

EUROPEAN POLITICAL COOPERATION

STATEMENTS OF THE FOREIGN MINISTERS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

1981

Statement on the release of the American hostages in Tehran	20 January 1981
Statement on the Namibia Conference	20 January 1981
Statement on South Africa	11 February 1981
Statement on Spain	17 February 1981
Speech, Minister of State, UK Foreign Office, on the Arab Israeli Dispute	12 March 1981
Statement at the International Conference on Assistance for Refugees in Africa	9-10 April 1981
Statement in the European Parliament on political cooperation	8 July 1981
Declaration on Afghanistan	13 July 1981
Namibia Day Message	26 August 1981
Speech by Secretary of State and Foreign Affairs, UK, at the 36 th General Assembly of the United Nations	23 September 1981
Statement on the Death of President Sadat, 36 th General Assembly of the United Nations	6 October 1981
Communiqué, EC-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting	13-14 October 1981
Statement on Cambodia, 36 th General Assembly of the United Nations	19 October 1981
Opening Statement, Madrid CSCE meeting	27 October 1981
Statement on Chad	17 November 1981
Statement on the participation of Member States in the Sinai Peace Keeping Force	23 November 1981
French government statement on the Sinai Peace Force	23 November 1981
Statement on Sakhorov's hunger strike	9 December 1981
Statement on Poland and Israeli Golan Height policy	15 December 1981
Speech, UK Presidency, to the European Parliament on political cooperation	17 December 1981

The European Council issued other statements. See the conclusions of the Maastricht (23-24 March 1981), Luxembourg (29-30 June 1981) and London (26-27 November 1981) meetings.

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

European political cooperation

Ministerial meeting

2.2.37. In Brussels for a Council meeting on general affairs on 20 January, the Ministers discussed a number of issues relating to European political cooperation. Discussions centred on the follow-up during the Dutch presidency to the Venice Summit fact-finding mission to the Middle East and on African problems.

2.2.38. Referring to the breakdown of the Geneva Conference on Namibia, the President, Mr Van der Klaauw, stated that the ten Member States of the Community greatly regretted that it had not been possible to reach agreement on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435. They had noted, however, the encouraging statements made by the Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations. It was important not to take any measure which might cause the situation to worsen or hinder the working out of a solution in accordance with resolution 435. The Ten therefore urgently requested the parties

concerned to explore all avenues that might lead to a rapid agreement. With this in view, they would continue to support the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his efforts to find an internationally acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia. They hoped in particular that the countries which had offered the Secretary-General their good offices would maintain their offer.

2.2.39. The Ministers adopted the following statement on the release of the American hostages in Tehran, which took place that day:

'The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the ten Member States of the European Community have taken note with great satisfaction of the decision by the Iranian authorities to free safe and sound the members of the staff of the Embassy of the United States in Tehran who have been detained as hostages for more than a year. They welcome the relief which this decision brings to the ordeal of the hostages and their families.

The Ten consequently consider that the measures imposed in respect of Iran in consequence of their declarations of 22 April and 18 May are no longer required. It falls to each Member State to take the steps which it considers useful for the re-establishment of adequate relations in the fields concerned.

On this occasion the Ten think it appropriate to recall the necessity of respect for all the principles of international law which should govern relations between States. In this connexion, the Ten look to the Government of Iran to accelerate the release of the four British citizens still detained in that country, against whom it is understood that no charges are to be brought.

The Ten have however always maintained that they fully respect the independence of Iran and the right of the Iranian people to determine its own future for itself. Now that the way is open for improved relations, the Foreign Ministers of the Ten express their

hope of establishing with Iran relations based on respect for independence and on mutual understanding.'

73. Press Statement by the Ten on the Namibia Conference (Brussels, 20 January 1981)

The ten member countries of the European Community deeply regret that, in spite of unrelenting and serious efforts to reach a peaceful solution to one of the major problems in Southern Africa, and because South Africa failed to seize the opportunity offered by the recent meeting in Geneva on Namibia, it has not been possible for the delegations to the recent meeting in Geneva, to agree on a date for the implementation of resolution 435 of the Security Council.

They took note, however, of the encouraging words of the acting chairman, Under-Secretary General of the U.N., Urquhart, that during the meeting useful discussions took place, valuable contacts were made and that consequently the meeting was only adjourned.

They therefore think it is essential that under the present circumstances no actions will be taken which might deteriorate the present situation or prejudice a solution in conformity with resolution 435 accepted by all parties. The ten member countries of the European Community urge the parties concerned to examine all possibilities which may be conducive to an early agreement. They continue to support the S.G.U.N. in his efforts to find an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem. They express their satisfaction at the efforts made by the Western Five in this matter and hope that the countries which did so in the past, will continue to offer their good offices to the S.G.

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

BRUXELLES LE 17/02/81 19H 26M 29S

OBJET : COMMUNICATIONS A LA PRESSE DES DIX ETATS MEMBRES DE LA
 ---- COMMUNAUTE EUROPEENNE CONCERNANT L'AFRIQUE AUSTRALE
 LA HAYE, LE 11 FEVRIER 1981

QUOTE

LES DIX ETATS MEMBRES DE LA COMMUNAUTE EUROPEENNE EXPRIMENT
 LEUR INQUIETUDE DEVANT CERTAINS DEVELOPPEMENTS RECENTS EN
 AFRIQUE AUSTRALE QUI VONT A L'ENCONTRE DE LA RECHERCHE
 DE SOLUTIONS PACIFIQUES AUX PROBLEMES URGENTS QUI SE POSENT
 DANS CETTE REGION.

LES DIX ONT APPRIS, AVEC PREOCCUPATION, LES RECENTES
 INCURSIONS MILITAIRES PERPETREES A PARTIR DE L'AFRIQUE DU SUD
 CONTRE DES OBJECTIFS DANS LA BANLIEUE DE LA CAPITALE DU
 MOZAMBIQUE AINSI QUE DANS LE SUD DE L'ANGOLA. LES DIX S'ELEVENT
 CONTRE L'EMPLOI DE LA VIOLENCE OU ET PAR QUI CE SOIT POUR
 RESOUDRE DES PROBLEMES POLITIQUES. ILS DEPLORENT CES NOUVELLES
 VIOLATIONS DE LA SOUVERAINETE ET DE L'INTEGRITE TERRITORIALE
 D'ETATS VOISINS DE L'AFRIQUE DU SUD ET DEMANDENT QU'IL Y SOIT
 MIS FIN IMMEDIATEMENT, LEUR REPETITION NE POUVANT QU'EXACERBER
 LES TENSIONS EN AFRIQUE AUSTRALE.

LES DIX ETATS MEMBRES DE LA C.E. ONT PRIS NOTE AVEC REGRET
 DES MESURES REPRESSIVES ADOPTEES RECEMMENT PAR LE GOUVERNEMENT
 D'AFRIQUE DU SUD ET QUI ONT RESULTE DANS LA DISPARITION DES
 JOURNAUX "'POST'" (TRANSVAAL) ET "'SUNDAY POST'", AINSI QUE
 DU BANNISSEMENT DE DEUX REDACTEURS SYNDICALISTES.

LES DIX NE PEUVENT QUE DESAPPROUVER DES MESURES QUI
 PORTENT UN COUP AUX EFFORTS DESTINES A ABOLIR LA DISCRIMINATION
 RACIALE.

UNQUOTE

Unofficial Translation

The Ten condemn the use of violent means for the solution of political problems and called for an aid to the new violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of South Africa's neighbouring countries. Any repetition of such raids, underlines the statement, would lead to a deterioration of the current tensions in South Africa.

The Ten also express their concern at the "repressive measures" adopted recently by South Africa resulting in the elimination of the "Post-Transvaal" and "Sunday Post", and the banning of their editors. The Ten stress their disapproval of these measures, indicating that they go against efforts to abolish racial discrimination.

Source: European Commission

Reply via RCA: call 212-248-7000

Reply via RCA:

Globe
TelegramGlobe
Telegram

5

European political cooperation

2.2.45. On the occasion of the Council meeting of 17 February, the Foreign Ministers also held a political cooperation meeting. Mr Colombo reported on his visit to Washington and his first contacts with the new Administration, and the Ministers discussed the resumption of the Euro-Arab Dialogue and the preparation of a Euro-Arab meeting at ministerial level.

Mr van der Klaauw told his colleagues of the preliminary meetings which he had as a follow-up to the Venice mission with the Secretary-General of the Arab League, Mr Klibi, and with President Sadat in Luxembourg. The Ministers also discussed the question of the Madrid CSCE meeting and the Afghan problem. Lastly, they expressed their concern at the kidnapping of the Head of the Jordanian Mission in Beirut.

2.2.46. The following statement was issued by the Presidency after the abortive *coup d'état* in Spain:

'The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Ten, acting within the framework of European political cooperation and aware of the important role of Spain in a democratic Europe, express their sincere pleasure with the failure of an attempt to overthrow constitutional order in Spain, noting at the same time that the Spanish people as a whole, inspired by His Majesty King Juan Carlos, have confirmed their commitment to the constitution and to democracy.'²

² Non-official translation.



BRITISH INFORMATION SERVICES

POLICY AND REFERENCE DIVISION

March 13, 1981

POLICY STATEMENTS

11/81. THE ARAB/ISRAELI DISPUTE

Mr. Douglas Hurd, Minister of State
at the Foreign and Commonwealth
Office, in Strasbourg, on March 12,
1981:

Both sides in the Arab/Israeli dispute would have to be enticed out of entrenched positions into which they had so deeply dug themselves, Mr. Douglas Hurd, Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, said when he spoke to the Democratic Youth Community of Europe Conference in Strasbourg on March 12, 1981. The continuation of these policies was bound to complicate the search for peace. While the West deliberated, he said, the position on the ground changed steadily for the worse.

Mr. Hurd said that the most obvious example was the process of establishing and developing Israeli settlements in the Occupied Territories. Virtually the whole of the international community had long regarded these settlements as contrary to international law and an obstacle to peace. On the Arab side, Mr. Hurd said that the PLO and certain Arab Governments must abandon the rhetoric which still denied Israel's right to a secure and peaceful existence. "Acts of terrorism" he said, "can do nothing but harm to the Arab and Palestinian cause." He said:

"The Ten members of the European Community have joined in a vigorous attempt to work for a comprehensive settlement of that running sore of international politics, the Arab/Israel dispute. The Venice Declaration of European Heads of State and Government last June marked the beginning of this attempt. This declaration of the fundamental principles on which the members of the Community believe a settlement could be based was followed by a tour of the countries most vitally concerned

/by ...

845 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y., 10022, Telephone: (212) 752-8400

by the then President of the Council of Ministers, M. Gaston Thorn, who discussed the general principles involved.

"The Netherlands Foreign Minister, President for this half year, is now on his rounds in the area, this time putting to the parties careful and detailed questions on the possible elements of a negotiated settlement. These questions have evolved from the thought which has been given to how the Venice principles could be translated into reality. It is already clear that this serious and considered approach is winning the respect of those concerned.

"No-one should be surprised that Europe should choose to play a more active diplomatic role in this crucial area of the world. Europe has a keen, continuing and legitimate interest in a negotiated settlement. We have no need to apologize for that interest, for it is dictated by geography and history. It will not go away. It is right that we should use our diplomatic weight to influence developments towards a just and lasting peace.

"It is a welcome sign of Europe's growing coherence that our interest in a settlement can now take the form of active diplomacy on behalf of the Ten as a whole. This diplomacy is already proving its worth. The Venice Declaration has been widely welcomed in the international community. It has served as a rallying-point for responsible opinion interested in a just and lasting solution to a dangerous problem. In the region itself friendly Arab states, who felt bound for their own reasons to stand aside from the Camp David process, have found encouragement in what we are doing. It has helped those of them who believe in a negotiated peace and has made easier cooperation between the West and the Middle East against external threats. It has shown those interested in peace that they need not wait helplessly to be dragged into another round of conflict.

"In his speech in Luxembourg last month, President Sadat also welcomed what we are doing. He spoke of the statement by the European Council in Luxembourg last year as a turning-point which is likely to have a constructive impact on the peace process in the near future. He urged support for the Palestinian right to self-determination and national dignity. A right which he described as God-given and not to

be thoughtlessly denied. Like us, he wants to see mutual recognition by Israelis and Palestinians, and understands the value of additional security guarantees as a contribution to a final settlement.

Complementing Camp David

"President Sadat has clearly seen that this European diplomacy is not aimed against what he, together with Mr. Begin and President Carter, achieved at Camp David. Our aim, indeed, has been not to contradict but to complement Camp David. Camp David was a historic achievement, for it brought peace between Egypt and Israel. It is crucial that this peace should not be undermined. But the process needs to move on if it is to be secure. In order to tackle the next range of problems there must be discussions which involve others. Even the Camp David framework envisages that others besides the parties, and especially the Palestinians, have to be involved. The Palestinians, through their own representatives, must be brought in to peace efforts. It is for the Palestinians themselves to say who these representatives should be, but there can be no doubt that the PLO enjoy wide support. The Venice Declaration says that they must respect the principles set out in the declaration and will have to be associated with negotiations. In our view this continues to be the right approach.

"In other words new thinking, new names, a new framework will be required. This is no easy task, but it cannot be dodged. I hope that we Europeans may be able to contribute.

"We are talking of a framework which can make possible a negotiated peace. Peace can only be negotiated. It cannot be imposed either on Israel or on any of the other parties. This is a principle fundamental to the whole European approach. Suggestions that we are looking to force one side to accept conditions which could never be freely accepted are without foundation.

"The Ten believe that this negotiated peace must depend on the right to existence and to security of all the states in the region, including Israel, and justice for all the peoples, which implies the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. That is a quotation from the Venice Declaration. It may come as a surprise to those critics who have read about the declaration but have not

/actually ...

actually read it. The right of Israel to existence and to security is clearly emphasized, as it has been consistently in European statements since the original Six first began to coordinate their foreign policies over 10 years ago. Those who impugn Europe's commitment to Israel fly in the face of the facts.

Obstacles to a Negotiated Peace

"Is a negotiated settlement on the basis I have outlined possible? Much will have to change. Both sides will have to be enticed out of entrenched positions into which they have so deeply dug themselves. There are policies and attitudes on both sides which are not compatible with a negotiated peace. The continuation of these policies is bound to complicate the search for peace. While we in the West deliberate, the position on the ground changes steadily for the worse.

"The most obvious examples is the process of establishing and developing Israeli settlements in the Occupied Territories. We and virtually the whole of the international community have long regarded the settlements as contrary to international law and an obstacle to peace. The process has now reached a point where there is a real danger that it may prove the block over which all efforts to find a peaceful solution will stumble. Why are the settlements so important? The central point is that a peaceful solution without an Israeli withdrawal is impossible. The Arabs ask how what amounts to colonization of the Occupied Areas can be reconciled with any intention to withdraw. And as the settlements develop and put down roots, will any future Israeli Government be able to impose their will on the settlers if that Government should decide for the sake of peace to dismantle settlements? With every new settlement and settler, it becomes more difficult to answer these questions optimistically. If Israel wants peace, it will have to halt this policy.

"South Lebanon is another area where needlessly provocative policies damage the cause of peace. Both sides must take a share of the responsibility for the constant and indiscriminate attacks which result in such loss of life and further fraying of the fabric of Lebanon. In recent days we have been particularly concerned again at Israel's support of Major Haddad, whose irregular forces are responsible for regular

/and ...

and indiscriminate shelling of Lebanese towns and villages. Settlements in the West Bank and forward policies in the Lebanon will not lead to lasting security for Israel.

"On the Arab side, the PLO and certain Arab Governments must abandon the rhetoric which still denies Israel's right to a secure and peaceful existence. The effort which now goes into denouncing Israel and attempting to undermine her right to be a full member of the U.N. and the international community would be far better channelled into the search for a practical means of coexistence. Acts of terrorism can do nothing but harm to the Arab and Palestinian cause. The time has come to move away from this path towards a realistic policy which accepts the need for compromise.

"There is much to be done. But slowly the forces working for a negotiated peace ought to become stronger as the thought of another war becomes more and more fearful. The United States' role in this peace process is a decisive one. We in Europe should and do recognize that fact. We are not in the business of transatlantic competition in peace initiatives. In this area, as in others, the West must work together. But there are ways in which we Europeans can make a distinctive contribution and we shall do so if we can. During the remaining months of the Dutch Presidency and during the British Presidency which follows in July, we shall be working out precisely what the form and substance of that contribution should be. Our aim, however, is clear -- to help to ease both sides into a position where each will recognize the rights of each other. It is no easy task, but 1981 may provide the opportunity for decisive progress. We cannot afford to miss the boat."

E N D

DWpp

A1-6, B4, EEC, P1/2/3/4/5/6/13.

European political cooperation

The Community and the International Conference on Assistance for Refugees in Africa

2.2.62. The Community and the Member States took part in the International Conference on Assistance for Refugees in Africa held in Geneva on 9 and 10 April. The Conference was presided over by the United Nations Secretary-General and attended by 97 countries.

Statement by Mr van der Klaauw

2.2.63. Speaking as President of the Council and on behalf of the ten Member States, Mr van der Klaauw, the Netherlands Foreign Minister, made the following statement:

‘1. This is a meeting which demands our hearts and our minds. The plight of the millions of people in Africa who have been forced to leave their homes and their countries moves us to compassion and feelings of solidarity.

2. Yet, compassion is not enough, for, if it only leads to acts of charity, the dramatic problems facing the refugees would remain unsolved. To the feelings and actions of our hearts we must, therefore, add a consideration of how our assistance is

to be organized. We must make sure that our aid really reaches those who need it most, and that it not only saves them from starvation but also enables them to build new lives in dignity.

3. ... Speaking in my capacity of President of the Council of Ministers of the European Communities and on behalf of the ten Member States of the European Communities, I want to assure you that we fully recognize the severity of the refugee situation in the African continent and that we highly value the efforts African countries are themselves making to alleviate and solve the situation. I would like to express our feelings of respect towards the African peoples and governments who have granted asylum and hospitality to the refugees. Their sense of solidarity—the more impressive because of the extremely limited resources of most of the recipient countries—may be held up to the entire world as an example of a humane approach to the refugee problem.

4. The ten Member States of the European Communities recognize the magnitude of the refugee problem in Africa. In recent years, the ten Member States and the European Community have made considerable assistance available through multilateral, bilateral and non-governmental channels. This assistance has been directed both at the care and maintenance of refugees in camps and at the achievement of permanent solutions.

5. We are aware, however, that the problems in Africa are not simply persisting, but are even increasing. Continuing worldwide efforts are needed to meet the immediate needs of refugees, to facilitate their repatriation and to continue the search for permanent solutions. We are prepared to participate fully in this essential and challenging effort. While for obvious reasons immediate relief activities remain urgently required, it is our common view that we have to explore long-term structural solutions.

6. ... The paramount necessity must of course continue to be that of helping to meet without delay the urgent needs of the refugees, many of whom are faced with death from starvation. Yet, we must not forget what have sometimes been called the ‘silent emergencies’ throughout the world: the untold millions of victims of mass poverty and hunger, whose claims for assistance have a legitimacy of their own.

7. The alarming increase in the number of refugees over the past few years has resulted in a growing imbalance between assistance available for humanitarian and emergency needs on the one

¹ Points 1.3.1 to 1.3.4.

² OJ C 107, 9.5.1981.

hand, and assistance available for structural development on the other.

8. ... The tremendous growth of the refugee problem faces us with questions relating to the allocation and reallocation of funds, but at the same time it forces us to take a look at the organizational side of the assistance rendered to refugees.

9. Here, I should like to start by stating that the Ten wish to express their admiration and gratitude to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and to his staff, for their devotion and invaluable work, often performed under difficult conditions. Furthermore, our deep appreciation goes to the many relief workers in the field, including those acting on behalf of the many very effective non-governmental organizations and especially the devoted work of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

10. It is true that a long series of important and arduous tasks has been thrust upon the High Commissioner's office, first by its very mandate, and then by subsequent resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations or by the Economic and Social Council.

The High Commissioner's primary tasks lie in the emergency phase of assistance and in the legal protection of refugees. Other agencies and programmes in the United Nations system and non-governmental channels are equipped to deal with the subsequent phases of assistance. Not all of them have so far taken on their full share in the joint responsibility for the care of refugees.

11. A thorough review of all administrative arrangements concerning the raising, administration and distribution of voluntary funds is urgently needed. I by no means wish to prejudge this organizational matter, but I am glad that this issue will soon be discussed, in detail, in the Economic and Social Council.

12. ... This Conference must reach practical and realistic conclusions. The African peoples and governments themselves have an important role to play in the search for a future solution, as they have vigorously done in the past. Ever since the creation of the Organization of African Unity, efforts have been made to provide a framework for constructive cooperation between African States in this field. One of the milestones in this process was the adoption, in 1969, of the OAU Convention on Refugees, which, among other things, regulates the important question of asylum. In 1979 this constructive approach by the African States and the Organization of African Unity was once again reaffirmed and further elaborated—in the light of increasing refugee problems—at the Arusha Conference on the situation of refugees in Africa.

13. However, the continued suffering of African refugees calls for a special effort from the international community too, so that relief operations can be continued and the number of permanent solutions increased.

14. ... The ten Member States and the Community are prepared to take their share in this international effort and to make substantial contributions available, the details of which each of them will announce in the course of the debate. I would like to emphasize our firm intention to take part, with all the means at our disposal, in the international operations on behalf of the refugees in Africa. The Community has concluded with most of the countries of Africa the ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé, which is an instrument for multilateral cooperation and which enables us to help also in finding a solution to the grievous situation of refugees. In this respect I would like to mention that within a few hours I shall preside over a combined meeting of the signatories of the ACP-EEC Convention in Luxembourg. There I shall draw their attention to the importance of this meeting in Geneva. Similar aid is supplied by the European Community, on a unilateral basis, to other African countries which are not party to the Lomé Convention. Finally, it should be noted that the Community's food aid to African States will be much greater in 1981 than in 1980. This is to take account in particular of the increased burden which results from the precarious situation of many refugees, whose subsistence can only be assured by the host country. This aid is supplied without charge and in many cases the Community pays the transport costs.

15. It would be difficult to put figures on these aid inputs, of variable form but identical purpose, without taking account of the substantial assistance provided bilaterally by the ten Member States of the Community. Without any doubt, more should and will be done and the Community will exert itself in this direction to the limits of its capabilities. Indeed, its participation in this Conference is evidence as to its intentions in this respect and its desire, in cooperation with other donor countries, to continue its aid for refugees in Africa either through the public authorities of the recipient countries or through international organizations which have proved their worth in distributing the aid.'

Statement by a Commission representative

2.2.64. A representative of the Commission also addressed the Conference, quoting figures to give an idea of the Community's aid to refugees.

'Since 1975 the European Community as such has assigned some USD 700 million in aid to refugees

and displaced persons throughout the world, in the form of food aid and financial assistance, in addition to the Member States' bilateral contributions. In 1975 the Community financed sixteen aid operations at a total cost of some USD 40 million. In 1979 the number of relief operations financed by the Community had risen to sixty-eight, for a total amount of USD 140 million, and in 1980 our total aid effort was of approximately the same order, of which about 50% was for refugees and displaced persons in Africa.

These figures illustrate both the magnitude of the problem of refugees and displaced persons over the last few years, and the willingness of the Community to respond to appeals from host countries and international and non-governmental organizations, a willingness confirmed by the President of the Council in the statement he made yesterday to this distinguished assembly on behalf of the ten Member States of the Community.'

The Commission representative remarked that the question of refugees and displaced persons was disturbing not only from the humanitarian point of view but also from the political point of view, as was noted by the Venice Western Summit (22-23 June 1980) in its declaration on refugees¹ and as the European Parliament has also stressed on several occasions. Moreover, the scale and nature of the problem had changed considerably over the last few years throughout the world and in Africa in particular.

The situation in which refugees and displaced persons found themselves could be subdivided into three phases:

- In the emergency phase, beginning with the departure from the country of origin, the needs to be met were essentials, such as drugs, food, seeds, tents and blankets, and these were generally covered satisfactorily;
- For the second phase—the subsistence phase—the international community as a whole had the necessary means: training, education and small agricultural production projects;

- Finally, there was the third phase: reinforcement of the economic and social infrastructure of the countries of origin (in case of voluntary repatriation) or (where voluntary repatriation was not possible) of the host countries, which were increasingly those developing countries which already had to cope with the multiple problems of their own populations' development. In this case the aid provided should be of benefit to both refugees and local populations, and should take the form of projects which were genuinely integrated with development plans and were aimed at settlement rather than just emergency relief or subsistence. In this phase, with a few exceptions, 'no overall consideration has yet been given to what is to be done. This is a serious gap which tends to make the situation of today's refugees and displaced persons a permanent one'.

Finally, the Commission representative announced—in addition to the bilateral contributions to be provided by the Member States—Community food and financial aid, already decided or in the process of being approved, for refugees and displaced persons in Africa for 1981, totalling USD 68 million (which in fact represents for the Community an overall budget effort of USD 85 million).

2.2.65. During its 6-10 April part-session in Strasbourg Parliament adopted a number of resolutions² on matters falling within the scope of European political cooperation; they included the situation in Poland and food supplies to that country, the military junta in Turkey, the crisis in Lebanon, the persecution of the Bahai community in Iran and aid for the Afghan refugees in Pakistan.

¹ Bull. EC 6-1980, point 1.1.18.

² OJ C 101, 4.5.1981.

77. Speech by Lord Carrington on behalf of the Ten to the European Parliament (Strasbourg, 8 July 1981, excerpts)

...

The international environment is far from serene. The shock caused by the Soviet Union's brutal invasion of Afghanistan some 18 months ago has still not died away. Events in Poland are a continuous reminder that a crisis much nearer home could erupt at any moment. We recall with sadness the events in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968: and I think that most of us realise how quickly an even more serious crisis could arise, with even more far-reaching consequences.

But the lessons of Afghanistan can bring us advantage if we

255

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

are determined to seek it. The Soviet occupation of that country has brought a new awareness in the Third World of the advantages of partnership with the West and with Europe in particular. Areas like the Middle East look to Europe to play a fuller rôle in these dangerous times. Here too we must ensure that our response is adequate...

Political Co-operation is an embodiment of the principle that the Ten speaking as one have more effective influence than if they speak with separate voices. Since the Luxembourg and Copenhagen reports on which political co-operation is based, we have come far. Particularly striking has been the unanimity with which the Ten have pursued their objectives at the meetings in the CSCE process, at Helsinki, Belgrade and, now, Madrid. It has also been gratifying to see the growing impact of the Ten as a group at the United Nations. The habit of co-operation is now I believe firmly ingrained in our Foreign Ministries at all levels. A greater solidarity in times of crisis has increased the confidence and security of us all.

Political Co-operation has been one of the success stories of Europe in recent years. But there is more to be done. The Ten have proved better at reacting to crises than at taking initiatives designed to forestall or resolve them. And there have been times when our reaction has been too weak and too late. Our failures are partly due to weakness in the mechanisms of political co-operation and partly to the weakness of the commitment to act together.

But I believe we are learning from our mistakes: on Poland, political co-operation has worked more smoothly. The statements of the European Council at critical moments have served to put on record Europe's determination to react firmly and decisively should Poland's right to settle her own affairs be interfered with. The rapid decisions of the Community to provide food at special prices made a useful contribution at a time of particular difficulty for the Polish Government and people.

Meanwhile, the action of the Ten over the Middle East has marked a new departure. Here at last Europe is not merely reacting to a crisis, but trying to make a positive and substantial contribution to resolving a long standing problem. The importance of the Middle East for the European Community, and the disproportionate contribution to security and

peace that a settlement of the Arab/Israel dispute could bring, make it essential for us to devote every effort to bringing a settlement nearer. During our Presidency we shall continue to build on the basis laid down in earlier statements by the Ten and on the valuable contacts undertaken since then by Mr Thorn and Mr van der Klaauw. A peace settlement in the Middle East depends first and foremost on the political will of the parties directly concerned—Europe does not seek to solve the problem on its own. We also recognise the crucial rôle played by the United States with whom, like our Luxembourg and Dutch predecessors, we shall maintain close contact. European and US efforts have been and will remain complementary. The Ten's task is to persuade all who will listen of the importance of a peaceful solution and the need for each side to accept the rights of the other, in accordance with the two fundamental and mutually balancing principles set out at Venice.

A second example of political co-operation on the move is the initiative on Afghanistan announced by the European Council on 30 June. This is a serious attempt to find a political solution to the crisis in Afghanistan. We are proposing a two-stage conference to be held early this autumn. The work of the first stage will be to work out international arrangements designed to bring about the cessation of external intervention and safeguards to prevent it in the future and thus to create conditions in which Afghanistan's independence and non-alignment can be assured. The participants would include the permanent members of the Security Council and countries of the region as well as the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Islamic Conference. The second stage would also include representatives of the Afghan people and its purpose would be to reach agreement on the implementation of the international arrangements and on all other matters designed to assure Afghanistan's future as an independent and non-aligned state. The European Council's proposal has been widely supported.

I have just come back from Moscow where I have been discussing this with Mr Gromyko. In explaining the proposal I made it plain that I was speaking on behalf of the Ten member states of the European Community. I emphasised that the problem with which it dealt was one of global

significance and whose solution was essential in the interest of peace, stability and the development of East/West relations. I reminded the Soviet Government that the Ten—and indeed the great majority of the international community—are convinced that the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops is an essential element of any solution. Mr Gromyko took the view that the proposal by the Ten was, as he put it, “unrealistic”, because the main problem was intervention by others in the affairs of Afghanistan, because it was not stated that the present Afghan regime should participate at the outset and because the proposed composition of the conference was unsatisfactory. I told him that I did not find these arguments convincing. Mr Gromyko did not say that he rejected the proposal and did not exclude further discussion. For my part I made it plain that the proposal, which has already received an encouraging degree of support in the international community, remains on the table and that a positive response from the Soviet Union was highly desirable in the interests of world peace and stability. The proposal provides the best hope of a negotiated settlement, which is wanted by the international community, and which the Soviet Union has also said that they want. It is obvious that a Soviet refusal to negotiate on Afghanistan makes it impossible to speak of normal relations and prejudices efforts to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on other matters. Ours is a serious proposal, and I hope that on reflection the Soviet Government will react in a constructive manner.

But the gap between Europe’s potential influence in the world and what it has actually achieved is still too wide. If political co-operation is to prove adequate to the expectations that are increasingly laid upon it, then we will need to strengthen the existing arrangements. The Netherlands Presidency have already done good work in preparing for this. The UK Presidency will carry on the task. It is one to which I attach particular importance and a number of my colleagues have made it clear that this feeling is widely shared.

Progress in political co-operation can never be a substitute for progress with the activities of the Community. They are, when all is said, but two sides of the same coin. We must build up our cohesion and unity on both fronts...

78. Declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the Ten on Afghanistan (Brussels, 13 July 1981)

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten Member States of the European Community today considered a report by the President on recent developments relating to the European Council's proposal of 30 June on Afghanistan. They noted that favourable reactions had been received from a significant number of governments and that the response of others was awaited. The Foreign Ministers look forward to a continuation of contacts on this matter, both bilaterally and in the framework of the appropriate international groupings.

The Ten Foreign Ministers strongly believe that the approach outlined in the proposal represents a logical, realistic and constructive attempt to resolve an international problem which remains an important cause of international tension and human suffering. They intend to continue to work for a solution which would considerably improve the international situation in accordance with the principles contained in that proposal.

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

79. Namibia Day Message of the Ten (New York, 26 August 1981)

1.

In my capacity as representative of the Country at present exercising the Presidency of the European Community, it gives me pleasure to convey to your Excellency greetings on behalf of the Ten Member States of the European Community on the occasion of Namibia Day.

2.

We wish to take this opportunity to reiterate our firm conviction that the people of Namibia, as a matter of great urgency, must be permitted to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with the settlement plan which

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

was approved by the Security Council in Resolution 435, and accepted by the parties concerned. We also wish to assure your Excellency of our continuing support for your efforts in that direction.

3.

The past year has been one of reverses for the early settlement of the Namibian problem, most notably at the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva. An important opportunity to achieve Namibia's independence through an internationally acceptable solution was then lost through South Africa's unwillingness to proceed. Our Ten Countries deeply regret that because of South Africa's attitude it has continued to prove impossible to reach agreement on implementation of the settlement plan. We are gravely concerned at the consequences for the whole region of continuing delay.

4.

It is therefore all the more necessary urgently to carry on the effort to bring about the independence of Namibia in conformity with Security Council Resolutions 385 and 435. We welcome and support the continued readiness of the Front Line States to make their special contribution and the renewed determination of the five Western States to continue their effort. We believe that South Africa should not continue to deny the people of Namibia its right to self-determination and independence. We urge those concerned, above all South Africa, not to throw away the progress that has already been achieved, and to examine all the possibilities that may help to bring about an early agreement.



BRITISH INFORMATION SERVICES

UNITED KINGDOM PRESIDENCY OF THE COUNCIL
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
JULY - DECEMBER 1981

September 23, 1981

POLICY STATEMENTS

PS(E) 2

SPEECH DELIVERED BY

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE LORD CARRINGTON,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND,

ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

AND ITS TEN MEMBER STATES

AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ON SEPTEMBER 22, 1981

845 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y., 10022, Telephone: (212) 752-8400

The United Kingdom currently occupies the Presidency of the European Community. My speech this year is therefore made on behalf of the Community and its ten Member States, and I shall abstain in the interests of brevity from adding the customary remarks on a national basis.

In this capacity, it is a particular pleasure to convey to you, Mr President, at the outset of the Thirty-sixth Session of this Assembly, very sincere congratulations on your election to the Presidency at this Session. I know that with your distinguished career and your considerable experience in this organisation you will guide our proceedings with skill and authority.

I should also like to convey my warmest congratulations and admiration to the outgoing President for his efficient and capable conduct of the proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Session of the General Assembly and also the Eighth Emergency Special Session.

The Ten Member Countries of the European Community also wish to express their gratitude to the Secretary-General for a further year of strenuous effort in the cause of peace.

Three principles are fundamental to the European Community and underlie its activity in the world today, and the role it seeks to play in the United Nations. First, the Community was born from a determination to avoid the recurrence of war and a desire for permanent and fruitful reconciliation. Secondly, it looks to partnership and collaboration between neighbours as a way to stimulate social and economic progress. And thirdly it is based on a belief in the fundamental importance of human rights.

The first principle, its commitment to international reconciliation, explains why the European Community feels a duty to help where it can with the problems that afflict the world. All conflicts, local, regional, or global, adversely affect the possibilities for peace and progress throughout the world. All of them add to the sum of human misery.

Middle East

The conflict which perhaps poses most dangers is the Arab/Israel dispute. The European Community believes that it has a distinctive role to play in the search for a negotiated, comprehensive settlement which must be both just and lasting. The Ten's view of the principles according to which a settlement can be devised, starting from Security Council Resolution 242, was set out in the Venice and Luxembourg Declarations of 13 June and 2 December 1980 respectively. The starting point must be the right to existence and security of all states in the area, including Israel, and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination. Acceptance of these principles by the parties concerned would remove a major obstacle to progress.

The Ten will pursue their efforts to promote a peace settlement energetically. Nevertheless we must be clear about what the European Community can and cannot achieve. Ultimately it is for the parties to negotiate a lasting settlement themselves. In our view a comprehensive settlement can only be negotiated if all the parties concerned, including the Palestinian people and the PLO, which will have to be associated with negotiations, accept the principles which we

set out in the Venice Declaration, and play their full part. One of Europe's main aims is to facilitate such negotiations, complementing the efforts of others towards the same objective. These thoughts underlay the Venice Declaration and the subsequent diplomatic efforts of the Ten, notably the contacts made by Britain's predecessors in the Presidency.

If a settlement is to be possible a climate of confidence must first be built up between the parties. Both sides must refrain from words or acts, particularly acts of violence as in recent months, which only complicate the search for a settlement. The Ten are bound to repeat that the Israeli policy of settlements is contrary to international law, and a major obstacle to progress towards peace. Nevertheless, while pursuing their efforts in every other possible way, the European Community will work to encourage a climate of confidence as a contribution to a comprehensive settlement. They therefore welcome all clear statements of interest in a peaceful settlement, including that made last month by Crown Prince Fahd of Saudi Arabia.

I should like to put on record the Ten's sympathy for human suffering in Lebanon and our support for the efforts of the Lebanese Government to promote security and national reconciliation. We believe that the unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon can only be assured if all concerned uphold the authority of the legal government and avoid all actions tending to undermine it. In this context the Ten value the work of the Quadripartite Committee of the Arab League. In South Lebanon the ceasefire has been a valuable achievement. We hope it will be possible to reinforce it and build on it. The Ten welcome and support all diplomatic efforts to this end. In particular they

believe that the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon should be enabled to carry out in full the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council. Meanwhile, we applaud the courageous and responsible work of the Force and express our sympathy for their losses: and I take this opportunity to reaffirm the support of the Ten for the valuable peacekeeping work of the United Nations in other areas also.

Afghanistan

If history, traditional and geographical proximity make the Middle East of particular concern to Europe we are no less concerned about other crises which strike at the very basis on which international peace and stability must rest.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which constitutes a grave breach of the UN Charter, is one such crisis. It is an affront to international opinion that the Soviet military occupation there continues. It has brought untold suffering for millions of Afghan people and untold problems for the countries to which large numbers of them have fled. It is to seek relief for that suffering and to contribute to international peace and stability that the European Council put forward its plan for a two-stage conference on Afghanistan.

The Ten's proposal for such a conference has received widespread support. It is therefore a great disappointment that the Soviet Union's response has so far been negative.

If the Soviet Union is sincere in its stated desire to withdraw its troops in the context of a political solution then the proposal of the Ten offers a way for negotiations to

begin. If however the Soviet Union's only real concern is to obtain the acquiescence of the international community in its occupation of Afghanistan, and increased status and recognition for a regime which is rejected by the Afghan people and world opinion, then the outlook for any negotiation is grim indeed.

The Ten support any efforts which will bring foreign intervention in Afghanistan to an end and allow that country to return to its traditional independent and non-aligned status. It is essential that the principles of the resolutions of this assembly should be observed. The Ten support the efforts of the Islamic Conference and the UN Secretary-General to find a way to a peaceful settlement in accordance with those resolutions.

South-East Asia

Another country which has been invaded and then occupied by a more powerful neighbour is Cambodia. Thanks to the admirable efforts of the international emergency relief operation led by UNICEF and the International Committee of the Red Cross the physical condition of much of the population of Cambodia has been transformed in the last two years. The European Community and its Member States have played a major part in the financing of the relief.

But now that the immediate cause of suffering has been removed, it is time to turn to the political problems that still afflict that country. As with Afghanistan the aim of the international community must be a comprehensive political settlement. The basis of that settlement should be an independent and neutral Cambodia with a genuinely

representative government. The position of the European Community was set out fully in the statement which, as President of the Community, I made to the International Conference on Cambodia which was held here in July.

The Declaration of that Conference puts forward a reasonable and practical basis for a settlement of the Cambodian problem. The Ten endorse that Declaration which we believe would protect the legitimate rights of all concerned. We call on Vietnam to agree to withdraw its forces and join the process of peaceful negotiations set in train at that meeting. The Cambodians must be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination without disruption, intimidation or coercion.

Southern Africa

The Ten are also very concerned at the continuing denial of the right to self-determination which lies at the root of the problem of Namibia. We deeply regret that the settlement leading to the independence of Zimbabwe has not been followed by further progress towards a speedy solution of the problems in that region.

The outcome of the pre-implementation meeting on Namibia in Geneva in January was a great disappointment to the Ten. We saw no justification for South Africa's prevarication. We hope that the renewed efforts of the Five will succeed in finding an acceptable basis for pursuing negotiations on the implementation of the United Nations plan in accordance with Security Council Resolution 435. This provides the only possibility of a peaceful transition to internationally recognised independence for Namibia in accordance with a precise and rapid timetable.

The Ten have condemned the South African incursion into Angola, the violation of sovereignty and territorial integrity which it has involved, and the loss of life and suffering it has brought. We have demanded the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from Angola.

Within South Africa itself, the Ten can find little cause for optimism. Virtually none of the expectations of worthwhile change in recent years have been fulfilled. Reforms promised by the South African Government, mostly still not implemented, do not deal with the fundamental problem of meeting the political as well as the social and economic aspirations of black, coloured and Asian South Africans.

Without an early move towards government by consent and the abandonment of the system of apartheid which we all abhor, the trend in South Africa can only be one of accelerating conflict and violence. The Ten appeal with the utmost urgency to those in South Africa who can still act decisively to face this reality and to show the imagination, boldness and leadership that are necessary to reach a political solution. In the meantime the Ten continue to press South Africa to bring about peaceful change in that country.

Cyprus

In this catalogue of unsolved problems, I am glad to be able to mention one small chink of light. The Ten commend the efforts of the UN Secretary-General on the question of Cyprus. Under his auspices the intercommunal talks have been established on a regular basis, and conducted in a constructive

manner. We have been pleased to note that there have been encouraging developments recently: we earnestly hope that there will be further progress towards a just and lasting solution to this grave problem.

Arms control

Simply to discuss specific crises does not give an adequate impression of the Ten's approach to the problems facing us all. To be faithful to the principle of reconciliation we must work not just for the resolution of conflicts when they occur, but to lessen the tension that gives rise to them.

Europe is fortunate to have been free from war for 36 years. But it is the area where the tension between East and West is felt most strongly. It contains the greatest concentration of military forces in the world. The Ten recognise the need to lessen tension by maintaining a dialogue between East and West. Efforts must be intensified to reduce the appallingly high level of armaments on both sides, while maintaining undiminished security for all states.

Many of the hopes that we entertained for concrete measures of arms control and disarmament as we entered the 1970s have been cruelly disappointed. Nevertheless the Members of the European Community believe that there can be no substitute for painstaking negotiation, resulting in agreements which tackle specific problems of arms control in a way which increases confidence and assures the security of all states.

We strongly support negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the mutual limitation of nuclear

forces and in particular the forthcoming negotiations on theatre nuclear forces. Success will not be easy. Despite the difficulties we believe that the objective should be to strike the balance at the lowest possible level. Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons remains a vital element for the security of us all.

But the control of nuclear forces, in Europe as in the rest of the world, is only one side of the coin. It is equally important to reduce the size of conventional forces. In Europe, the negotiations on mutual and balance force reductions continue to work towards this. The Members of the European Community have also given their full support to the French proposal for a conference on disarmament in Europe to negotiate confidence building measures of real military significance, which will be binding, verifiable and applicable to the whole of Europe. We are seeking agreement on this important proposal at the Madrid Review Meeting on the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and we remain convinced that confidence building measures which meet these criteria will make a real contribution to reducing the tensions and dangers of armed conflict. Such an approach could be useful in other regions of the world also.

International economic questions

The European Community's second principle is cooperation. Duty and inclination point the same way. The Community is the world's biggest international trader. The handling of economic questions in harmony goes to the heart of the Community's interest.

To draw harmony from a variety of existing instruments is a challenge for the whole world community. The International Development Strategy, to take one example, is addressed to developed and developing countries alike, and recognises their mutual interdependence. The greatly increased assistance provided by the IMF and, especially, the World Bank, to take another, deserves acknowledgement and support. The Community welcomes both.

The current problems of the world economy accentuate the need for cooperation. They do not automatically make it easier. Adjustment to slower or negative economic growth, higher energy prices and weaker demand is taking time. Inflation, unemployment and interest rates remain high, and exchange markets volatile. The shoe pinches very hard for many countries, especially in the developing world. As was stressed by the European Council at its meeting last June, the Community is of the opinion that cooperation with developing countries, and the intensification of international economic relations serve the interest of all concerned, and that they are necessary not only to strengthen the economies of the developing countries but also to promote the recovery of the world economy.

The Community sees no room for defeatism. I shall examine some issues which are getting our active attention.

Trade is vital if developing countries are to achieve sustained economic growth. This concept underpins the close and friendly ties we have with the developing countries, reflected in the Lome Convention, the generalised system of preferences, and the EC's other arrangements. The Second Lome Convention has further improved the trade advantages extended by the Community to the African, Caribbean and Pacific

signatories. It has also made available substantially increased amounts of aid. Meanwhile the Community stands firm for the maintenance of an open trading system and continued resistance to protectionism. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has served the international community well. The Community attaches importance to the full implementation of the Tokyo Round. It endorses the broad agreement within the GATT that the contracting parties should envisage a ministerial meeting in the coming year to consider the overall condition of world trade.

Let there be no doubt, equally, about the importance the Community attaches to official development assistance. We welcome the intense diplomatic activity at present surrounding problems of development. Despite real budgetary difficulties we in the Community remain committed to the target of 0.7 per cent GNP and have accepted the target of 0.15 per cent of GNP as aid for the least developed. The Community and its Member States individually already provide development assistance worth over \$12 billion a year. This is 39 per cent of all aid given to the developing countries, more than half the OECD total and 6 or 7 times that given by the countries of Eastern Europe. We see room for a matching effort here.

The Community was pleased to see the progress made at the UN Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy in Nairobi last month. This was the beginning of a long but vital road. We were closely involved in the preparation of the Programme of Action. We welcome its adoption. We believe that the Conference will be seen as a milestone in the search for global solutions to energy problems that affect developed and developing countries alike.

We in the Community know full well that the problems of the world economy, which affect us all, create a particular hardship for the developing countries and especially the poorest among them. We welcomed the successful conclusion of the Paris Conference and will do our best to ensure that it is followed by positive and concrete results which will help the least developed countries to overcome their fundamental problems.

No discussion of the international economy would be complete without tribute to the efforts of the out-going President of the General Assembly to bring all sides together in order to launch a new round of global negotiations. Last June the European Council expressed the view that preparations for the new round of global negotiations should be completed as soon as possible and called on the Summit Conferences in Ottawa and Cancun to give a positive impetus to these preparations. The Community wants to see relations between developed and developing countries take a new and constructive course. In this connection the Community was happy to note that those countries attending the Ottawa Summit declared themselves "Ready to participate in a mutually acceptable process of global negotiations in circumstances offering the prospect of meaningful progress". We also welcome the recognition at the Ottawa Summit of the importance of making increased resources available for the purpose of accelerated food production and food security in the developing world. The Cancun Summit will also provide an exceptional opportunity. We hope that the exchanges there will be imaginative and spontaneous. A two-day summit cannot achieve miracles, but the discussion could mark an important step forward in mutual understanding and provide a political impetus in the North/South Dialogue. The atmosphere of the Preparatory Meeting in Cancun was an encouraging augury.

Human rights

The third principle which governs the Ten's activities on the international stage is the defence of human rights. The Community is a group of states founded on a commitment to democratic principles. Our citizens participate in a political system which guarantees and respects the fundamental freedoms of the individual. Inevitably therefore the defence of human rights is a matter of concern to them.

We stand for the promotion and protection of all categories of human rights: civil and political, as well as economic, social and cultural. We especially condemn cases of torture, detention without trial or arbitrary execution. We think it deplorable that there should still be situations where people disappear without trace, or where they are persecuted on grounds of race or religion, or for defending human rights.

It is now accepted that these and other violations of human rights are a subject of proper and necessary concern for discussion at the United Nations. As Member States of the United Nations we all have the obligation to promote and protect human rights in our own countries and in the international community as a whole. We shall continue to speak out against violations of human rights in appropriate UN fora, and also at the Madrid Review Meeting of the CSCE.

Too often in the past the UN has been unable or has failed for reasons of political expediency to respond to flagrant violations of human rights. This undermines the credibility of the United Nations. We must not overlook such

violations of human rights, no matter where they occur. Rather we should work together to protect the victims and to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to promote human rights.

Conclusion

Mr President, I hope that I have demonstrated that the European Community is a force for peaceful progress in a turbulent and troubled world. We threaten the security of no-one. We have no ideology or system that we wish to impose on those of other cultures and traditions. We respect the right of all nations to self-determination and freedom from foreign interference and we wish to help them in their pursuit of stable economic growth. It is our conviction that among the vast majority of the members of this Assembly there is an enormous potential for common understanding and co-operation which could only be for the benefit of all mankind.

E N D

A1-6, B4, EEC, B1/a/b, P1/2/3/4/5/6/13.

81. Statement at the 36th session of the United Nations General Assembly by Sir Anthony Parsons on behalf of the Ten on the Death of President Sadat (New York, 6 October 1981)

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Ten Member States of the European Community. It is with the greatest shock and horror that we have learned of the assassination this morning of President Sadat. This awful event will have brought a profound sense of loss to all of us here in the General Assembly this afternoon. Any act of violence, however individual, diminishes the international community as a whole, and this sudden and tragic death of a great Head of State is a grievous blow to those shared values which bind us all together as nations and peoples.

We have lost in President Sadat a great statesman and a great leader of his people. He was a man whose inspiration spread far beyond the boundaries of his own country, Egypt. His courage and humanity provided an example to us all. Above all he was a man of peace. His desire for a peaceful and prosperous future, both for his own country and for all the peoples of the Middle East, will remain an inspiration for us all.

He was also a true friend of Europe known and admired throughout the Member States of the European Community. We remember, with particular vividness, how he came to address the European Parliament and his wish in doing so to speak directly to our peoples and demonstrate his friendship.

I should like to pay solemn tribute to his memory here this afternoon and to convey also our deepest sympathies and condolences to his family in their grief, and of course to the Government and to the people of Egypt. We too share, in our own way, in their terrible loss. Our sympathies go out also to the families of those others who were killed or wounded in the attack.

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

83. Communiqué issued on the occasion of the EC-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (London 13/14 October 1981)

1.

The Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community and of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) met on 13–14 October 1981 in London. They had a wide-ranging and constructive exchange of views about current international and regional problems. They reaffirmed their commitment at Kuala Lumpur to world peace, international co-operation and understanding, economic development, social justice and human rights, and the principles of the UN Charter.

2.

The Ministers paid particular attention to current areas of instability in Asia. They deplored the continued presence of Vietnamese armed forces in Kampuchea and of those of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. In each case, a small independent State had been invaded and occupied by a foreign power in violation of international law. This threatened inter-

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

national peace and security, inflicted untold suffering on the peoples of these two countries and caused acute problems for neighbouring States.

3.

The Ministers reiterated their support for Resolutions 34/22 and 35/6 on the situation in Kampuchea which had been so overwhelmingly endorsed by the UN General Assembly. They stressed the need for the total withdrawal of Vietnamese forces and the establishment, under United Nations supervision, of conditions in which the Kampuchean people would be able freely to elect a Government of their own choice. The Ministers expressed their satisfaction that the solution proposed by the International Conference on Kampuchea which met in New York in July 1981, in which the great majority of the international community participated, conforms to these principles. They expressed the hope that Viet Nam and other States concerned will co-operate with the efforts undertaken to find a balanced and reasonable solution to the Kampuchean question. The Ministers acknowledged that the legitimate security concerns of States in the region must be taken into consideration and that a peaceful solution to the Kampuchean problem is in the true interest of all parties concerned. They expressed their confidence that the resolution of the Kampuchean question will contribute to durable peace and stability in South East Asia.

4.

In this context, the Ministers noted the absence of Viet Nam and the other States concerned with the issue from the International Conference on Kampuchea held in New York and urged them to attend the future sessions of the Conference. They expressed the hope that Vietnam would participate in a negotiating process which could lead to a peaceful solution of the Kampuchean problem and to the restoration of peace and stability in South East Asia.

5.

The EC Ministers expressed their appreciation that in the search for a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean conflict, the ASEAN Member Countries were moti-

vated by the desire to create conditions conducive to the realisation of the Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFEAN), whereby all Countries of the region could enjoy peace, stability and freedom from interference by outside powers.

6.

The Ministers considered the refugee problem in the light of recent developments. They noted with concern that the exodus from Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea continues to pose problems, particularly for the countries and territories of first refuge. The EC Ministers noted that those countries and territories in the region continue to give temporary asylum to refugees from the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and that the ASEAN Countries deemed the extension of first refuge depends on commitment of resettlement in third countries and the avoidance of residual problems in the area. Both sides recalled the importance of Viet Nam adhering strictly to the undertakings given at the UN Meeting of Refugees and Displaced Persons at Geneva in July 1979, and to her co-operating in the implementation of the orderly departure programme.

7.

The Ministers noted the commendable work performed by the international and non-governmental relief agencies in the UN Emergency Relief Programme in Kampuchea which have managed to achieve the bulk of the objectives assigned to them. However the Ministers continue to hold the view that the problems facing the Kampuchean people, particularly the reconstruction and development of Kampuchea, can only be solved when a comprehensive political settlement is reached and when a legitimate Government, duly and freely elected by the Kampuchean people under United Nations supervision, has been set up in Phnom Penh.

8.

The Ministers noted that Thailand continues to carry a heavy burden in the form of Kampuchean refugees inside Thailand and along the border. They hope satisfactory arrangements could be made, in co-operation with UNHCR, for the re-

fugees in Thailand to return to their homeland without deterrence from any parties if they so wish. They stressed the importance meanwhile of maintaining international assistance to Thailand to help care for the refugees and continue cross-border feeding.

9.

The Ministers noted with deep concern that military operations by Soviet troops against the Afghan people to a severe ordeal and creating a massive flood of refugees and a heavy burden for neighbouring countries, in particular Pakistan. The Ministers strongly urged that conditions be created in Afghanistan which will enable these Afghan refugees to return to their homeland in safety and honour.

10.

They noted that all appeals by the United Nations, the Islamic States and the Non-Aligned Countries for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and a political solution enabling the Afghan people to determine freely their own form of Government have been ignored. They agreed that the situation in Afghanistan remains an important cause of international tension.

11.

The ASEAN Ministers reiterated their support for the European Council's proposal for an International Conference on Afghanistan and expressed their conviction that it would open a constructive way forward for a political solution to the problem of Afghanistan. The Ministers expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would realize that a positive response was in the interest of world peace and stability.

12.

The Ministers agreed that all efforts, including the convening of an International Conference on Afghanistan, should be made for a comprehensive solution of the Afghanistan problem, consistent with the resolutions of the United Nations and its Agencies and the Organisation of the Islamic Conference and with the European Council proposal concerning Afghanistan of 30 June 1981.

13.

The EC Ministers repeated their conviction that ASEAN had developed into a cohesive regional grouping, which is playing an independent and positive rôle in working for peace and stability in South East Asia. For their part, the ASEAN Ministers confirmed their conviction that the European Community is exercising a stabilising influence in a world fraught with danger and uncertainty. Both sides acknowledged that their respective efforts were reinforced by their close and friendly co-operation.

14.

The Foreign Ministers had a general exchange of views on the stabilising world economic situation. They discussed the results of the Ottawa Summit Meeting and especially welcomed the call for continuing resistance to protectionist pressures. They reaffirmed their commitment to an open international trading system. They agreed to continue their constructive co-operation in international fora, particularly on commodity issues, by supporting commodity agreements where appropriate, participating in them, and taking the necessary steps to bring them into force without delay.

15.

They also discussed the prospects for the Mexico Summit Meeting. They hoped that this would lead to a meeting of minds which would give momentum to the launching of global negotiations as soon as possible and contribute to a new international economic order.

16.

The Ministers recalled their previous joint declarations following their Meetings in Brussels in 1978 and Kuala Lumpur in 1980 and reaffirmed their determination to deepen their co-operation. They therefore welcomed the forthcoming meetings between Community and ASEAN Representatives in Brussels and the opportunity which these would provide to give impetus to their co-operation agreement to which they attached the highest importance.

84. Statement by the Presidency on behalf of the Ten on Cambodia at the 36th session of the United Nations General Assembly
(New York, 19 October 1981)

Mr President,

I speak on behalf of the Ten Member Governments of the European Community.

It is now nearly three years since the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia. The regime which they installed in Phnom Penh remains totally reliant on Viet Nam for its existence. Having suffered the atrocities of the barbarous Pol Pot regime, the unfortunate people of Cambodia have still not regained their independence and right to self-determination. Meanwhile a vast army of occupation remains bogged down in the countryside, and no political solution is in prospect. *The risk continues that the conflict could, at any time, spill over the borders of Cambodia.*

Yet, Mr President, there has been some progress in the last year. As to the humanitarian aspects, at least the spectre of starvation no longer hangs over Cambodia. Thanks to the efforts of the Secretary General, Sir Robert Jackson, the specialised agencies, with UNICEF in the lead rôle, the International Committee of the Red Cross, other non-governmental agencies, and the response of the international community, the physical survival of the Cambodian people seems assured, though there may be shortages next year. Should this happen, *the European Community and its Member States*, who have together contributed some 40% of the international relief effort, may be prepared to consider making a further contribution. In this connection, I pay tribute to the Royal Thai Government for the compassion and generosity with which they have absorbed—and continue to absorb—Cambodian refugees in such large numbers, despite the considerable difficulties this has entailed for them and the Thai people.

On the political front, the tireless efforts of the ASEAN countries to promote a solution have continued. Their efforts rightly enjoy the support of the great majority of the interna-

tional community. The Ten took part in the International Conference on Cambodia here in July. We support the Declaration and Resolution adopted by the Conference, including the decision to set up an ad hoc committee. The Ten call upon all parties concerned fully to utilise the framework of the United Nations in seeking a lasting solution for the Cambodian people. They continue to believe that a solution to the Cambodian problem must be based on an independent and neutral Cambodia, with a genuinely representative government, free from any foreign military presence and maintaining friendly relations with all countries of the region. Future sessions of the Conference, as provided for in the resolution tabled by ASEAN, will no doubt take the process forward next year. Any settlement must give the people of Cambodia the right to determine freely the form of government and leadership they want. In the light of recent history, it will also be important to have assurances that a future Cambodian government will maintain friendly relations with all countries of the region, especially her immediate neighbours. *Such assurances will, of course, have to be reciprocal.* Meanwhile, we note the recent agreement in principle between representatives of Cambodian parties opposed to the Vietnamese invasion to form a coalition.

The Ten appreciate that in the search for a settlement ASEAN are motivated by the desire to create conditions conducive to the *establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality* in South East Asia free from interference by outside powers.

Mr President, the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese forces is an essential step in returning Cambodia to normality. Effective measures must also be taken to ensure that no armed group can either seize power by force or use the threat of force to intimidate the Cambodian people and so deprive them of their right to self-determination. In this connection, Mr President, let there be no misunderstanding about our attitude to the Pol Pot regime. We abhor that odious regime, whose human rights violations were more flagrant than those of any other in recent history. It is for the people of Cambodia to decide who should emerge from free elections as their new government. But we have no doubt that, given the chance, they will reject the Pol Pot regime decisively. Our attitude on this is consistent. It stands in

marked contrast with *that* of the Soviet and other pro-Vietnamese representatives who as late as the autumn of 1978 strenuously opposed, in the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, Western efforts to persuade the international community to investigate the atrocities of the Pol Pot regime.

Be that as it may, the history and record of that regime is no justification for invasion and occupation. It is in the interests of all to insist on the inadmissibility of foreign interference and intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, and especially that small and vulnerable countries should not be subject to invasion by their larger neighbours, on whatever pretext. As one delegate wisely said in the Debate on Cambodia in the General Assembly last year, there are no "justified" interventions or "good" occupations, regardless of the validity of the motives invoked. There can be no recognition of any right to impose governments or regimes on independent countries.

Mr President, the Ten will once again support the resolution which ASEAN tabled, as they supported their resolutions at the 34th and 35th General Assemblies. As ASEAN recognises, there can be no political solution without the participation and the cooperation of all those concerned in the conflict. We hope therefore that the Vietnamese government and others concerned will reconsider their decision not to take part in the International Conference on Cambodia and will begin to play their part in the search for a negotiated political settlement. The sooner they do, the sooner the Cambodian people can enjoy the peace they long for.

32. CSCE: Opening Statement on behalf of the Ten (Madrid, 27 October 1981)

1. As we resume our work it falls to me to reiterate, on behalf of the Delegations of the Ten Member States of the European Community, the general purpose which we have been pursuing throughout our Madrid meeting. It is to try, despite the unpromising background, to establish a secure political foundation for the peaceful and co-operative management of our relations and of the inevitable processes of change during the 1980s. We had established—or we thought we had established—at Helsinki a foundation which would serve this object. It had three main elements: respect for international law, restraint in the pursuit of national interests, and the ideal of greater openness throughout Europe as the essential long-term basis for full understanding and co-operation. Our general purpose at this meeting has been to try to draw the Soviet Union back to that sound foundation, on which we had thought we had all agreed to base our conduct. Our purpose has been thereby to reverse the trend towards confrontation, which has resulted from the Soviet Union treating the use or threat of force as a regular option in her relations with other States, and from Soviet rejection in practice of the Helsinki commitments towards greater openness. By calling the Soviet Union back to observance of the Helsinki Principles and other provisions, we hoped that the united voice of the great majority of our participating States would produce—not the millenium—but at least sufficient change for the better in important fields to restore the damaged basis for co-operation, and repair the damage done to the CSCE process itself. We still hold to this general purpose.

2. It was in that spirit that I drew the attention of this meeting on 24 July to the initiative of the Ten Member States of the European Community, designed to open the way to a political solution to the problem of Afghanistan, through an international conference in two stages. I recognized at the time that the situation in Afghanistan was a global

issue with global implications and that it was of interest and concern not only to the States represented at our CSCE meeting but to the world community as a whole. It is therefore appropriate for the matter to be discussed by the United Nations General Assembly. At the same time, the issue remains of importance in our CSCE context, particularly given the second Helsinki Principle on refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, and the 8th Principle on respecting the equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination. The people of Afghanistan continue to make clear their opposition to the Soviet-created regime by fighting or fleeing in ever increasing numbers. There are now some 2,400,000 refugees in Pakistan with at least 400,000 in Iran. This is now the largest concentration of refugees in the world and forms an increasingly grave humanitarian problem. It is necessary therefore for me to express today the disappointment of the Ten that there has been no positive response from the Soviet Union to our initiative. The Soviet Government have shown no willingness to take part in an attempt to negotiate a peaceful settlement acceptable to the international community. In effect, they argue simply that the world must recognize a regime imposed by force on the people of Afghanistan, and that Soviet troops will not withdraw until this happens. There can be no clearer instance of the Soviet failure to respect and implement the Final Act. Nevertheless, the Ten's proposal remains on the table as a reasonable and practical approach to the problem of Afghanistan. We hope that in time the Soviet Union will respond more positively to this initiative, just as we hope the Soviet Union will respond to concerns in other fields which must be alleviated before we can reach the threshold of an era of co-operation.

3. One such field is that of human rights, where the record of the Soviet Union not only constrains the normal development of improved bilateral relations with her but also impairs more generally public confidence in the validity of the commitments undertaken in the Final Act. It was not for nothing that our Heads of Government recog-

nized at Helsinki that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was 'an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and co-operation among themselves as among all States'. These are words which there is provisional agreement that we should emphasize again in our own concluding document. How much more valuable it would be, however, if the conclusion of our meeting could be marked by progress in *deeds*, in response to all the legitimate calls made here upon the Soviet Union to fulfil the commitments which she undertook at Helsinki.

4. The record, unhappily, has been growing worse rather than better. During our last recess there has been no let-up in the campaign which began before the 1980 Olympic Games and has been carried on throughout our meetings, with the publicly avowed object of paralyzing activity which the Soviet authorities characterize as 'hostile' but which in reality consists in individuals or groups in the Soviet Union seeking a variety of ordinary liberties which are indentified with the kind of rights and freedoms whose effective exercise we all undertook in the Final Act to 'promote and encourage'. Since early 1979 some 500 people are known to have been arrested, which is by far the worst score in two decades. This year more than 50 political trials, with a least 80 defendants, have already taken place in the Soviet Union. Some of these sentences have been very severe: while the average is 4 to 5 years, some have been given up to 15 years in labour camps, generally followed by internal exile. There have also been cases of people being re-arrested and charged again before they had completed previous sentences. One class of people who have been attacked particularly in this drive is those who have sought liberty to express their views on implementation of the Final Act and have called attention to gross abuses. I have in mind members of various Helsinki monitoring groups as well as the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, all of whose members have now been arrested. Another class which has suffered is members of religious groups who have failed to obtain official regis-

tration. The Council of the Evangelical Christian Baptist Churches has been particularly attacked and some 114 unregistered Baptists are currently known to be under arrest or to have been sentenced. A third class to have suffered particularly is the Jewish community. In the circumstances it is natural that members of the Jewish community should be active in the human rights movement in the Soviet Union and more of them have been harassed or brought to trial this year than in the past 10 years put together. In addition, there seems to be a general crack-down on Jewish groups, such as groups devoted to the study of Hebrew, which have been formed in order to try to preserve their cultural identity in face of the discrimination against them. In Czechoslovakia too the record seems to be growing worse rather than better. Following the wave of arrests in May, ten people have remained under arrest awaiting trial, and Rudolf Battek, a Charter 77 signatory arrested a year earlier, was sentenced in July to seven and a half years imprisonment, reduced on appeal this month to five and a half years; and there have been reports of trials of a number of religious personalities in recent weeks.

5. Against this background it is incontestably necessary for this meeting to live up to its name and to 'follow up' the provisions of Principle VII in the Final Act. We have made clear from the start that our interest does not lie in abrupt revolutionary change, and that we have avoided deliberately any proposals that would touch upon the fundamental structures of systems different from our own. Our interest lies instead in a peaceful evolution along the lines established in Principle VII; a gradual evolution, which should show constant and tangible progress in lifting restrictions on rights and freedoms which 'derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development', an evolution towards greater humanity and tolerance and towards greater openings; an evolution away from the dead end of totalitarian oppression of the individual. It is in this spirit that we have confined our proposals for improved unilateral implementation to two points: tolerance, instead of persecution, of individuals who express

their views on implementation of the Final Act—a thing which cannot be refused in good faith by any government which subscribed to the Final Act; and the progressive removal of obstacles which still exist in some countries to the practice of religion and to the provision of facilities required for this—a move forward which can hardly be deemed to threaten the social system of any State. Language is on the table on both points, and after full discussion it is now ripe for final negotiation. In the field of multilateral implementation, the delegations of the Ten Member States of the European Community support the proposal that the subject of human rights should be followed up by an experts' meeting, whose terms of reference are also ripe for negotiation.

6. On the military aspects of security, one of the main features of this Meeting has been the widespread support for the view that, if we are to engage in the process of a conference, it must be on the basis of a mandate: a mandate which sets the frame within which we might negotiate measures that would genuinely enhance security in Europe; a mandate which defines clearly the task of the first stage of a conference as being to negotiate confidence and security-building measures which are of military significance, binding and verifiable, and which would apply throughout Europe and up to the Urals. The Ten Member States of the European Community have a positive interest in trying to initiate in this way the negotiation of an arms control régime of openness concerning the disposition of major military formations throughout Europe. We therefore welcome the broad support which the French proposal has received at the Madrid Meeting, and the progress which has been made in agreeing on the exact terms of the mandate. Our unsatisfactory experience with the recent Soviet notification of a set of manoeuvres, which certainly did nothing to increase confidence, has underlined the desirability of making a fresh start on meaningful confidence and security-building measures. What has held us up until now has been the apparent reluctance of the Soviet Union, not to talk about disarmament, but to commit herself unequivocally to a concrete negotiation of confidence and security-building

measures, on the basis of an unambiguous mandate covering the essential points which I have mentioned. We hope that veil of fluff will be dropped which has for so long obscured the Soviet Union's willingness to engage herself with the rest of us in this joint endeavour for greater openness in the military field. The choice of whether or not we can engage in the first stage of a conference is seen ever more clearly as resting in the hands of Moscow. After all that we have heard on the subject from the Soviet Delegation here in all these past months, it would be a great surprise, as well as a great disappointment, if they were to draw back at the last moment.

7. Openness is the aim which we have pursued as well in Basket III, in accordance with the spirit of the Final Act. Under Human Contacts, we have negotiated already language which reinforces the Final Act provisions on family reunification by making more specific the manner in which these provisions should be implemented. So far as it goes, this is good. But it is, of course, the performance which matters; and one has to note that the standard of Soviet performance has been dropping to an abnormally low level. For all the ethnic groups suffering from family separation there has been a sharp decline this year in the number of exit visas granted. In the case of Jewish people, less than 500 were allowed to leave the Soviet Union in August and September. The total for 1981 so far represents a drop of no less than 73% compared even with last year's returned figure, and takes us back to the level of years before the CSCE process began. At the same time, the harassment and discrimination against applicants continues. The general objectives of the Final Act and the CSCE process are bound to suffer if commitments continue to be ignored in this way by the Soviet authorities. In the field of information, equally, there is a clear need to reinforce the Final Act provisions by making more specific the manner in which they should be implemented. In this field too, we have seen a reversion to 'cold war' practices of the days before Helsinki. Take the jamming of radio broadcasts as an example. The resumed Soviet jamming of certain broadcasts in the Russian language can be seen as a gross breach not only of

the commitment to 'facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds' but also of the principle of reciprocity, when one compares it with the massive scale of Soviet broadcasting to other countries in various languages. It is, incidentally, a gross misuse of resources when one considers that four days of the present scale of Soviet jamming cost as much as an entire year's operation of the BBC Russian Service.

8. Work therefore remains to be done in a number of areas of our negotiations, in order to complete a concluding document that will give renewed force to the commitments we all assumed at Helsinki. We have returned with the intention of concluding our much protracted meeting with the adoption of a substantial and balanced document, by the middle of December. In practice this means that, besides the present week, we have only the four weeks of November left in which to reach agreement on the main outstanding issues. In the view of the Delegations of the Ten, this is perfectly feasible, considering the amount of ground already covered. We intend therefore to go on devoting ourselves to reaching agreement on a substantial and balanced concluding document in these next weeks, on the assumption that all the other participants share our desire to reinforce the Final Act and to make it in practice the basis for our relationships. It is only if that assumption proved false and insufficient progress had been made on the main issues by the end of November that we might regretfully have to draw the necessary conclusions from the continued lack of agreement. We hope and trust that that contingency will not arise.

86. Statement by the Ten on Chad (London, 17 November 1981)

The Ten Member States of the European Communities have taken note of the 29 October Communiqué of the Council of Ministers of the Government of Chad which demands the withdrawal of Libyan troops stationed in Chad and the rapid deployment of the African Peace Keeping Force whose creation has been decided by the OAU. The Ten take note of indications that the Libyan withdrawal is taking place as well as the efforts exerted in parallel by African countries to create a Peace Keeping Force, demonstrating their determination to resolve the problems of the African continent.

The Ten are also aware of the call by the GUNT for the international community to assist with the economic reconstruction of Chad. They note that this call was repeated by the 34 countries meeting in Paris.

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

87. Statement by the Ten on the participation of Member States in the Sinai Peace Keeping Force
(London, 23 November 1981)

The Ten consider that the decision of France, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to participate in the multinational Force in Sinai meets the wish frequently expressed by the Members of the Community to facilitate any progress in the direction of a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the mutual acceptance of the right to existence and security of all the States in the area and the need for the Palestinian people to exercise fully its right to self-determination.

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

81/94

FRANCE TO PARTICIPATE WITH OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN SINAI PEACE FORCE
STATEMENTS BY FRENCH GOVERNMENT, EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

FRENCH GOVERNMENT STATEMENT, PARIS, NOVEMBER 23, 1981

The French government has agreed to participate in the multinational peacekeeping force to be set up in Sinai. France, along with the governments of Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, has informed the governments of the United States, Egypt and Israel of this decision in the following terms:

"The governments of France, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, after consultation with their European Community partners and contingent upon their constitutional procedures and upon agreement on practical and legal provisions, have decided to respond favorably to the request of the governments of Egypt, Israel and the United States to contribute to the multinational peacekeeping force in Sinai.

"The four governments state that their participation in the multinational force should be understood in the following way:

"1. The force exists solely for the purpose of maintaining peace in Sinai following the Israeli withdrawal. It has no other role.

"2. The force is being established in its present form in the absence of a United Nations decision on an international force and its position will be reviewed should such a decision become possible.

"3. Participation by the four governments in the force will not be taken either as committing them to, or excluding them from, participation in such other international peacekeeping arrangements as have been or may be established in the region.

"4. Participation in the multinational force by the four governments is without prejudice to their well-known policies on other aspects of the problems of the area."

--Finally, this decision symbolizes the determination of the four governments to reach a comprehensive peace settlement following negotiations among the parties, a settlement that would

insure justice for all the peoples and security for all the states of the region.

The four governments welcomed the peace concluded between Israel and Egypt as a first step toward this objective. In the same way, they were pleased by Israel's withdrawal from Sinai, which they see as a first step in implementing the request for withdrawal contained in Security Council Resolution 242, which expressly states that the acquisition of territories through war is inadmissible.

The four countries believe that the international community has an obligation to play its role--whenever necessary and with the agreement of the parties involved--in drawing up peace agreements in the Middle East. They are also ready to participate in such agreements regarding the other currently occupied territories in the context of the Israeli withdrawal. They consider their support for the agreements concerning implementation of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty to be completely distinct from and independent of the rest of the Camp David process.

--Moreover, the four governments express their support for the government and people of Egypt and their conviction that Egypt needs stability and continuity. The decision by the four governments to participate in the multinational force stems from their policy as defined in the statement issued in Venice in June 1980 and in later statements. While emphasizing guarantees for the security of the state of Israel, this policy puts equally strong emphasis on justice for the Palestinian people and on its right to self-determination. It also implies that the Palestine Liberation Organization be involved in the process leading to a comprehensive peace.

The governments are committed to supporting this force. They also point out that along with their partners of the Ten they will continue to work through all means compatible with their principles to bring about a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

STATEMENT BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITY COUNTRIES, LONDON, NOVEMBER 23, 1981

The Ten consider that the decision of France, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to participate in the multinational force in Sinai meets the wish frequently expressed by members of the Community to facilitate any progress in the direction of a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East on the basis of mutual acceptance of the right to existence and security of all the states in the area and the need for the Palestinian people to exercise fully its right to self-determination.

89. Statement by the Foreign Ministers of the Ten on Sakharov's hunger strike (London, 9 December 1981)

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten Member States of the European Community express their deep anxiety at the fate of academician and Mrs Sakharov, who have been on hunger strike for two weeks over the refusal of the Soviet Authorities to allow Lisa Alexeyeva to join her husband.

Referring to the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, the Foreign Ministers appeal urgently to the Soviet Authorities for a speedy resolution of this sad humanitarian problem by authorising Lisa Alexeyeva to leave the Soviet Union and by permitting academician Sakharov and his wife to return to a normal life.

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

90. Statement by the Foreign Ministers
of the Ten on Poland and Israeli Golan Heights policy
(London, 15 December 1981)

I.

The Foreign Ministers of the member states of the European Community are concerned at the development of the situation in Poland and the imposition of martial law and the detention of trade unionists. They have profound sympathy for the Polish people in this tense and difficult time. They look to all signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of the Polish People's Republic. They look to Poland to solve these problems herself and without the use of force, so that the process of reform and renewal can continue.

Foreign Ministers of the Ten are continuing to follow events in Poland with particular attention, and agreed to remain in close consultation on this question.

II.

The Foreign Ministers of the member states of the European Community strongly deplore the decision of the Government and Knesset of Israel to extend Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration to occupied Syrian territory in the Golan Heights. Such an extension, which is tantamount to annexation, is contrary to international law, and therefore invalid in our eyes. This step prejudices the possibility of the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 and is bound to complicate further the search for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East to which we remain committed.

91. Speech by Lord Carrington to the European Parliament on the development of Political Co-operation (Strasbourg, 17 December 1981, excerpts)

... Throughout its period of office, the British Presidency has tried to put into practice its firm belief that the Community should exert an influence in world affairs more appropriate to its position as the world's largest economic grouping, trading entity, and donor of aid to the developing world...

Here too there is some useful progress to report. Decisions were taken both at the Development Council on 3 November and at meetings of the Foreign Affairs Council on ways to improve the effectiveness of the Community's aid to the less developed countries. Agreement was reached on Community positions in a number of important trade negotiations including the Multi-Fibre Arrangement, trade with Japan, and export credits. Successful joint Commission and other meetings were held with a number of third countries.

The Community has also made an important and distinctive contribution to a number of multi-lateral meetings, including the Ottawa Summit meeting in July and the Cancún meeting in Mexico in October. It has been prominent among those endorsing the commitment of the international community to a new round of global negotiations. Important decisions have also been taken on the further provision of food at special prices to Poland.

Madam President: In my speech to this Parliament six months ago I referred to the Luxembourg and Copenhagen Reports on which Political Co-operation was based. I am proud to say that to those two documents we have added the London Report. Over the period since the Copenhagen Report was agreed we have all found Political Co-operation to be useful and important. We have also found in third countries a growing expectation that Europe will speak with one voice and a growing wish for a dialogue with the Ten as such. It was therefore time for us to look again at the way Political Co-operation was organized. We agreed to do this under the Luxembourg Presidency; much of the difficult

work was done under the Dutch Presidency and in our Presidency we brought it to a conclusion. But it is the work of all of the Ten. I believe it has been useful to register our strengthened political commitment to joint action in foreign affairs, to set up an agreed procedure for convening meetings quickly in a crisis and for giving extra support to the Presidency in its increasingly demanding rôle. I note also that the London Report registers the Ten's legitimate interest in political aspects of security and ensures the Commission will be fully associated at all levels with Political Cooperation.

During the British Presidency, the Ten have continued their efforts to promote progress towards a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. This is a difficult period in Middle East diplomacy: Israel's withdrawal from Sinai is shortly to be completed; but the positions of the parties remain wide apart on the central questions of Palestinian rights and Israeli security. We have seen the pursuit of peace becoming more, not less, complicated, most recently through the decision of the Israeli Government and Knesset to extend Israeli law to occupied Syrian territory in the Golan Heights, an act which the Governments of the Ten strongly deplore. These developments call for the Ten to adhere to a consistent policy based on the two principles clearly set out at Venice and universally accepted by the international community, namely the right to existence and security of all states in the region including Israel, and self-determination for the Palestinians in the framework of a comprehensive peace.

I believe that it is right for Europe to be closely involved, and we have done our best to maintain the involvement in a positive and impartial way. During our Presidency I visited Riyadh on behalf of the Ten to discuss the eight principles set out by Crown Prince Fahad, which we regard as an encouraging sign of movement in the Middle East. Four of the Ten have also agreed to participate in the Sinai Multinational Force. The Ten have given their support to this decision. We believe that by participating in the Sinai force we can make a constructive contribution to peace in the Middle East.

The Community has also contributed actively to international efforts to restore independence and non-alignment to Af-

ghanistan. As the Parliament knows the European Council in June put forward a proposal for a two stage conference on Afghanistan; and I subsequently visited Moscow to put this to Mr Gromyko on behalf of the Ten. We believe that this proposal represents a realistic and practical way out of the current tragic and unacceptable situation. It has been endorsed by a large number of countries including many from the Third World, and it remains on the table. The Russians bear a heavy responsibility for the terrible suffering which they have caused the Afghan people, and they must show the political will to remove their army of occupation from Afghanistan. The recent vote in the UN General Assembly made it clear that the views of the Ten on this subject are evidently shared by an overwhelming majority of the nations of the world.

An area of particular concern to the Ten throughout the British Presidency has been East-West relations. On 15 December, the Ten expressed their concern at recent developments in Poland together with their profound sympathy for the Polish people in this tense and difficult time. They reiterated their view that the Polish people should solve their problems peacefully and in a spirit of compromise, and without outside interference, so that the process of reform and renewal can continue. Madame President, in the 48 hours since the Ten Foreign Ministers met in London the Polish skies have continued to darken. We are familiar, alas only too familiar, with natural disasters, but here in the heart of our continent is a man-made disaster on a colossal scale. Although news is censored and communications cut and diplomatic facilities suspended, we read of arrests and detentions and evictions. There has almost certainly been some loss of life. There is an ominous silence about the fate of Lech Walesa. Madame President, I should not want to see the situation made more difficult by any words of mine. There is much that I could say but will leave unsaid. But two things seem to me clear. First, as has been said so often before, there must be no foreign interference whatsoever. And second, there must be an early resumption of the process of negotiation and conciliation, including the release of those in detention. That alone can produce a solution to Poland's problems. I note that assurances on this subject were given yesterday in Warsaw by what is called the

Military Council of National Salvation. This Parliament and the world will be watching to see how those assurances are put into effect. The Ten will continue to follow events in Poland with particular attention and we stand ready to arrange urgent consultations if these should become necessary. In Madrid we have been working for a balanced and substantial conclusion to the CSCE meeting. Some progress has been made, but proposals for a Conference on Disarmament in Europe and in the field of human rights remain unresolved. The Ten have been clear and united in our wish for real progress rather than vaguely worded or cosmetic agreements. I should add that co-ordination in Madrid with other friendly delegations, including the United States, has been excellent. There have, however, been more positive developments in East-West relations. We warmly welcome the start of talks on intermediate range nuclear weapons in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union and the constructive proposals made by President Reagan. We hope that the Soviet Union will respond positively. The full and frank talks Chancellor Schmidt had with President Brezhnev were also particularly welcome given the emphasis placed by the European Council in November on the importance of keeping open channels of communication for dialogue with the Soviet Union.

Madam President, time does not permit me to give a full account of all the activities of the Ten, but I should draw attention to the interesting and important meeting I and my colleagues had in London with the Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN countries. I have circulated in the Parliament a statement by the Ten on the progress made over the Code of Conduct on employment practices in South Africa, which we believe is an important instrument of peaceful change there. I should also like to mention the high level of coordination by the Ten at the United Nations in New York. Performance cannot be measured only by common statements and explanations of vote but it is nevertheless encouraging that we have done better than ever before in this respect—a reflection I think of the growing importance we attach to working together.

Finally, I should say that I have noted the keen interest this Parliament takes in Political Co-operation. A Presidency Minister was present throughout the Parliament's recent