchange of economic and commercial information and statistical data and to improving facilities for business contacts. These fields should provide scope for progress in the short term, which will be in the interests of industry and more particularly of the small and medium-sized enterprises.

In Basket Three, the Nine attach particular importance to the question of the free circulation of citizens of all participant States. They also take the view that the dissemination of information, which should contribute to improved understanding between our peoples, and working conditions for journalists are fields in which substantial progress needs to be made.

As you know, the Madrid Conference had a difficult start because certain participants were disinclined to accept a balanced pattern of work which would allow sufficient time to be devoted to looking at implementation.

In my speech on behalf of the Member States of the Community, I expressed our concern on this question. The solution finally adopted on the agenda, the pattern of work and the timetable for the meeting will, in the Nine's view, make it possible to safeguard their essential interests. They will see to it that the work proceeds in such a way that these interests continue to be preserved.

Madam President, I have tried to sum up the main subjects to which the Nine have given their attention in the course of the past year. There are many other questions, of lesser or of less general importance, which I have been unable to discuss and which I no longer have time to mention. In the major international assemblies, the Community's presence has made itself felt both, I must emphasize, in the day-to-day work of consultations between the delegations and in the adoption of joint positions. I have myself had the opportunity on three occasions of speaking on behalf of the Nine before the United Nations General Assembly. Both these official speeches and the everyday work of the Member States' representatives, under the guidance in each half-year of the country holding the Presidency, mean that the Community is in fact now a reality on the international scene, an imperfect reality, it is true, but none the less an effective one.

*(Applause)*

As for Mr Glinne's question, the rules require me to read out the reply the Nine have adopted on this subject. The Council would remind you that on 16 September 1980 the Ministers of the nine Member States meeting in political cooperation adopted the following declaration:

The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nine held an exchange of views on the situation in Turkey and expressed concern at the turn of events in that country.

They took note of the assurances given by the military authorities concerning the rapid re-establishment of democratic institutions, the observance of human rights and guarantees regarding the treatment of those politicians currently under house arrest.

They are deeply anxious that these assurances should be fully and speedily put into effect.

## Thorn

It is in this spirit that the Community will pursue its cooperation with Turkey.

That is what we said on 16 September 1980, and this is in fact something we have already discussed in this Chamber.

At this stage, the Council as such has not discussed the situation in Turkey.

In addition, at the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 16 October 1980 the Turkish Foreign Minister stressed his Government's determination to re-establish a system of parliamentary democracy within as short a time as possible and re-affirmed that in the transitional period the Turkish Government would fully conform to the principles of the rule of law and the observance of human rights and fundamental liberties.

On the same occasion the Committee of Ministers — which, and this is why I mention it, includes the nine Community Foreign Ministers — took note of the Turkish Minister's statement and stressed the importance it attached to the principles of parliamentary democracy, respect for the law and the right of all the people to enjoy all fundamental liberties.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Madam President, we listened with enormous interest to the various items of information which Mr Thorn gave us in outlining the many problems facing us, and I shall begin by asking him, on the question of political cooperation, how he plans to organize *rapprochement* and dialogue between what I would call the countries of the inner circle, namely the Member States of the European Community with our own internal political cooperation, and the countries of the outer circle, the democratic countries of Western Europe which are members of the Council of Europe. There is no need for me to stress the common bond of ideology and fundamental structure which unites all these countries politically, and often, in our respective political groupings, we note in our relations with our Swiss, Austrian and Scandinavian friends a certain frustration on their part at not being fully involved in some at least of the questions we deal with. In the Assembly of the Council of Europe voices have been raised in favour of this kind of cooperation. I would very much like you to tell us what the national governments and the President of the Council himself think of it, since any such move should be made without confusing institutional responsibilities, with the aim of sharing and strengthening the ideal of political democracy and the attachment to fundamental liberties which are common to all the countries concerned.

On the question of political cooperation, let me say directly, before returning to this point later, that I regret that aid has been so disappointing recently in an area whose importance you none the less stressed, i.e. the inadequacy of the Member States' contribution compared to the objective of 0.7% of the gross national product which was discussed at such length at the extraordinary session of the United Nations General Assembly. It is disappointing particularly in view of the outstanding and well-reasoned appeal contained in the Brandt report, to which I hope to be able to return to later.

Europe still, and perhaps more than ever, presents a problem of peace and *détente*. To a certain extent the present crises in the world have weakened the process of *détente* in Europe, but happily they will not be able to halt it. It is exceptionally fortunate that in spite of enormous difficulties attempts are being made in Madrid, Vienna or elsewhere to find the political impetus which is necessary above all if we are to succeed in the first place in reducing current military potential while maintaining a mutual equilibrium in our own geographical zone which contains the greatest military potential in the world. In this connection, Mr Thorn I should like to say that our group particularly supports the initiatives of the French and Polish Governments, which have suggested a European disarmament conference, and of course there can be no question in our view of taking action only on the basket dealing with military balance. A pan-European disarmament conference? Very well, but maintaining the indissoluble link with the two other traditional elements of Helsinki, Belgrade and Madrid, and particularly without losing sight of the primordial question of human rights.

Mr President, you referred to the difficulty created for some months now by the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. I should like to say that recently, at the Madrid congress of the Socialist International, we expressed our disappointment and very deep regret that the Soviet Union has not responded to date to the appeals of the United Nations and of the international community to withdraw its occupation forces from Afghanistan and to respect the independence and non-alignment of that country.

Democratic socialists the world over support the declaration of Vienna on this point, which was reaffirmed by the recent Madrid conference, and in our view those who are fighting for reasons of collective and personal dignity in Afghanistan are not so much rebels as freedom fighters, a difference worth stressing.

You spoke a great deal, Mr President, about the Middle East. It is possible that as a result of the present international situation less attention is focused on this particularly disturbed region of the world than in the past. It is probable that the outbreak and continuation of hostilities between Iran and Iraq, the recent