

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION**

**Official Records\***



FIRST COMMITTEE  
49th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 5 December 1983  
at 3.00 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 65: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 66: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/38/PV.49  
10 January 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 65, 66 AND 67 (continued)

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Since this is the first time in its nearly 40-year-old history that this Committee is giving some specific attention to the Mediterranean, it becomes an auspicious occasion, and a brief historical perspective would not be out of place.

The strategic importance of the Mediterranean Sea has a chequered history. The calm blue sea was dominated in the past by a succession of single Powers. As the meeting-place of three continents and the melting-pot of even more civilizations the Mediterranean so far has never enjoyed a lasting power balance. The pax Romana was followed by centuries of Islamic rule which, in turn, gradually was replaced by an uneasy relationship between the Porte and the emerging British Empire, occasionally challenged by France.

The opening of the Suez Canal subsequently transformed the Mediterranean. From an inland sea it became at one stroke the main link between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans and thus an important international commercial and military artery in the tenuous balance of power. After the Second World War the importance of the Mediterranean as a strategic nexus between East and West was further enhanced.

The Mediterrean in fact became a key area in the Western system of deterrence and remained mainly under the influence of the Atlantic Powers. During this latest historical phase for the first time a significant change occurred. It was a wholly external Power, the United States, which provided in the Sixth Fleet the principal instrument of naval dominance. Concurrently many new actors appeared on the regional stage, as island, West Asian and North African States of the Mediterranean attained their independence. It now seems certain that the era of one-Power predominance in the Mediterranean belongs to the past.

Since the Arab-Israeli war in June 1967 a second external Power, the Soviet Union, has established a political and military presence in the Mediterranean on a scale larger than ever before. Today neither one of the two blocs can yield dominance in the Mediterranean to the other, and thus a precarious balance of force prevails.

Parallel to the latest historical phase a new movement has also emerged, gaining steady strength. It is a movement which sees the need for concerted action among Mediterranean States so as to enable them, and them alone, to become the

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

principal masters and arbiters of their own regional destiny rather than being helpless victims of outside interests. It is a movement which has strong roots at the popular level but has not yet been fully translated into firm and concerted governmental action. It is a movement which stands uncertainly between trying to maintain an old and anachronistic order and sensing its escalating disadvantages but, while not yet fully committed to the prospects of an alternative, one that is not indifferent to its compelling potential.

Thus the Mediterranean today is poised between the end of an old era and the birth pangs of a new awakening. The questions it faces can no longer remain a side-issue. In helping to determine our future choices rationally a close scrutiny of recent history would serve us as a good guide. If it has accomplished little else in terms of regional security, the post-war period at least has demonstrably shown that external Powers have little chance either of monopolizing influence in the Mediterranean or even of controlling events. On the contrary, their presence has had several negative effects. Among the worst is that today the confrontation of external naval and associated forces in the Mediterranean is at the peak of both density and danger.

And yet there are many reasons why this should not be so. I will mention only the most important. In the first place, the maritime Powers, with their modernized navies, no longer require bases of the old conventional kind. In the second place, the presence of surface and even submarine naval units in congested areas makes them exceptionally vulnerable to modern missiles. In the third place, the presence of these units has not in any single case prevented the outbreak of regional conflict, particularly in the eastern Mediterranean. And, finally, the presence of these units renders much more probable the involvement of the nuclear Powers in a localized conflict - as indeed happened in 1973, when a world-wide nuclear alert was secretly ordered arising from the Israeli-Arab conflict.

The unfortunate and unintended reality is that the introduction of increasingly complex and efficient arms is rendering the strategic balance in the enclosed and restricted Mediterranean area more precarious and vulnerable. Weapons that were built for large theatres of warfare are now being deployed in a relatively small and highly explosive area for which they are either too fast or too powerful or both. The ever-present and growing fear is that the super-Powers may be drawn into new conflicts of their client States in this area as a function

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

of the wide dissemination of these powerful weapons, adding a new and serious dimension to the dangers of any future conflict.

Whatever the form of measure or counter-measure taken by the opposing naval forces, it is only the danger that increases. Stability will not be enhanced because of the mutual suspicion between the opposing forces. In addition, of course, these actions only serve to aggravate the resentment of countries outside the military alliances, which constitute the majority of Mediterranean States.

One might well ask, "Where will it lead?" since the major Powers are not likely in the foreseeable future to change their polarized positions. The dangers are, I submit, obvious, and they may never have been as obvious as they are at the present time. The very number of naval units involved, their sophisticated armaments, including nuclear weapons, and the multiple uses to which they are being put are an almost certain guarantee of an eventual clash, through accident if not deliberately.

Indeed, during these very days, with scant Power consultation among Mediterranean peoples, a new generation of missiles will be installed in the Mediterranean, and new strategic alliances are being formed which will only add fuel to the dangerous confrontation currently prevalent. The danger cannot abate but will constantly increase unless and until an alternative policy is cogently planned by the Mediterranean countries themselves. In view of the present world-wide strategic balance any new policy would have to be cautiously and carefully devised in such a way that neither one of the two Powers is given advantages detrimental to the other and hence to regional stability.

That, very briefly, is what Malta advocates as a rational alternative - a difficult policy to be sure, but one which is more strictly based on regional support and which therefore can succeed.

It is conveniently assumed by military strategists that the Mediterranean region lacks the political, economic and ethnic homogeneity essential for a process of independent stability. Superficially, this may appear to be the case, but closer analysis portrays a totally different picture.

In the first place, the commendably co-operative cohesion in the North and Central Mediterranean is the product of a conscious policy of gradual integration of policies. It sets both a pattern and a practical example. The prospects for regional expansion and for emulation are striking. A fairly recent study by the

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Council of Europe provides some idea of the potential. I quote from the study which is political and economic in its approach.

"Africa, the Middle East and Europe will number 1,000 million inhabitants in the year 2000. The way things are going at present, the 700 million inhabitants of the south will have an income 30 times smaller than the 300 million in the north. Only industrial and economic redeployment, not emigration to the north, can achieve a better balance of population and economy and, above all, save the cultural values specific to the regions and the peoples concerned.

"Thirty per cent of Western Europe's industrial capacity is unused, representing some 180,000 million dollars lost every year. Europe could supply Africa and the Middle East with several thousands of millions of dollars every year for 10 years, which would ultimately be converted into investment goods, major projects and industrial equipment. This in turn would stimulate the European economy and reduce unemployment.

"Europe, which has no energy and no basic raw materials, is severely penalized by the situation on the energy front. Agreement between Europe, the Middle East and Africa could avoid difficulties for European balances of payments and dangers of stagnation and collapse for the Middle East and Africa."

Against this challenging target, would the Mediterranean region not be the natural focal point for a start to be made? Without question the answer is in the affirmative. The signs have already become more and more apparent.

Within a few years at most, nearly all the countries in the northern area of the Mediterranean will have joined the European Economic Community (EEC). The other Mediterranean countries have or will have negotiated varying degrees of association with the Community. Simultaneously and convergently, many bilateral agreements for long-term economic and political co-operation will have been signed between Mediterranean countries.

The trade figures between the EEC countries and the Mediterranean basin provide practical details of the evolutionary trend already under way in this direction.

For anyone who may be interested, I have culled the trade statistics between the European Community and the Mediterranean basin. In addition, merely for purposes of analytical comparison, I have also reproduced trade figures between the

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

European Community and other important regions, namely, Eastern Europe, Central and South America, the United States, and the Pacific countries of Australia and New Zealand combined.

Some significant trends emerge. The imports bill for the European Community from the Mediterranean basin, at around 6 per cent of the Community's total, was already larger in 1960 than that from Eastern Europe and the two Pacific countries, but smaller than the corresponding totals for Central and South America and roughly one fourth the imports bill from the United States. In 1980, however, imports from the Mediterranean basin had equalled those from the United States and grown to almost twice the totals for Central and South America and for Eastern Europe. They had grown to 10 times the imports bill of the two Pacific countries. In fact, they had practically equalled the total of the last three mentioned regions combined. In a different perspective and in percentage terms, the imports bill from the Mediterranean basin had grown by 1,258 per cent in two decades, that is, at an average annual growth of 62 per cent.

The exports of the Community to the Mediterranean region have been consistently high, averaging 9 per cent of the total. They were and remain the highest among the regions mentioned, including the United States, both during 1960 and 1980. In that period the totals increased by 1,018 per cent, at an annual growth rate of 50 per cent. The other regions also recorded substantial growth rates, but with the exception of Eastern Europe the percentage of the total imports bill for every other region mentioned declined.

The balance-of-trade figures for the European Community with the same regions may perhaps complete the trading picture I am trying to convey. Of the five regions mentioned, the terms of trade of the European Community improved from 1,452 European currency units (ECUS) in 1960 to 8,237 ECUS in 1980, a growth rate of 568 per cent. With the exception of the two Pacific countries with which a trade deficit in 1960 was turned into a surplus in 1980, the deficit of the European Community with the other regions increased heavily against the Ten. It is significant to note that the surplus with the Mediterranean basin was enough to offset either half the deficit with the United States or else to wipe out completely the deficit of the two other regions, with a substantial reserve in hand.

I apologize if I may be quoting too many statistics. I know it is tiring, but is also important and revealing. I will therefore limit myself to one more statistical paragraph, although in this case, unfortunately, I was not able to

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

obtain in time the most recent totals, but I still believe that they are equally significant.

Maritime transport provides the most voluminous trade vehicle for the international exchange of goods. In 1970, 30 per cent of total sea-borne trade was already centred in the Mediterranean basin. Maritime Mediterranean trade increased at an average of 10 per cent annually in 1970, while the total tonnage of the world fleet increased by only 5 per cent, that is, half the growth rate for the Mediterranean. The seventh largest merchant-fleet nation was reported to have around 300 ships plying Mediterranean routes daily. In the seven-year period ending in 1970, Mediterranean sea-borne trade had already doubled. With the subsequent reopening of the Suez Canal, the projected annual growth rate was bound to be even higher.

These statistics clearly indicate that the land-mass neighbouring Europe across the Mediterranean provides fertile ground for economic, strategic and political co-operation. Asian and African Mediterranean countries provide energy to Europe's industrial plants as well as an insatiable market for its technology, while on their part the Afro-Asian Mediterranean countries require from Europe an outlet for their primary produce and a dependable source of industrial and technological know-how and investment equipment.

The figures for mercantile trade also point out two other plus-factors. First, the fears openly conveniently advanced by strategists that a "power vacuum" would be created if naval forces were withdrawn are clearly not well founded. Mercantile traffic in the Mediterranean is more than enough to ensure that there will in fact be no vacuum. Secondly, another requirement often quoted, of "showing the flag", will also not be adversely affected, for the national flag of the major Powers can fly as proudly on a tourist liner or on a trade freighter as on an aircraft carrier, and in fact would generate feelings of friendship and solidarity rather than fear and resentment.

In fits and starts attempts have been and are being made to harness this tremendous Mediterranean potential, which in turn is facilitated by the cultural, linguistic and historical links between Mediterranean countries. The United Nations regional commissions have had their interest awakened, but unfortunately the Mediterranean is only on the periphery of their ongoing activities - a staff Cinderella of unco-ordinated and sporadic attention. Many non-governmental as well as political parties and organizations have also explored promising sectors of

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

progress, but although interest is great, efforts have also been sporadic and more often than not unconcerted.

Malta has therefore tried to instil some planned order into those efforts. We have insisted and will continue to insist that, given the inseparable link between Europe and the Mediterranean, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process is the best means to pursue this objective until such time as a specific alternative forum is devised. As a result of the determined efforts carried out within the CSCE in the past decade or so, meetings on Mediterranean co-operation in the field of culture, technology and economics will shortly enter a second phase in Venice as a follow up to the first meeting held in Valetta, where many promising sectors of co-operation were initially identified.

It is important, however, that action should be taken in parallel on political co-operation in order to tackle the serious question of Mediterranean security. This so far has been resisted, despite commitments already undertaken. Some say the time is not yet ripe; they have been repeating the same arguments for a number of years now. But evidence clearly shows that, the longer we delay, the worse the situation becomes. And to those who claim that no progress is possible, we beg to express our disagreement, for Malta can proudly point out what national determination can accomplish.

Since 1975, I have given this Committee a faithful report of what Malta has done each year. In brief recapitulation, we have in fact concluded all the national measures possible to promote regional peace and co-operation.

Our major contribution was the assumption of an unambiguous status of neutrality, based on the principles of non-alignment. All foreign military bases previously established in Malta have been dismantled. Our neighbours have all received guarantees that Malta's territory will not be used for any aggressive activities against them. This, simply stated, constituted a complete reversal of Malta's centuries-old previous history and was accomplished with single-minded determination and unilaterally, within the span of one decade. As a result, we have established new political, economic and commercial relationships with an ever-increasing number of countries far and near. Those measures have expanded and diversified our patterns of trade in a healthier and future-oriented performance.

We are pleased by and grateful for the tangible support we have received from various countries too numerous to mention individually. We now advocate similarly determined action to cover the entire Mediterranean region. At present it is deep



(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

in the throes of its historical winter of discontent. We urge the nourishment of the spring of hope, based on concerted action in pursuit of identified common interests.

On the narrow basis of self-interest, but even more on the basis of commitments assumed, particularly those under the Mediterranean chapter of the Helsinki Final Act, the super-Powers should be among the first to acquiesce in the evolution of such an alternative process. Better still, they should give it active encouragement if they really wish to lessen tension and military confrontation in such an uncontrollably sensitive region and provided, of course, that they really wish to uphold principles of international law rather than to ride roughshod over the sensitivities of other countries in the attempt to consolidate and expand their spheres of influence.

Malta is not blind to the problems that exist. These are of long standing, and appropriate forums have already been established for their discussion. We seek to replace neither those discussions and negotiations nor the existing forums where they are discussed. We realize also that those problems cast a long shadow over prospects for progress, but we do know that progress is possible where determination exists, even in the midst of apparent difficulties.

Even here we have a practical example to quote. Two years ago, Libya and Malta were at loggerheads over exploration activities on the continental shelf separating the two countries. But good will and common sense prevailed; after having utilized the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the dispute is now being peacefully adjudicated by the International Court of Justice.

We also know that difficulties left to fester can augment negativism to extremes, the Middle East crisis being a prime example. We simply cannot allow the smoke from that conflagration to choke the entire Mediterranean. Our determination is to nourish the positive and reduce the negative and eventually confer upon the Mediterranean its proper role as a major corridor of peace serving international trade and communications. For Malta, this is a question of national survival.

Again we have one more practical example to cite. The Mediterranean environment was suffering badly some 10 years ago. Together, the Mediterranean countries became the pioneers of a regional effort to improve the situation. The Barcelona Convention and Protocols were negotiated and signed. Concerted action

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

has been taken, deterioration has been halted and constant improvement is being encouraged. Already the Mediterranean ecology is breathing more freely as a result.

To recapitulate then, we see the Mediterranean countries not simply as helpless victims of outside confrontation, but rather as countries acting together first to stabilize military tension, secondly to reduce it and thirdly to strive, with growing confidence and in a careful balance, to distance military adventurism from Mediterranean shores. The openings and the prospects are there. All we need is to recognize them and to work energetically to attain them.

We therefore welcome the brief analysis of replies received, prepared by the Secretary-General, as contained in the report in document A/38/395 of 30 September 1983. It is a first step in the right direction. It throws light on the aspirations of the countries of the region; it shows much convergence among replies received from States in the region and also shows the extent of support from far beyond the region, especially from the Non-Aligned Movement as a whole. Much more, as usual, still needs to be done and we now have to go beyond declarations to some form of concerted action. The sooner we start, with universal backing, the better. That is why Malta has not only clearly expounded its own ideas, but has also joined other Mediterranean countries in submitting a draft resolution which sets out a path for potential action.

We hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus, because it represents only a modest first step. The real work still lies ahead in practical steps to be agreed on in order to search for a unifying Mediterranean identity and to build a community of interests in as many sectors as possible at any particular time, gradually strengthening the process and then proceeding to tackle the more difficult areas.

It is of course quite impossible to determine in advance when there is likely to be a break in the political clouds that menace the Mediterranean. But it is equally impossible to resign ourselves perpetually to paralysis, and to an abject acquiescence in a constantly deteriorating situation. We need to act now if we wish to shift the course away from disaster. Let the Mediterranean countries rise to the occasion. Consultations and co-operation can and must prevail over confrontation and division.

In the wider field of international security, Malta has also taken active steps within the Security Council to show in particular the latter's tremendous potential to prevent conflict from erupting, rather than trying to take action when

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

it is too late. We shall continue our endeavours in the coming year when we enter a new phase in the round of discussions already initiated, the results of which have been brought to the attention of all members in the note by the Council's President, our colleague from Guyana, dated 12 September 1983. Malta even went so far as to try to remedy one glaring deficiency in this session - the absence of the Soviet Foreign Minister - by proposing a meeting of the Council at ministerial level last month in Malta. The conditions were then not considered right, but the offer remains open, and we believe the Security Council in particular must be prepared to assume its proper role in the future, for therein lies mankind's best hope.

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The 1970 United Nations Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is one of the milestones in a process which has given the peoples hope for security and a peaceful future. The 1960s and 1970s saw the emergence of the clearly marked contours of such a future. Realistic approaches emerged with a view to addressing global challenges and jointly resolving them to mutual advantage and for the benefit of all mankind, notwithstanding differences in social systems.

Agreements on arms limitation and disarmament testified to a growing awareness of mutual interests in curbs on the arms race and in practical steps towards stemming the danger of nuclear war. While constituting initial measures, they did have a beneficial effect on international life. The realization that international security in the nuclear age can be ensured collectively only by reducing the huge military arsenals, in other words, by what has come also to be called security partnership, was gradually gaining ground. It is thus understandable how legitimate those positive expectations were, expectations which were also voiced in this Committee and reflected in pertinent resolutions.

In the meantime, however, the situation has radically changed. In recent years, the debate on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has increasingly been dominated by grave concern felt for the safety of world peace. Today we have to note that the danger of the outbreak of a third world war and hence of a nuclear holocaust has become even more acute. This is denied only by those circles which seek to lull world public opinion into slackening its vigilance for the sake of their politics of unbridled rearmament and preparation for war. When has the United Nations oft-quoted paramount goal of

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

saving succeeding generations from the scourge of another world war been of greater topicality than at this time?

People are asking with ever greater insistence what has caused this dramatic worsening of international relations. Our answer is clear, and its accuracy has been proved by a complete chain of facts: it is the massive and globally pursued attempt by the most aggressive imperialist forces, particularly those in the United States, to gain military-strategic superiority in order to dominate the world and to rearrange it in their own image. The plan is to reverse the profound historic process of liberation of peoples from foreign hegemony. This ambition is not new. Yet since the start of this decade it has led to a perilous aggravation of international relations because the present United States Administration is obviously determined to reach its aims at all costs, chiefly by the use of military force. Its plans consequently anticipate the possibility of unleashing nuclear war. What underlies the greatest arms build-up in the history of the United States is the adventurist concept that such a war can be won. This is evidenced by the existing doctrines of deterrence, first use of nuclear weapons and the feasibility of fighting and winning such a war.

Wherever we look, in all regions, the United States is engaged in expansion of military might. As a result, international relations in their entirety are being driven into a rapidly advancing process of militarization. The intention is for the United Nations Charter's requirement of settling international disputes by peaceful means to be rendered inoperative by the threat and use of military force. This policy is a persistent and grave violation of paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. The lust for power which has possessed the most aggressive imperialist forces leaves in their thoughts and actions no room for respect for the sovereignty of States and the right of peoples to self-determination. An adventurist crusading mentality, and a presumption of being entitled to interfere wherever peoples are shaping their way of life according to their own aspirations, result inevitably in heightened tensions, new conflicts and an increased danger of war. The targets of this policy are not only the socialist States, but all others which show no willingness to submit to United States dominance. National security is being invoked as implying a right to interfere in whatever form in other countries' affairs, even if they are situated thousands of miles away from the borders of the United States.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is speaking out in a situation which is of critical significance for all mankind. A few days ago, deployment of new American medium-range weapons started on the territory of several Western European countries. Thus a decision fraught with serious consequences was made to the detriment of international peace, security and co-operation, a decision diametrically opposed to the peoples' vital interests and to the stated will of the vast majority of citizens of the countries concerned. The numerous initiatives launched by the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries, all of which took account of the security interests of all sides, have been ignored in the most irresponsible manner. It must be stated clearly and unmistakably: the stationing of new American first-strike weapons on the territory of Western European countries has created a new situation in Europe and in the world at large.

The real danger of a nuclear world war has substantially increased; a new round has been set off in the arms race; the climate of international relations in Europe and worldwide has come under considerable strain, and the existing stock of confidence in relations between States has been shaken; for the first time since the end of the Second World War, there emanates from German soil west of our State's border a direct threat against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries - a danger which opens the possibility of a world war being unleashed from German soil - this time, through the use of American first-strike arms; Western Europe has become a nuclear hostage of the United States.

Since the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) deployment decision was announced in 1979, the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist States have on several occasions pointed to the dangers and consequences which are bound to arise from the stationing of United States medium-range missiles in Western European countries. It was made unmistakably clear that the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe would result in the people of Europe being put to one of the most severe tests in their post-war history. The interests of security and peace in Europe require that the United States and NATO not be allowed to gain military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union and all other Warsaw Treaty member countries.

The USSR put forward numerous proposals at the Geneva negotiations on nuclear arms in Europe which provide a sound basis for the achievement of an agreement that

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

would take into account the interests of all sides. Furthermore, the USSR made an additional contribution through unilateral measures, such as a freeze on the deployment of new medium-range missiles, to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion. At the same time, the implementation of counter-measures was very clearly indicated in the event that Pershing-2 and cruise missiles should be deployed. Those measures, indispensable for the maintenance of the military-strategic balance, as has been said by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yuri Andropov, are now being carried out.

The German Democratic Republic fully supports such counter-measures. They have been taken strictly within the framework that has been dictated by the NATO States. They have been taken with a view to doing only what is required for maintenance of the military balance. History has proved that it has always been the United States which has forced the Soviet Union to adopt counter-measures in response to the introduction of new weapons, from the first nuclear weapon, strategic bombers, nuclear-powered submarines carrying ballistic missiles and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) to multiple re-entry vehicles (MRVs) and multiple individually-targeted re-entry vehicles (MIRVs).

The required counter-measures have always been designed to prevent the other side from gaining military-strategic superiority.

In the light of the new situation that has emerged owing to the beginning of deployment of new United States nuclear medium-range weapons in Western Europe, the German Democratic Republic will now increase its efforts aimed at the prevention of a nuclear inferno and the termination of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field. As the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker stated, in this connection on 25 November:

"The commitment to do everything for peace is even greater, and we will fulfil it. Now as before, there exists no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence. More than ever before, it is imperative to mobilize all forces for its implementation. The worldwide peace movement is firmly called upon to increase its action."

The further deployment of United States medium-range weapons must be stopped immediately and weapons already stationed must be dismantled.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

We can state with satisfaction that the majority of States represented here share the same goal, which is reflected in the number of resolutions. What matters most is to limit the damage caused to the process of détente, to the European systems of agreements and to bilateral relations. We will therefore continue to conduct the political dialogue with all those who act upon their responsibility for the history of their peoples and of mankind, and who are ready for mutual understanding.

Under the present conditions the conclusion of a treaty on renunciation of the use of military force between the Warsaw Treaty States and NATO is gaining in importance. We hope that this proposal made by the Warsaw Treaty member States will be considered with the required seriousness and elicit a positive response from the other side. Non-binding statements by Western representatives concerning renunciation of the use of force - some of which statements can be heard in this Committee too - are not sufficient. That, as well as the other proposals made by the Warsaw Treaty member States in Prague, Moscow and Sofia, still remains valid.

Since international peace and security is indivisible, we are concerned by dangerous conflicts existing in other regions of the world.

The alarming news from the Middle East indicates that tensions menacing peace in that region are still mounting. The expansionist course pursued by the aggressor, Israel, which has recently been granted further comprehensive military and financial assistance by its major strategic ally, threatens to wage another war against the Arab States.

The German Democratic Republic demands the immediate termination of that policy, in particular the dangerous escalation of the military pressure upon Syria. Being in full agreement with the documents adopted at the Geneva International Conference on the Question of Palestine, the German Democratic Republic advocates finding a solution to the Middle East issue within the framework of an international conference with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Without implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestine people, including its right to establish an independent State of its own, no lasting peace can be achieved in that region.

In southern Africa a settlement of the conflict is being delayed further, since the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization continue to support the apartheid régime and its rule in Namibia, thereby encouraging acts of aggression launched against free African States. Therefore, it is high time that

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

the decisions taken at the Paris International Conference on the Question of Namibia were taken into account and that the question of Namibia were settled on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), under the full responsibility of the United Nations. We unreservedly support the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for its national independence.

Following upon the aggression of the United States against Grenada, United States covert actions and military pressure, above all against Nicaragua, have further increased. We demand a stop to all military activities and any interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. The rising danger of military intervention must be eliminated and a political solution of the crisis found.

We witness an aggravation of the situation also in the Mediterranean. Another particularly dangerous element - the deployment of nuclear cruise missiles - has been added to the naval presence of the United States and the extension of military bases.

In the Indian Ocean the expansion of military bases, directed against nationally liberated States, is continuing. All steps towards limiting military activities in that region are being rejected by the United States.

There is also deep concern about the growing militarization of South Korea. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic supports the activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at the preservation of peace on the Korean peninsula and the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea, for the peaceful and democratic unification of Korea without external interference.

It is our obligation to take every opportunity to express the political will to strengthen international security and to take appropriate practical measures. As history has proved, hegemony and adventurism can be overcome when they are countered with resoluteness and united political actions. We must, and we can, succeed in bringing international relations back towards peace and common sense. To achieve that end, the German Democratic Republic will work unceasingly, not only here at the United Nations but also regionally, as well as in its relations with other States.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In my previous statement on Thursday last week, I echoed the wise old saying that "forthcoming events cast their shadows before them". I felt we were nearing a global catastrophe. And by the end of the week, we realized that those shadows presaging the effects were real and we now know that



(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

we are in a very dangerous situation, so much so that it is futile to be discussing matters here in the usual manner, as if we had much time before us, when it is a case of dealing with a most dangerous situation obvious to anyone who can think - or even to anyone not given to much thinking.

The Charter relates peace to international security; it does not relate it to disarmament at all. It relates it to international security, from which disarmament would flow. It is obvious that the Charter specifies international security as the first duty of Member States, in contradistinction to the Covenant of the League of Nations, which made disarmament the first obligation of Member States and never even mentioned international security. The League of Nations having failed lamentably, the drafters of the Charter realized that they must deal with a security system and give it prominence, as required by the circumstances of the world situation.

We have now reached the stage when everyone is alarmed to a certain degree. The United Nations could not be less alarmed than the ordinary man in the street. Therefore, we must seek a way out of this situation.

This is no time for fault-finding; if we were to engage in fault-finding, we would be in a very strong position to find the fault and say where it lies. But that is not what is required. What is required now is to stop the slide towards nuclear war. The situation in Lebanon is most dangerous. The former United States representative to the United Nations and former Under-Secretary of State in the Kennedy and Johnson Administration, Mr. George Ball, on 21 November 1983 wrote an open letter to the President of the United States, published in The New York Times, in which he drew attention to the danger of nuclear war that could result directly from the situation in Lebanon. I shall not quote what he said but merely point out that, in his view, Lebanon could be the place where nuclear war might start. He cautioned against the escalation of the situation in Lebanon. And now we see that his words are coming true.

But even without that, just by watching the world situation, we can see where we are being led. We cannot be blind or shut our eyes to where we are heading nor can we deal with matters in the old way, just like last year or the year before, and - as we have done for 15 years now - adopt the same kind of ineffectual resolutions. Each year we are making the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security less effective and our resolution does not gain more votes. Hence we have to repeat our position even more emphatically.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I do not believe we should waste any more time. We must deal with the real heart of the problem: the two protagonists in this situation - the Soviet Union and the United States - have the responsibility to solve the problem and they must do so through understanding. And that understanding cannot come by their discussing means for disarmament. No matter what reduction of armaments - even to half of present levels of weapons - is enough to destroy the whole world. We are now aware that their previous meetings on disarmament have practically failed, because disarmament is a negative concept requiring strict inspection, control and verification, something which is never attained.

The positive aspect is international security. Yet it has never been given due consideration. From the very start of the United Nations the major Powers have not given the Security Council the means to implement its decisions; thus the security system provided for in the Charter has remained inoperative.

Now there is a full security system provided for in the Charter which cannot function, because the basis for the effective implementation of Security Council decisions is lacking. Therefore, we have a Security Council which is not really a security council. It is a debating society which adopts resolutions - everybody says "Oh, yes, a very good resolution" - and not very good resolutions, but they remain there. Once they remain there unimplemented there is no international security and, consequently, as we go along we get ever more into a world of insecurity, anarchy and terrorism - terrorism from above and terrorism from below.

In a world such as ours with its rapidly increasing, galloping arms race for ever-more effective nuclear weapons, is there any hope of survival, when the situation in Lebanon shows that we are very near a confrontation?

Therefore my delegation wishes to introduce, under agenda item 67, the following draft resolution (A/C.1/38/L.86) intended to meet the present-day situation: it is entitled "International peace and security".

"The General Assembly,

"Alarmed by the growing threat of a looming nuclear exchange leading to a holocaust,

"Recalling the foresight and grave warnings by eminent men of science and politics in their earnest calls for timely action to prevent global catastrophe," -

There are many such warnings, but I shall mention only those from Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein and, later, the very important one by U Thant, the wise Secretary-General, who said at the end of 1969 and the beginning of 1970:

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"After many studies that my men have conducted, we have concluded that the Members of the United Nations have perhaps 10 years left" - that is, until the 1980s - "in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment and to supply the required momentum for world development efforts." And we have noticed that during the 1980s, for reasons that I shall not go into now, the situation in the world has deteriorated greatly and rapidly and we are now heading to a catastrophe.

The draft resolution continues:

"Gravely concerned over the reality that the time is up and mankind may well be on the verge of plunging into chaos,

"Expressing the universal desire of nations and peoples to avoid a cataclysm and live in security and peace,

"Bearing in mind that in the present times of unprecedented crisis there must be" - and I emphasize this - "a radical change of approach by Governments and peoples to question of war and peace,

"Conscious of the necessity to substitute the positive notion of common security in place of the negative concept of nuclear deterrence, which has abundantly proved counter-productive to security and only resulted in the continuous escalation of the arms race,

"Conscious further of the need for mutual restraint, understanding and co-operation in a positive spirit between the two major Powers in order to avert the threat to mankind from a nuclear confrontation," -

At the moment there is need for meeting, for understanding and for co-operation between the two super-Powers, not in the sense of disarmament, of reducing armaments - on which they can never agree, as has been proved - but in the sense of international security. International security has been ignored and bypassed, and thereby the Charter itself has been ignored. It must now be revived.

The two major Powers have never met to discuss this positive aspect. There has never been a meeting between the Soviet Union and the United States to discuss the possibility of international security through the United Nations.

During this session, in this Committee, the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Petrovsky, said that it was "now time to tap the possibilities of international security through the United Nations" to meet the dangers of today. We thus have that statement from the Soviet Union. And there are also statements by

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

the United States that it wants an understanding towards international security and peace. Hence the draft resolution notes

"with satisfaction that both major Powers have expressed their desire for understanding and for compliance with the Charter of the United Nations".

In its operative part the draft resolution

"1. Calls upon the two major Powers to hold a high-level meeting for the positive purpose of strengthening the United Nations in its needed capacity for the maintenance of international peace and security, in accordance with the Charter;

"2. Calls upon all other Member States, particularly those of the two major military alliances, to give active support to the holding of the aforesaid meeting and to exert all efforts for the relaxation of the present tension in international relations."

It is our hope that such a meeting between high-level representatives of the two major Powers will materialize in order to save humanity from the increasing danger and real threat of a nuclear conflagration.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The debate on the question of strengthening international security is beginning this year in a very tense and dangerous situation caused by the adventurist actions of those who are bringing the world ever closer to the point of no return. The United States attempts to secure for itself the dominant position in the world are aimed against two groups of States - the socialist countries and the countries which only a relatively short time ago freed themselves from colonial dependence on the West.

A veritable crusade has been declared against the socialist States, primarily against the Soviet Union. The idea is being impressed on people that there is no room whatsoever for socialism on this planet. Attempts are now being made to place this adventurist premise on a material foundation of nuclear missiles. With the consent of Bonn, London and Rome, Washington has begun to deploy its medium-range missiles in Europe, thereby seeking to disrupt the approximate balance of military forces, including nuclear forces, that has been established in Europe and to gain military supremacy.

The United States position in the Geneva negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe created a situation that doomed the talks to a stalemate. From the very outset the United States did not want to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on nuclear arms in Europe. It was interested not so much in the

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

reduction of Soviet missiles as in the deployment of its own missiles. It was not motivated by a concern over the threat from the East but by a desire to create a threat to the East. The Soviet Union did everything it could to reach agreement at the negotiating table in Geneva. The Soviet proposals in their totality provided a real basis for a mutually acceptable compromise on the question of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

That this was precisely the case is not difficult to prove. At one time West European leaders said that if the Soviet Union cut down the number of its missiles to the 1977-1978 level the deployment of new United States missiles in Europe would then become unnecessary. In the meantime in the course of the talks the Soviet Union proposed far deeper reductions in the number of its medium-range missiles than what the leaders of West European countries had called for; it indicated its readiness to reduce them to a level even lower than that of 1976. Moreover, with a view to creating a more favourable atmosphere for reaching agreement, the Soviet Union did more than once take unilateral steps, such as the declaration in the spring of 1982 of a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of new missiles in the European part of Soviet territory.

Regrettably, all the efforts of the Soviet side were ignored by the United States, which sought one thing and one thing only, namely, to deploy in Europe, in addition to the existing nuclear systems of the countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), including the British and French arsenals, new United States nuclear missiles and, thereby, to acquire military superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies - that is, 59 per cent more nuclear delivery vehicles and twice as many nuclear warheads. No less important is the fact that Pershing-2 missiles can reach Soviet territory in five to six minutes, while cruise missiles - according to United States calculations - are supposed to slip undetected through Soviet air defences. Therefore all these new United States weapons in Europe are strategic first-strike weapons, and their deployment is designed to give NATO the advantage - both quantitative and qualitative. It should also be noted that all this deployment is taking place when the United States is stubbornly refusing to follow the example of the USSR and assume an obligation to forgo the first use of nuclear weapons.

That is why top Party and Government leaders of seven socialist countries declared at their meeting in Moscow on 28 June 1983 that under no circumstances would they tolerate military superiority of the NATO bloc over the Warsaw Treaty countries.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It will be recalled that, in view of the situation that has been created counter-measures to be taken by the Soviet Union were announced in the statement made by Yuri Andropov on 24 November 1983. As a nation that lost 20 million lives as a result of the treacherous surprise attack by fascist Germany in 1941 we cannot in this nuclear age remain indifferent to the fact that first-strike or surprise attack systems are right at the threshold of our homes.

Having carefully weighed all these factors the Soviet leadership has taken a number of decisions. First, it was deemed impossible for the Soviet Union to continue to participate in the negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. Secondly, the obligations assumed unilaterally by the Soviet Union with a view to creating more favourable conditions for success at the negotiations have been revoked. Thirdly, in agreement with the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, the work initiated some time ago on the deployment of operational-tactical missiles of an increased range in the territory of those countries has been accelerated. Fourthly, since by deploying its missiles in Europe the United States is increasing the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union, corresponding Soviet systems will be deployed in ocean areas and seas and will be adequate to the threat which United States missiles deployed in Europe pose for the Soviet Union and its allies.

At the same time the Soviet Union declares - and this was emphasized in the statement by Comrade Andropov - that it is not seeking military superiority and will do only what is absolutely essential to ensure that the military balance is not disrupted. The Soviet Union does not intend to have a single missile in excess of what the United States and NATO have overall.

If the United States and other NATO countries show a willingness to revert to the situation that existed prior to the beginning of the deployment of United States medium-range missiles in Europe - if, in other words, those missiles are not deployed - the Soviet Union also will be ready to reciprocate. In that case our earlier proposals on the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms in Europe would regain their validity. Provided the situation is restored to what it was before, the unilateral obligations assumed by the USSR in this area would also become effective again.

The Soviet Union wishes to stress most emphatically that the implementation of forced defensive counter-measures by no means implies a change in the position of principle underlying Soviet foreign policy. Even in the acute present-day situation there is no doubt in our minds as to what course to follow in

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

international affairs. Ours will continue to be a course aimed at achieving détente, curbing the arms race, preserving and strengthening peace and expanding and deepening co-operation among States. The Soviet Union continues to be in favour of the true zero option in Europe, that is, of a Europe totally free of both medium-range arms and tactical nuclear weapons. We continue to propose that, following the example set by the Soviet Union, all nuclear Powers, and above all the United States of America, assume an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We continue to favour early negotiations on a treaty between the countries signatories of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO which would rule out first use of any military force.

The Soviet Union is in favour of a nuclear-weapon freeze and is known to have submitted proposals to this effect which have already been endorsed by the First Committee. We continue to stand by our declaration that the Soviet Union will never and under no circumstances use nuclear weapons against countries that have neither nuclear weapons of their own nor foreign nuclear weapons on their territory, and we are prepared to conclude necessary agreements on guarantees with non-nuclear States. Thus we are countering the adventurist policy of the present United States Administration with our policy which combines forced measures dictated by military caution and a continued struggle to prevent the nuclear threat and strengthen international peace and security.

Recent times have witnessed an unprecedented escalation in imperialist pressure brought to bear on newly independent developing States.

It should be stressed in particular that it is erroneous to think that deployment of United States missiles in Europe does not directly affect countries in other continents. In effect, it gravely prejudices the security of the peoples of European countries and the American people itself. If the United States and NATO succeed in implementing their plans to deploy "Euromissiles" in Sicily, among other places, dozens of States in northern and central Africa, the Near and Middle East and South-West Asia will find themselves within their range.

Experience has confirmed the validity of the view set forth by Yuri Andropov in his well-known statement of 28 September last, that

"If anyone entertained illusions that the policy of the present United States Administration could evolve for the better, recent developments have conclusively dispelled them. It is going so far in pursuing its imperialist objectives that one cannot fail to question whether Washington has any brakes at all that would prevent it from crossing the line at which any thinking person must stop."

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

And indeed a look at any part of the globe will reveal that Washington's militaristic policy is in effect eroding the foundations of international relations, destabilizing the situation all over the planet and defying the entire world. Existing military tensions and crises are being aggravated, while new tensions and crises keep cropping up: undeclared wars have been fought against a number of independent States.

The hotbed of war danger in the Middle East has been smouldering for years, and peaceful settlement remains elusive. As a result, both the vital interests of the peoples in the region and international security interests are affected. The United States military stronghold in Lebanon is being rapidly built up. The United States is co-ordinating its activities with the Tel Aviv Government and continuing to encourage Israel's aggressive policies. This has once again been demonstrated by the results of Prime Minister Shamir's visit to Washington a few days ago. United States actions aimed at expanding and solidifying its military presence in that region, in particular through "multinational forces" which are essentially American, are posing a direct threat to the Arab peoples.

This is how we must also view yesterday's mass attack by American airplanes on a number of mountainous regions in Lebanon, in particular on the positions of the Lebanese national patriotic forces and the Syrian troops which are part of the Inter-Arab peace-keeping forces in the region. Obviously, that unprovoked attack was undertaken to intensify the situation in and around Lebanon to create a pretext for the further expansion of aggressive actions by the United States against Syria. The American actions once again confirm that Washington and Tel Aviv are not interested in maintaining peace and quiet in the Near East, but would like to subordinate the whole region to their military control. In decisively condemning this act of aggression, the Soviet Union has stated its solidarity with the peoples of Lebanon, Syria and other Arab countries.

Pressure is also being applied against independent Mediterranean States. An escalating process of militarization is changing the Mediterranean Sea into an area directly threatening the peoples and States in that region. The Soviet Union has consistently advocated the transformation of the Mediterranean from an area of political and military confrontation into a zone of stable peace and international co-operation. We have advanced a concrete programme of action which provides, inter alia, for an agreed reduction of armed forces in the region, the withdrawal



(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

from the Mediterranean of nuclear-weapons carrying ships and the renunciation of deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear Mediterranean States.

Turning now to yet another region, Central America, there too the United States has set about to sharply exacerbate the situation in its attempts to suppress popular struggles for socio-economic change, freedom and independence. Socialist Cuba remains the target of vicious attacks and hostile actions; overt incursions into Nicaragua are being organized and carried out; Pacific and Caribbean waters are plyed by United States naval fleets manned by Marines whose primary mission is to intimidate the people of that country. The situation there is plainly becoming increasingly tense and calls for constant attention on the part of the United Nations.

The fact that the United States has turned to acts of open aggression has once again been confirmed by the armed invasion launched against the peaceful people of a small country, Grenada, which had posed no threat to anyone. This invasion has demonstrated utter disregard for the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter and generally recognized rules of international law.

Another area where active intervention on the part of the imperialist forces is becoming ever more extensive and dangerous is the African continent, the scene of attempts to restore domination over the African peoples, limit their sovereignty and deny them the right to take their own decisions. In southern Africa, South Africa and its protectors are impeding the decolonization of Namibia.

"Constructive engagement" with South Africa and the blocking of effective Security Council measures against the apartheid régime encourage the racists to commit acts of overt aggression against neighbouring States and lead to new and dangerous tensions.

Lately, some countries in the Asian continent are being more and more persistently dragged into global adventurist plans. The desire to speed up the militarization of the Far East is not concealed. That these preparations are aimed primarily against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is an open secret. It would be wrong to think, however, that this policy of imperialism is spearheaded only against the Soviet Union. Its aggressive nature is contrary to the national interests of other Asian countries also.

The failure to settle the Korean question does not enhance the stability of the situation in the Far East. An acceptable basis for its solution is to be found in the proposals made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which provide for the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea and the creation of

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

conditions for uniting the country by peaceful means, free from outside interference.

The escalation of militarist preparations in the Persian Gulf area, where large United States naval units have been dispatched since the spring of 1979, has a destabilizing impact on South-West Asia. Further important proof of that is the establishment, on 1 January 1983, of the United States Central Command, CENTCOM, whose area of operations has been unceremoniously extended to cover 19 States of South-West Asia and North-East Africa. The formation of CENTCOM is part and parcel of a plan to turn a vast area - from Pakistan to Kenya - into an American politico-military spring-board threatening the security interests, sovereign rights and independence of the peoples in the region.

One wonders who gave the United States and those acting at one with it the right to trample upon the sovereignty of independent countries, to interfere in internal developments occurring thousands of kilometres away from the United States and to dictate their neo-colonialist rules of conduct to other States. Such hegemonistic encroachments on the part of imperialist forces are in glaring contradiction with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and other international instruments.

In rebuffing the militaristic policy of imperialism, the Soviet Union believes that the importance of the task of reversing unfavourable international developments is increasing rather than diminishing in the prevailing circumstances. The mustering of political will to prevent disaster, rather than irresponsible attempts to get people accustomed to the idea that nuclear war is admissible, is what today, in our view, should be the determining factor in the policies of all States, above all the nuclear ones.

New major initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union at the current session of the General Assembly serve this very purpose. We are gratified to note their approval by this Committee and we express once again our appreciation to the delegations supporting them.

The Declaration on the condemnation of nuclear war which the Committee adopted is aimed at ensuring that the States Members of the United Nations become fully aware of themselves as the United Nations - united in their determination to save present and future generations from nuclear destruction. The Declaration is intended to give new impetus to efforts by States to remove the threat of such war, stop the nuclear-arms race and reduce these weapons drastically until they are completely eliminated.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

These same goals are pursued by the Committee's declaration on a nuclear-weapons freeze by States, above all by the United States and the Soviet Union.

A decision to accelerate the elaboration of a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from outer space against the Earth should become a response to the growing apprehension among the peoples that outer space might become yet another source of mortal danger to life on Earth.

We are convinced that the adoption of these recommendations and, what is most important, their earliest possible implementation, would be vital for securing a decisive change for the better in the global situation and for strengthening international security.

The United Nations must not allow all the positive gains of the 1970s in international relations to be dismissed. What is needed as never before to prevent the growing threat of a new world war, to improve the political climate in the world and to get the development of international relations back on the positive track of détente are collective actions by all States, large and small, and by all peace-loving forces, regardless of their ideology and political convictions.

The fact that the United Nations discusses the item on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security every year promotes the mobilization of efforts in this area and the identification of signposts and routes leading to lasting peace. I can assure the Committee that the Soviet Union will continue to participate actively in this important endeavour.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): This year too the First Committee is taking up for consideration agenda item 66, "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security."

A brief survey of world developments since last year's General Assembly session shows that international peace and security are in no better shape today than they were a year ago. On the contrary, the world situation has deteriorated and is charged with new conflicts, tensions and threats.

In the Middle East, after the Zionist-imperialist aggression against Lebanon and the ongoing assaults on the Palestinians, the situation continues to be serious and fraught with new dangers. The dispatch of United States marines and other foreign forces to Lebanon and the concentration of American warships and troops in the eastern Mediterranean, accompanied by the brandishing of arms, are preludes to new acts of aggression against the countries and peoples of the region. The same

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

holds true for the entire Mediterranean basin, where there is today a huge concentration and intense activity of the naval fleets of the super-Powers. Thousands of miles from their shores, those fleets are criss-crossing the waters of that basin to carry on their gun-boat diplomacy and, one day, when they see fit, to launch direct attacks and aggression against the countries and peoples of the region.

The Balkans have not remained outside the effect of the political climate existing in Europe and the Mediterranean. There too the super-Powers strive to shuffle the cards, each for the benefit of its own game, in order to create complicated situations that would offer them the chance to become arbiters. But the peoples of the Balkans, which have suffered so much from the imperialist policies of the past, will not allow themselves to become victims of the game played by the super-Powers and other imperialist Powers.

Europe remains as always the main theatre in the war plans of the super-Powers. At present it has become a hotbed of rivalry between them and their political-military blocs. This has been manifested especially in their frenzied arms race and more concretely in their efforts for the deployment of the medium-range missiles Pershing-2, Cruise and SS-20s in Europe.

The crisis over the Euro-missile deployment has been accompanied by hysteria and a war of nerves between the super-Powers which is explained by them with an imperialist logic that would have us all believe that it is nothing out of the ordinary, but acceptable and even justifiable, to fight a nuclear war. "Atomic holocaust" and "nuclear catastrophe" have become words of everyday use in the imperialist jargon of the super-Powers. Thus, the old continent has in no way become more secure since the signing with great pomp of the Final Helsinki Act, when high praise was sung of "detente", nor after the Belgrade and Madrid meetings. On the contrary, the euphoria which these meetings and other super-Power negotiating forums try to create has been refuted by the present-day reality of Europe. Hence the peoples of Europe and of the world at large that sincerely cherish peace and recognize the importance of strengthening international security are seeing clearly and becoming more convinced that it is imperialism, social-imperialism and other forces of reaction, with their expansionist ambitions and their hegemonistic policies of aggression, that have brought about the grave situation of insecurity in Europe, and may one day lead mankind into a new world war of unpredictable consequences.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

It is not only the Middle East, Europe or the Mediterranean basin that are now threatened by the rivalry and the aggressive policy of the super-Powers, by their military blocs, fleets and weapons: A serious situation which is cause for concern exists also in Central America. It is a direct result of the pressure and interference of United States imperialism to stifle the struggle of the peoples of that region for freedom and independence and to rid themselves of exploitation and domination. The threats against and interference with the Nicaraguan people and its anti-imperialist revolution, the all-round efforts to undermine the Salvadorian people's struggle, and very recently the piratical American aggression against a small Caribbean country, Grenada, all show that the super-Powers hasten to start new conflicts and launch fresh acts of aggression while peoples have not yet overcome the consequences of the old ones.

The situation is no better on the African continent either, which is suffering the consequences of the imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policy. The racist régime of Pretoria - the bastion of imperialism on this continent - continues stubbornly to pursue its policies of apartheid in South Africa and still holds Namibia under its occupation. Moreover, it threatens neighbouring African countries and from time to time undertakes acts of aggression against them. As a result of imperialist interference and rivalry in Chad, a tense, grave and destabilized situation has been created which may be exploited as a pretext for new interference.

In South-West Asia the war between Iraq and Iran, incited by the enemies of the peoples, goes on causing them great losses in terms of human lives and material damage, whereas in South-East Asia the super-Powers strive to destabilize the situation which in turn would offer them ready-made pretexts to justify their penetration and presence in that region. Four years have passed since the Soviet social-imperialists invaded Afghanistan; yet that Asian country still remains under their occupation.

Today there is almost no part of the world, no corner of the globe, where there is no hot-bed of conflict or war, where force is not used in international relations, where countries and peoples are not subject to the super-Powers' threats, blackmail and aggression. Therefore the responsibility for the grave situation existing in the world today that threatens international peace and security falls on the imperialist super-Powers, which are keeping the world under constant threat of nuclear war, inciting local conflicts and wars and daily

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

threatening other countries with their policy of interference, diktat and aggression.

So how can there really be international peace and security while the super-Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - are engaged in an unprecedented arms race and war preparations, when they establish military bases everywhere and send their troops to different parts of the world, committing barbarous acts of aggression against the peoples?

In conclusion, the Albanian delegation wishes to reiterate that the lofty cause of international peace and security can best be served by resolutely opposing the super-Powers and other imperialist Powers' policy and their war preparations by making the peoples conscious of the dangers threatening them, for with their incalculable strength the peoples will become an insurmountable barrier to the warmongering plans of the super-Powers and halt their aggressive plans.

Mr. PHAM NGAC (Viet Nam): International security is a matter of primary concern to all States, big and small. Over the years, tremendous efforts have been made to that end by the majority of delegations in this Committee.

In 1970, at its twenty-fifth session, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, resolution 2734 (XXV). Since then, this Committee has been reviewing the implementation of that Declaration every year. There is increasing evidence that the consideration of this item is still important. As wars, conflicts and tensions continue unabated in various parts of the world, the rising concern of countries has led to the addition of even more items and declarations in the same vein.

In 1978, the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace resolution 33/73 - was unanimously adopted. It called for the joint efforts of all States for peace and disarmament.

In 1981, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States - resolution 36/103 - was adopted. The Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries met in New Delhi last March, and the Political Declaration of that Summit Conference:

"hailed the adoption of this Declaration as a historic contribution by the Non-Aligned Movement to the task of ushering in a régime of inter-State relations based on mutual respect for sovereignty and independence"

(A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, p. 46)

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

and

"called upon all States to adhere to the Declaration and observe its principles in their dealing with other States". (ibid)

New developments which have taken place in the world since the adoption of those Declarations call with even greater urgency for their full implementation and adherence by all States.

After some years of fruitful negotiations, bilateral disarmament talks between the USSR and the United States of America have been disrupted, bringing multilateral negotiations to a standstill. East-West détente, welcomed as a guarantee of world peace, has been poisoned by the cold-war atmosphere.

Recently the incident of the South Korean aircraft has been exploited to the full. A thorough campaign of mass hysteria was launched against the Soviet Union, and in such a climate the United States Congress approved its largest peacetime military budget, taking for granted the production of much-deplored weapons such as MX missiles and B-1 bombers and the deployment of Cruise and Pershing 2 missiles in Europe. Such deployment has not only shattered remaining hopes for the USSR-United States negotiations in Geneva but has also undermined the commitment by the two German States not to let their respective territories be the starting point of another world war and has made the danger of a nuclear conflagration in Europe more threatening.

Last week, members of this Committee also witnessed the same demonstration of the policy of acceleration of the arms race: a nuclear Power voted against all substantive resolutions on nuclear disarmament; it also voted against resolutions on the promotion of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and on the prevention of the arms race in outer space and in naval forces. The single negative vote cast by one of the two major nuclear-Powers is tantamount to a veto blocking all meaningful negotiations on disarmament, bilateral and multilateral, challenging all the disarmament efforts of the international community. We have heard in this Committee an appeal to the United States not to stand in the way of the joint efforts made by Member States for disarmament. These actions have indeed placed international security in greater danger.

While the whole of mankind is faced with an increasing threat of nuclear war, small countries are the first victims of the use of force. The present military adventures in Lebanon, the naked aggression against Grenada and the present threat against Nicaragua are but a few examples in the long list of countries that are victims of United States aggression and intervention around the world.

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

The root-cause of the present tension in the world and the insecurity of States lies, unmistakably, in the long-standing policy of the United States. In the present-day world, peaceful coexistence is generally accepted as a principle governing the relations between States of differing political and social régimes. The United States, however, continues to pursue a policy of military superiority and refuses to abide by the principle of equality and equal security in disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union. Its foreign policy vis-à-vis other countries - in particular, third-world countries - remains one of gunboat diplomacy. It leaves no stone unturned in interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, exploiting every conflict, supporting all reactionary forces and opposing independent States and the self-determination of nations.

The delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shares the views of many other delegations which feel that the present international tension requires all States to redouble their efforts for peace and disarmament. They must adhere to the underlying principles of the declarations adopted by the General Assembly.

For its part, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam approves of all initiatives for genuine peace and disarmament. It lends its full support to the endeavours of the forces of peace and national independence. As the delegation of an Asian State, we wish to reiterate our full support for the proposal of the Mongolian People's Republic for the conclusion of a convention on non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific. The conclusion of such a convention would greatly improve the relations between States in the region and the international climate as a whole.

During the past four decades, South-East Asia has been the only region of the world ravaged by uninterrupted wars, the bloodiest of which was the Viet Nam war. The countries of the region, especially the countries of Indo-China, have been repeatedly subjected to outside aggression and intervention. The aggressors, in the past as well as at present, have always pitted one country of the region against another and used one country as a springboard for aggression against others.

The peoples of Laos, Kampuchea and Viet Nam, generation after generation, have lived in good-neighbourliness and have always come to one another's help in difficult times. The fact that one after another the aggressors turned the three countries into one single battlefield has sealed the fate of the three peoples together. Throughout the history of their struggles for existence and development a militant alliance has developed among them and has become a law of development of the three countries' revolutions, a fundamental factor for defeating all enemies



(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

and regaining their independence and freedom. This has been reaffirmed by the Heads of State of the three countries at their meeting in Vientiane on 22 and 23 February 1983.

As the statement of the summit Conference of Laos, Kampuchea and Viet Nam made clear:

"The principles which guide relations among the three Indo-Chinese countries not only meet the interests of the three peoples, accord with their long-standing tradition of solidarity and friendship but also conform with the spirit of international agreements on Indo-China and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Non-Aligned Movement."

The statement also confirmed that:

"The three countries of Indo-China are prepared to develop good relations with their neighbouring countries as well as with countries of different political and social systems on the basis of principles of peaceful coexistence."

In spite of the fact that China continues its multi-faceted war of destruction against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, as in Laos and Kampuchea, my country has time and again reiterated its proposal for resumption of negotiations with China and our desire to conclude with it a treaty of non-aggression and non-interference. The same proposal has been made to China by Laos and Kampuchea.

As regards the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the three countries of Indo-China have set forth the principles guiding the relations between the two groups of countries and proposed that the resolutions of the Seventh summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries be taken as a basis for the dialogue between ASEAN and Indo-China. The three countries of Indo-China are also prepared to accept the proposal of the ASEAN countries for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality (ZOPFAN) as a basis for discussion between Indo-China and ASEAN for turning South-East Asia into a zone of peace and stability.

Membership in our Organization has increased three-fold since its foundation. Over 100 countries have been freed from colonialism and have become independent. Countries of different social systems have chosen to live in peace with one another. That is the law of historical development. Certain countries have tried to prevent this course and have used force to keep old world order intact, but all their attempts have been in vain. Hot war, cold war and confrontation have not worked. In the nuclear age, it is even clearer that there is only one alternative: peaceful coexistence between countries of different social systems,

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

and peaceful settlement of disputes on the basis of equality and mutual respect for each other's interests.

That is just as true of international problems as it is of regional problems. It is true also of the problems of South Asia.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): A few days ago the Committee started its debate on the question of the strengthening of international security. In the face of today's highly complex international situation with rising tensions, confrontations and the persistence of certain negative factors which have an adverse impact on international security, the arms race has become one of the gravest international problems, jeopardizing international security and even the survival of mankind in the light of its negative repercussions for international relations, as was emphasized by the study on the relationship between disarmament and international security, from which I quote:

"The arms race poisons the international atmosphere, adversely affects all aspects of international political relations and creates obstacles for the practical implementation of the peaceful coexistence of States as reflected in the Charter of the United Nations. It hinders the process of improving and changing relations among States on the basis of mutual understanding, mutual co-operation and equality." (A/36/597, para. 27)

The arms race has reached extremely disturbing proportions because of the qualitative and quantitative improvement of weapons systems and their deployment in very tense regions of the world and because the world's resources are being devoted to disarmament at a time when they could be used to improve the lot of mankind. These dangers are all the greater in that international negotiations on disarmament are deadlocked within the United Nations and in other forums.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted 13 years ago by the General Assembly, is based on fundamental principles requiring Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of States or for purposes of interfering in their internal Affairs. The Declaration also provides for the peaceful settlement of disputes, reaffirms the right of peoples to self-determination and invites all Members States to comply with their obligations under the United Nations Charter.

Notwithstanding the continual reaffirmation of the merit of these principles and their importance in various United Nations resolutions, international relations are still based on injustice, oppression, inequality and exploitation of peoples, and disregard for international declarations and instruments by the forces of

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

colonialism, primarily the United States, which is practising a policy of hostility and belligerence against the peoples of the world and using economic and political pressure and military force as an instrument to impose United States domination and hegemony on the world in order to extend the sphere of American influence and bring pressure to bear on peoples whose political, economic and social choices run counter to United States ambitions. In doing so, the United States has been using forces stationed around the world.

Thus the United States has been pursuing a policy of international terrorism against a considerable number of peoples of the world. The great number of its military bases and the deployment of forces by the United States is designed to carry out a policy of terrorism and to protect racist régimes and monopolies.

The belligerent policy of the United States Administration and its racist allies has given rise to the creation of a number of hotbeds of tension and to the emergence of armed conflicts resulting in the destabilization of various regions of the world and posing a threat to the peace and security of certain areas, such as Central America, the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Africa and Asia. In Central America and the Caribbean the United States Administration is pursuing its belligerent policy against the peoples of Cuba and Nicaragua and other peoples of the region. This policy has taken the form of political, economic and military pressure and intervention in the domestic affairs of the region. Most recently, there was the military invasion of Grenada.

In the Middle East the Zionist entity, with the support and encouragement of American imperialism, has been pursuing its policy of aggression based on expansion and on the colonization of Arab territories, the displacement of the Palestinian population, the invasion and occupation of Lebanon and threats against the Syrian people. The situation is all the more serious in that the United States military presence in Lebanon is very visible, as evidenced by the multinational forces. The American military presence is part of a plot against the Arab peoples to impose United States hegemony over the region.

Exactly one week ago - on 30 November - on the occasion of the visit of the Prime Minister of the Zionist entity, Mr. Shamir, to Washington, President Reagan declared the existence of a new unholy alliance between the United States Administration and that Zionist entity. That alliance involves aggression against Arab States and has, in particular, made provision for the establishment of United States-Zionist committees for military planning and strategy, for the stockpiling

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

of United States armaments in Israel and the holding of joint military manoeuvres. President Reagan clearly said:

"I am pleased to say that we have come to an agreement on the establishment of joint political and military committees to set out ways and means of strengthening Israeli-American co-operation. Those committees will give priority to the threat to our common interests - in other words, the increased Soviet presence and intervention in the Middle East."

These remarks are altogether unrelated to the realities of the region, because the United States intervention and Israeli expansionism have grown massively - for example, the presence and concentration of United States troops in Lebanon along the shores of the Mediterranean and, indeed, the rest of the Mediterranean - thus constituting a threat to the peoples of the Middle East.

The new alliance also involves strengthening the Zionist economy by a reciprocal reduction of customs duties, the cancelling of the Israeli debt to the United States, assistance to the arms industry research in Israel and so on.

Acts of aggression against Syria have clearly been co-ordinated. As we witnessed on 3 and 4 December, the Zionist entity bombed Syrian positions and Moslem districts in Lebanon.

As a member of the Arab world, our country is deeply disturbed by events in our region and is anxious to strengthen international peace and security. For that reason, in a letter dated 9 November 1983, addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Leader of the Revolutionary Council, Colonel Qaddafi, it has drawn the attention of the international community to the dangers to peace and security in the region and their implications for world peace and security. The veracity of his remarks was borne out by yesterday's aggressive actions committed against Syria. He stated:

"... at a time when the world, regrettably, seems sunk in a coma or stupor and the world conscience seems afflicted with deafness or lethargy, I wish to warn the whole world - and I address myself to you directly as being internationally responsible for the maintenance of world peace - that the whole world is living today on the brink of the abyss; it may suddenly, as a result of a heedless action, slide into the hell from which there is no exit and no deliverance for anyone." (S/16138, p. 2)

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

"The concentration of United States naval and air fleets and of NATO fleets off the coasts of Syria and Lebanon constitutes a fortiori a threat to the peace experienced by the world ...

"It is my duty to state to the world that these forces which are increasing daily in intensity and number in Lebanon and near the Syrian border came to the region in the name of peace-keeping forces in the circumstances of the Israeli aggression which aimed at the destruction and occupation of Lebanon ...

"The world well knows that the situation in Lebanon and in the region became more dangerous and more complex after the arrival of the peace-keeping forces, and the dimensions of that danger have even extended beyond the region to threaten the peace of the entire world. This places upon you a historic responsibility requiring rapid action for the withdrawal of those forces from the region immediately and their return to their bases." (S/16138, annex, pp. 2 and 3)

The situation in the Mediterranean is just as dangerous as the situation elsewhere in the world, given the presence of United States fleets and a network of military bases, and has given rise to heightened tension in and destabilization of the region resulting from belligerent and provocative acts against the peoples of the region, particularly the people of Libya.

The United States Administration for some time now has been committed to a hostile policy against the Libyan people and territory demonstrated in acts of aggression and provocation carried out by the United States Air Force and Navy, which have violated Libyan territorial waters and airspace. Those acts of provocation against the Libyan people were debated in the Security Council in February and August of this year.

My country is exposed to American belligerence - violations of the airspace and territorial waters of Libya, an economic embargo against Libya, a campaign of disinformation carried on by the media, the encouragement of belligerence by neighbouring countries against Libya, and provocative military manoeuvres off the Libyan coasts and near Libya's borders. Since 1973 United States aeroplanes have violated Libyan airspace 326 times - 174 times in 1983 alone. The United States Administration has imposed an embargo on the sale of civilian aircraft and agricultural equipment to Libya, placed restrictions on the sale of hardware for

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

oil extraction and prevented Libyan students from carrying on their studies in various United States cities.

The United States, which has been attacking Libya and now Syria directly, is seeking to generalize the conflict. Mr. Larry Speakes, a White House spokesman, said on 2 December that the Zionist-American Military Committee which has been established has drawn up plans for internal and external threats in the region, particularly against Libya and Iran.

Today we received a most curious letter addressed to the Secretary-General relating to the "right" of the United States to engage in aggression and containing a hopelessly inaccurate interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter, as if the Libyan coast were just off the American coast rather than, as it is, thousands of miles away. We have been told that Libya and Syria should not react to American espionage carried on by spy aeroplanes; otherwise Article 51 of the Charter will be applied against those countries.

The military threats and provocations against Libyan and other peoples of the region constitute flagrant violations of the principles of the Charter which governs us all, as well as of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and the principles prohibiting the use of force and non-interference in the affairs of other countries.

The situation in the Mediterranean leads me to refer to the question of strengthening security in the region, which could well prove to be explosive, owing to the increasing focal points of tension and militaristic activities in the form of a broad network of military bases and the introduction of nuclear weapons into the region at a time when we are calling for the establishment of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

By virtue of its geography the Mediterranean region is strategic from the political, economic and cultural points of view, linking three continents. That is why the strengthening of security and co-operation in that region is a vital issue for the countries there and, indeed, for the international community as a whole. It is on the basis of this idea that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has supported all efforts to strengthen security and co-operation among Mediterranean peoples and feels that the implementation of that objective requires the following measures.

First, a commitment to respect the principle of the independence and sovereignty of countries, the inviolability of their frontiers and non-interference in their internal affairs; the peaceful settlement of disputes; the non-use or

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

threat of use of force; respect for the sovereignty of countries over their natural resources, and their right to self-determination.

Secondly, the dismantling of colonial, military bases; withdrawal of foreign fleets, the presence of which is a threat to peace and security, and cessation of the supply of military equipment to racist countries.

Thirdly, a just solution to the problem of the Palestinians; recognition of the right of those people to return to their homes and to the establishment of an independent homeland of their own.

Since its revolution of 1 September, the Jamahiriya has worked hard to strengthen peace and security in the Mediterranean, and it is through the dismantling of colonial military bases, the elimination of all foreign military bases and the withdrawal of all foreign fleets that that can be done. We will do our utmost to achieve a peaceful settlement to the problems of the region.

The security of the Mediterranean is closely linked to security in Europe. The deployment of nuclear missiles and the establishment of military bases on Mediterranean islands by countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have increased tension in the region and are a threat to peace and security there.

The maintenance of international peace and security is and has been one of the major concerns of the United Nations since it was founded. Issues relating to peace are among the fundamental aims of the Charter, on behalf of which the United Nations has made immense efforts and adopted various declarations and resolutions. Notwithstanding those efforts and the adoption of those declarations, international peace and security continue to be unattainable goals because of the worsening of international relations, the increasing use of force, disregard for the principles which should govern relations among States and the implications of those acts for the role of the United Nations and its efforts to reduce tensions in the world. This has had an impact on the Security Council, which, though responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, is often incapable of implementing its own resolutions on international problems affecting peace and security. That in turn has a negative impact on the Council's ability to take action, for example under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, in response to breaches of the peace.

I should like to express our gratitude to the Ambassador of Sierra Leone for the interest he has taken in the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter and for the inclusion of this item on our agenda. My

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

delegation supports the objectives pursued by Sierra Leone and Ghana and also the draft resolution they have submitted to the Committee on this agenda item. In order to maintain peace and security in the world the great Powers should respect the Charter and refrain from threatening small States.

In conclusion I should like to say that in addition to disarmament measures the maintenance of international peace and security requires constant dedication to the Charter and other international instruments, the elimination of hotbeds of tension and a lasting solution to the economic and political problems in the world.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece): On behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community, I should like to stress the fact that the Ten share the preoccupations with regard to the increasing tensions in international relations. Security cannot be ensured within the context of recourse to the use or threat of force, military intervention, aggression and foreign occupation, the aggravation of existing crises in the world and the outbreak of new ones. They will welcome any constructive negotiations between the two super-Powers in mutual good faith which will avert and prevent confrontation. They reiterate their firm conviction that as long as tension and mistrust prevail every serious attempt must be made to strengthen international peace and security. They will therefore support all endeavours which enhance the removal of mistrust and resulting tensions.

The Ten have on various occasions underscored the fact that without an adequate perception of security the solutions of disarmament problems will be faced with major difficulties. Disarmament and security are inextricably linked. These two factors influence each other in a decisive way. A third no less important factor is development. Development at an acceptable rate, however, is hardly possible to reconcile with the continuation of an arms race. Substantial progress in the field of development is understood to be essential for the preservation of world peace and security.

Genuine security can be safeguarded not by the accumulation of armaments but only through an atmosphere of increased security between nations through co-operation, through the growth of exchange and interdependence among peoples and through promotion of mutual confidence.

The Ten share the concern of the Secretary-General that the United Nations system of collective security often has not been used effectively and that frequent disregard has been shown for the provisions of the Charter. Within this context it is encouraging that the Secretary-General suggests a series of practical measures



(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

aimed at increasing the effectiveness of the Organization in preventing conflicts. The Ten welcome the fact that these suggestions have been discussed at length by the Security Council, which is the organ primarily responsible for ensuring peace and security.

The Ten believe that the failure to implement the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter is a matter which should concern us all. They are prepared to support all constructive approaches to the prevention and settlement of conflicts. We therefore welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General focusing the attention of the international community on this vital issue.

The Ten firmly believe in an effective Security Council and in that respect fully subscribe to every effort made in the direction of enhancing the authority and enforcement capacity of the Council in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. They have reached the assessment that the lack of effectiveness of the United Nations system is a result not of institutional or structural deficiencies but rather of the growing incidence of failure to utilize the mechanisms offered by the United Nations as well as to implement its decisions in the context of an international situation increasingly marked by disputes and by acts contrary to the aims and the principles of the Charter.

The Ten remain committed, as they have repeatedly underscored, to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. They therefore consider that our debate on international security in the First Committee should focus more on the substance of the agenda items than has heretofore been the case and thus contribute in a meaningful way to the aims of that Declaration.

The Ten have supported and will support all efforts which lead to the strengthening of security, at both the international and regional levels. They are fully conscious that recessionary conditions still prevailing in the economic field have affected the ability of developing countries to reduce their high debt burden and have aggravated their economic problems. Such conditions cannot be conducive to strengthening international peace and security. In this respect they recognize that one result of the recent attention to the social and economic aspects of the arms race is that it has made it increasingly clear that not only do military threats affect the security of States but that social and economic factors may also become a part of a wider comprehension of the concept of security.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

The Ten welcome any action in the field of reduction of military expenditures which would pave the way to a better allocation of resources that have thus far been used for military purposes and would facilitate economic and social progress, in particular in the developing countries. Such a reallocation of resources will facilitate the adoption of appropriate measures to help developing countries overcome the difficult, and in some cases desperate, situation in which they find themselves.

The Ten regard the forthcoming Conference in Stockholm on confidence and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe as providing an important opportunity and a prospective step forward in making concrete progress which, in turn, could lead to realistic progress towards confidence and disarmament. They are determined through their active participation at the Conference and their commitment to the goals of security and confidence building to contribute to the enhancement of international security.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): If one thing is evident on the international scene today it is that with every passing year peace and security are drifting further out of control. The question then arises: what is the point of having devised so many rules and having elaborated so many international conventions, let alone having founded the United Nations - which is equipped with a remarkable Charter - only to return constantly to our point of departure, as if the practical skills of men who have made so many theoretical tools available to our common well-being were constantly to be called into question by morality?

Both the mounting number of breaches of the peace and their increasing gravity today are increasingly striking. Consider for example the embarrassing choice facing us in this debate between a number of equally important topics, each of which would suffice to sustain the most thorough discussion for some time. They are as follows: the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter, and consideration of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. My delegation's remarks are centred on these last two items.

Before going any further in my analysis, Mr. Chairman, I should like, since my delegation did not take part in the disarmament debate, to congratulate you on behalf of the Congolese delegation, which at this stage can with all objectivity

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

tell you how much we admire the masterly way in which you have conducted the work of the First Committee. I should appreciate you conveying our keen gratitude to the other officers of the Committee and the members of the Secretariat for their dedication in pursuit of our work.

Given the cheerless picture offered by today's world, one is left with a prevailing feeling of uncertainty and disenchantment. Enlightened observers have without any exaggeration already considered that the crisis that has prevailed lately in connection with the bilateral Geneva talks on the Euromissiles, which have caused such alarm in an extraordinarily over-armed European continent, is the most serious crisis that has occurred between East and West since the 1948 Berlin crisis and the 1962 missile crisis.

But if the peoples of Europe and North America none the less are living in illusory comfort known as the "balance of terror", this is far from the case on other continents which have almost constantly borne the lethal burden of the principal breaches of the peace in the form of armed conflicts, liberation struggles or resistance towards all forms of aggression.

Obviously such a situation cannot continue indefinitely, or else the price in terms of fatal political consequences would be too heavy for civilization in general.

Only a resolute thrust involving precise moral and political commitments will make it possible to arrive at suitable solutions to the tragic situations of certain countries whose roots are to be found in the very recent past. To this end there are a suitable number of mechanisms for the prevention and settlement of conflicts through regional and international plans which should not be allowed to fall into disuse and simply need to have a new input of political will for them to become active.

It is in this context that the Non-Aligned Movement has acted. I am referring in particular to its recent initiative involving a number of Heads of State or Government who joined the Chairman of the Movement, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in bearing witness at this session of the General Assembly to the concern of many nations about international peace, security and co-operation.

Unfortunately the enthusiasm of the non-aligned countries has met only with indifference on the part of the great Powers, which have proposed no specific action to meet those concerns, even though their components and implications are well known.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

In fact, there has recently been a crystallization, as it were, of the mistrust of certain great Powers towards these universal mechanisms, beginning with those of the United Nations, which they feel are unsuitable for meeting the requirements of their ambitions.

At a time of acute world economic crisis, those countries, for instance, feel that they should still strive to preserve the golden age of their prosperity while rejecting any dialogue with the Group of 77 on the launching of global negotiations and consequently the eventual establishment of a new international economic order, which alone is capable of averting disorder stemming from economic insecurity.

In the political sphere the absurdity of the situation sometimes reaches a peak, as, for example, in the Middle East, where there are those who against all reason are devising various scenarios except the right one, which is, of course, that of giving priority to the Palestinian problem.

After other famous historic injustices visited on entire peoples in the name of "civilization", whether in America, Africa or in Europe, everything seems to conspire to provide a sort of "final solution" to the Palestinian problem by denying the Palestinian people its right to sovereignty and freedom.

Similarly, the South African system of apartheid gives free rein to the nazi instinct exported from Europe, as if, having been condemned in Europe itself, nazism were entitled to prosper in other climes. Taking cover behind the lavish support it enjoys from certain countries members of the so-called Western contact group, the apartheid régime has for more than three years managed to thwart implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and thus stymie the whole process leading to Namibia's independence.

The liberties which South Africa has been taking with the norms and morality of international public life are matched only by the contempt shown by certain major Powers towards the opinions and decisions of the United Nations. The "constructive engagement" which those countries advocate in place of general sanctions in fact makes them real accomplices of South Africa in its insulting attitude towards the peoples of southern Africa and its constant exploitation of those peoples.

The world at large is less and less able to understand the motivation behind such attitudes which lead certain major Powers cynically to sacrifice to their own short-term interests the right of peoples in southern Africa to self-determination and justice.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

The Congo considers it unjustifiable and unacceptable to blame the cold war and ideological rivalry for all the problems in the world. That kind of spurious linking of very different problems, such as the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with Namibia's accession to independence, is an extremely dangerous precedent which could at any time be used by any State to justify its rejection of an international convention or to bargain away some important principle in favour of base interests. More than 20 years after the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, it is inconceivable that the United Nations should be prevented from carrying out its duty with respect to a people and a Territory that come directly under its authority, as does Namibia and its people.

Just as colonialism is a direct factor of violence and insecurity, its eradication is a mission of the highest significance for international peace and security.

There is no doubt also that the system of apartheid, as an institutionalization of racism and a crime against humanity, deserves to be fought most steadfastly for the sake of the dignity of mankind and the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

When, moreover, the South Africa régime champions aggression and sets about violating with impunity the territory of independent neighbouring States - such as Angola, part of whose territory it occupies - one may seriously wonder about the ways and means that only the Security Council can decide upon and the untapped powers conferred upon it by the Charter in this connection.

Twice already in successive annual reports, the Secretary-General has pondered the Security Council's commitment to defend anything other than the interest of certain of its members, particularly those with veto power.

This year again, the Secretary-General has been most clear. He said:

"The Charter of the United Nations clearly gives priority to dealing with threats to international peace and security and to the commitment of all nations, especially the permanent members of the Security Council, to co-operate ... towards this end. It is the weakening of this commitment that has, perhaps more than any other factor, led to the partial paralysis of the United Nations as the guardian of international peace and security."

(A/38/1, p.2)

In our awareness that it is in the minds of men - to use the terms of the Charter of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

(UNESCO) - and that it is in the political will of States that the final spark capable of changing the course of world events is to be found, we realistically assess the limits of conventional texts and other resolutions, the number of which is constantly growing, and which have never fundamentally improved the fate of man nor thwarted the perils threatening States, particularly the weaker ones.

It is the latter that are especially subject to the most harmful effects of situations of conflict now prevailing in the world and in connection with which collective security mechanisms have been unbelievably ineffective.

In this regard, the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries, echoing last October the concerns voiced by the Heads of State at the New Delhi Conference and at previous summit meetings, pointed out that:

"despite the adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, ... policies of intervention and interference, pressure and the threat or use of force continued to be pursued against many non-aligned countries."

(A/38/495, annex, para. 17)

Demonstrations of force have never been so favoured by certain Powers as they are today. They find them a convenient expedient for the dreams and fantasies that they dangle before their peoples.

Certain of the most military and economically powerful States are stepping up their efforts to preserve the vestiges of outmoded systems which are falling apart at the seams under the relentless force of world development and are doing their utmost to determine vital interests in foreign areas and to gag the expression of democratic views in the smaller States through the use of the most reprehensible State terrorism.

The situation in Central America and the Caribbean, in Korea, in South-East Asia, in Chad and elsewhere should be seen in this light, where the leaden layer of strategic interests tends to conceal the real problems that should be solved in a local or regional framework.

The Congolese Government considers that any State or group of States is free, for the purposes of its development and the general progress of its citizens, to equip itself with the political, economic, social or cultural institutions of its choice, without having to abide by foreign models or accept neo-colonialist diktat.

Imperialism is no longer content with the classic procedures of dissemination of conventional weapons in the third world which enable it to defend its interests by using developing countries as intermediaries and maintaining the constant risk

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

of war, which bring commensurate financial and political benefits to the Power selling arms and trafficking in influence.

The use of mercenaries, which has reached unprecedented levels and is equally beneficial to the supplier States, has now been overtaken by the phenomenon of direct intervention which, it is believed, ensures better alignment and the infallible export of the all-purpose model of society which the good countries are supposed to adopt "freely".

The immense misunderstanding on which this atmosphere of tension surrounding us thrives could perhaps be dissipated by restoring to peoples and individuals the reasons and the means for proclaiming, as in the preamble to the Charter, their determination to preserve peace and their faith in the rights and dignity of others, which are essential to the success of any political endeavours, both large- and small-scale.

Democracy, so often used as an excuse for the most unjustifiable actions, would then flow from such demands. Then democracy would be defined and expressed not in theories that circumstances later prove wrong, but in the will and the life of the peoples themselves.

Mr. STRULAK (Poland): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time for me to speak in this Committee at this session, allow me to start by adding my personal congratulations and words of recognition to those already expressed to you by the Polish delegation.

The discussion of the question of implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is taking place this year at a time of serious tension, which is of grave concern for the whole of mankind. This international tension has dramatically heightened with the beginning of the deployment last month of new American nuclear missiles in Europe.

The bridges built between East and West over the years are being undermined. Negotiations have ground to a standstill and the arms race, particularly the nuclear one, is gaining momentum and entering a new qualitative stage of greatly destabilizing dimensions.

A tide of propaganda spreading disquiet, distrust and hatred is in full spate.

The danger of conflict has increased, security has diminished and fears for the future are multiplying.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

In this situation our discussion is more relevant than ever before. We should give thorough consideration to the problems of restoring international security and look for means to halt the further increase of tension and effectively avert the threat of nuclear war.

One is bound to commence by referring to the recent missile deployments by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Europe. This step has been undertaken in spite of the repeatedly stated Soviet readiness to dismantle a considerable number of SS-20 missiles, which offered a real possibility of avoiding further purposeless competition in nuclear forces and a destabilization of the obtaining approximate military balance between the two major military alliances. The deployment of United States missiles now begun has led to the collapse of negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces.

Poland is gravely concerned by this dangerous development which threatens not only its own security but undermines that of Europe and of the world as well. We fully share the Soviet Union's evaluation of the dangerous consequences of the militaristic policy of the present United States Administration, as contained in the statement of Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, made on 24 November 1983.

The Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, commenting on this statement on 25 November 1983, characterized it as an important link in a series of Soviet initiatives, supported by the allies of the Soviet Union, which were intended to prevent the upsetting of the military balance between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The Polish statement recalled the relentless efforts of the socialist States to limit the arms race and to counteract the danger of war, expressed in their appeals and proposals, particularly the Prague Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty of January this year and the Moscow statement of the leaders of the socialist States in June 1983.

In accordance with the highest interests of the security of the Polish State, and in the course of regularly held consultations, Poland supported the Soviet proposals and actions in the Geneva negotiations on the limitation of medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe. They are irrefutable proof of the consistent striving of the Soviet side to reach a compromise and to conclude a mutually acceptable agreement.



(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

These proposals met with ill will on the part of the United States and its European allies. Thus the policy of constructive dialogue and of sound disarmament agreements enhancing peaceful international relations has been rejected by the NATO leaders. Therefore the Council of Ministers of Poland accepted with full understanding and approval the decisions and measures of the Soviet Government aimed at ensuring the security of the Soviet Union and its allies.

At the same time, the Polish Government welcomed with satisfaction the readiness of the Soviet Union to return to the proposals already submitted by the Soviet side on the limitation and reduction of armaments if the United States and other countries concerned demonstrate their readiness to return to the situation obtaining before the beginning of the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe.

In view of the dangerously increased threat to peace brought about by the confrontation policies of the United States Administration, the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic expressed full solidarity with the statement of Yuri Andropov.

Polish foreign policy has never confined its efforts to preserve peace to the limitation of armaments. Together with other members of the Warsaw Treaty, Poland has been actively participating in the elaboration of a programme of peace, détente and international security and co-operation, aimed at improving relations among States and at the same time arriving at equitable agreements to curb the arms race. Poland has advanced proposals aimed at strengthening international security and improving the international atmosphere. The goal of the Rapacki Plan for a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe, presented in the United Nations 26 years ago, was to eliminate nuclear weapons and delivery systems and to reduce armed forces and conventional weapons in a crucial area of Central Europe and so help to ease tensions and lessen the risk of an outbreak of conflict.

It is worth recalling today, when the new American missiles are being deployed, that had the Polish proposal been accepted the European situation would probably have been different today. However, that proposal was then thwarted by the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nevertheless, the idea of nuclear-free zones has not died. It has since found full or partial realization in several international accords and proposals for the establishment of such zones in various parts of the world, including one calling for a global nuclear-free zone encompassing the whole of our planet. Proposals for the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world have been a

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

regular feature of declarations by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty States, in numerous United Nations General Assembly resolutions and in recommendations of its special disarmament sessions. The idea of such zones has lost none of its vitality and topicality. Its translation into practice is today more necessary than ever.

In the conditions of today's highly dangerous international situation, of greatest importance is the creation of proper conditions for the resumption of serious negotiations on matters of disarmament and international security. This requires, first of all, refraining from actions that set in motion the fatalistic action-reaction syndrome in nuclear armaments as well as in international policies in general. An obvious first step here is the withdrawal and abandoning of the deployment of new United States missiles in Europe.

Genuine efforts are urgently required to reverse dangerous trends in strategic nuclear weapons, to limit by agreement the development and deployment of new systems which may impinge upon strategic stability and the very possibility of effective limitation and reduction of nuclear arms. Equally urgent are steps aimed at thwarting the indeed awesome schemes of extending the arms race to outer space.

The NATO nuclear countries should also give most serious consideration to joining the Soviet Union in its pledge of non-first-use of nuclear weapons.

It is indeed highly regrettable that the United States and some other NATO countries have been doing their utmost to obstruct the work on the proposal to conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

Elaboration of such accords would constitute major developments contributing to an enhancement of confidence between States, would be helpful in reducing the level of tension in the world and in settling disputes and disagreements by peaceful means. They are of primary importance for the strengthening of international security.

As a country situated in the heart of Europe, Poland has every reason to be concerned by the deterioration in security on that continent. Individually and collectively with our Warsaw Treaty allies, through bilateral and multilateral European dialogue, Poland continues its efforts to build a system of European security. This policy is conceived by us as a factor essential to our national existence and development.

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

A comprehensive notion of security in Europe does comprise the question of military security, but also the question of its consolidation through broad peaceful co-operation. We see a compelling need to reopen the channels of dialogue and introduce effective political measures to preserve peace in the world.

We wish to express our satisfaction that common sense and realism have finally got the upper hand and made possible the satisfactory conclusion of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), held in Madrid. A common interest in preserving the fabric of political, economic, cultural and human contacts has thus prevailed. It proves that constructive negotiations backed by political will can effectively contribute to overcoming even serious differences. It is also proof of vitality of the CSCE process at a time of increased tensions in Europe.

The impending convocation of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe is a major constructive result of the Madrid meeting. Our conviction is that a display of the same constructive and realistic spirit in Stockholm, as finally prevailed in Madrid, would be a premise for positive results.

Its history makes it natural for Poland to be dedicated to the cause of peaceful coexistence and to making good-neighbourliness a veritable principle of relations among States. This principle we construe as having a comprehensive sense, covering not only relations among States having common borders or separated by a common sea, but also to relations in a subregional, regional or supraregional dimension.

In our view, the basic criterion for a genuine will to develop good-neighbourly relations would be the single but very basic requirement of not inflicting damage and of abstaining from attempts to gain unilateral advantages. In this connection we are bound to note that the presence of such a genuine will has to be called into question in the case of the policy of so-called sanctions and restrictions practised by the United States and some other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) against Poland. This policy is evidently aimed at hampering the process of restoration of our national economy which, by the way, is a condition for Poland's ability to meet its international economic obligations.

We believe it would be both in the interests of a broadly conceived policy of good-neighbourliness, as well as a strengthened sense of international security, to safeguard nations through internationally adopted measures under the New International Economic Order against politically-motivated outside actions aimed at harming their economic growth. This has been the consideration behind Poland's

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

initiative on the economic confidence-building measures adopted at this session by the Second Committee.

With regard to the item on security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, my delegation wishes to recall that Poland is not and cannot be indifferent to threats to peace stemming from that region. Poland has always supported proposals to transform the Mediterranean into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Poland was in favour of extending the confidence-building measures in the military field provided for in the Helsinki Final Act to the Mediterranean region, of withdrawing nuclear-armed warships from that sea and of refraining from deployment of nuclear weapons in the territories of all those Mediterranean States that do not possess such weapons. It should also be recalled that the States members of the Warsaw Treaty, including Poland, urged that the Mediterranean Sea be transformed into a zone of peace and co-operation and that appropriate negotiations be conducted toward this end.

Our contribution to the promotion of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region is being made within the framework of the CSCE process. Poland also maintains close political, economic and cultural relations with the countries of the region. We are also interested in the furtherance of these relations as a way of contributing to the cause of consolidation, security, stability and co-operation in that area.

Of necessity, we had to focus on matters closest to our country, but in our view they are matters of vital importance also to the world as a whole. Before concluding I should, however, point out that Poland continues with interest and full understanding to follow the initiatives and actions aimed at strengthening security and co-operation in other regions of the world. On more than one occasion we have manifested this interest in the other United Nations forums, through our membership in the Security Council, in particular.

In this context we must once again voice our deep concern over the dangerous aspects of the present United States confrontational policy in various regions of the world, as evidenced by the brutal invasion of Grenada and recent military actions in Lebanon.

Moreover, we feel that to expose this policy and to condemn it, justified as this would be, would not suffice. The international community must indeed exert its utmost determination to bring this policy to a halt, just as the ill-considered and mortally dangerous arms race should be halted. The road to peace and security

/...

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

in the world, peace and security for all nations indeed leads through honest dialogue and negotiations.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to your notice, if you have not already observed it, the treatment the last three items on our Committee's agenda is being accorded by the Department of Public Information in the form of press releases. It is my delegation's view that these items are not being given the importance they deserve.

Hence, I hope you will find time, Sir, to look into the matter and, if necessary, perhaps the Committee would want to bring to bear the importance that should be attached to them.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall certainly have the Secretariat of the Committee look into the matter.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make an announcement.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that the delegations of Mali and Uganda have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.83.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.