

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
50th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 6 December 1983
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 50th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 66: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (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 (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.50
11 January 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 65, 66 AND 67 (continued)

Mr. SALMAN (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The international situation at present is experiencing serious tensions in various areas of the world. Indeed we are today faced with a situation unprecedented in the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race. The rivalry in the manufacture and deployment of sophisticated missiles, together with the failure in the negotiations between the super-Powers on limiting nuclear weapons, is an extremely serious phenomenon, one that threatens international peace and security and the very survival of all mankind.

In the Middle East, the Mediterranean and Africa we have for several years now been witnessing bloody armed conflicts stemming from the practice of the States of the region, in particular the racist entities, to follow a policy of force, blackmail, domination and expansion, as well as from the refusal of those entities to apply the principles of justice and peace adopted by the international community and enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

The situation obtaining in the Middle East and in Africa is similar to that which has been raging in Africa, South-East Asia, Latin America and other areas of the world. If the arms race and the efforts made to manufacture and stockpile sophisticated weapons threaten international peace and security, nuclear weapons are responsible for this first and foremost. To say that nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction have enabled us to deter the threat of nuclear war and to consolidate peace ever since the Second World War and that those weapons are a factor for peace and security is to resort to a logic that is in total disregard of the principles and bases for a lasting and just peace.

Furthermore, it is counter to the provisions and principles of the United Nations Charter, in particular Chapter I, Articles 1 and 3. International peace and security based on a balance of terror threatening all mankind cannot be considered a true and lasting peace. It is a peace that is faced with a serious danger: the rivalry in the frenzied race to manufacture and deploy weapons of mass destruction. It is a mere respite while preparations are made for a new wave of confrontations with incalculable consequences. A just peace should be based on freeing mankind from fear of the destruction of its civilization. The maintenance of international peace and security within the framework of the arms

(Mr. Salman, Iraq)

race can take place only through a gradual reduction in weapons, beginning with nuclear weapons, with a view to reaching complete disarmament.

There is another phenomenon threatening international peace and security: the establishment of racist entities in different regions of the world. The support lent to those entities and the supply of sophisticated military technology to them constitute a serious phenomenon to which the international community should pay heed, because we all know that those entities were established to implement specific policies in the regions in which they exist. Through resort to armed force they impose their domination in the region, which in most cases is a crucial one, such as the Mediterranean and Africa. That is a policy of blackmail threatening the sovereign independence of States.

There are various examples in contemporary history which we have in mind and which support this fact. In the Middle East the Zionist entity proceeded to occupy neighbouring Arab territories and has undertaken various acts of aggression against the peoples of countries in the region, acts which have been condemned by the international community. In Africa the South African racist régime plays the role of policeman of the region. There is co-operation taking place between these two racist entities, especially in the development of their military potential - a factor which threatens peace and security not only in those two regions of the world but throughout the rest of the world.

In this connection, my delegation wishes to emphasize the following concerning the strengthening of international peace and security. First of all, the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with all States of the world. The international community should combine its efforts to establish a just and lasting peace based on respect for the sovereignty of States and the inadmissibility of interference in their internal affairs.

Secondly, the major Powers, which have considerable military arsenals - especially the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union - are responsible in particular for the maintenance of international peace and security. Consequently the two super-Powers should endeavour to resume negotiations on the limitation of nuclear weapons and work in a positive frame of mind to reaching a solution to an international problem.

Thirdly, the international community should fulfil all its responsibilities for the elimination of hotbeds of tension stemming from the creation of racist

(Mr. Salman, Iraq)

entities based on force, blackmail, domination and threats. The racist entities should be boycotted, pursuant to the United Nations Charter.

Fourthly, there must be a development and strengthening of economic, social and political relations among States, as well as scientific relations; the resources freed by the reduction in the arms race must be channeled to development and progress.

The peoples of the world want peace and disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, and the strengthening of international peace and security. They have expressed that desire through demonstrations in various parts of the world. The peoples of the whole world have voiced indignation and rejection over the arms race and war. We should therefore focus our international efforts on peace and security in the world.

Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): International security is facing growing threats. Massive armament policies, the weakening of the United Nations system, a growing propensity to resort to force in international relations, policies of invasion and occupation are all threatening to become the norm of the international behaviour of States. This disquieting situation gives special importance to the items under consideration that deal with international security, which we believe remains the kernel of world international order.

The security of the world as a whole is being eroded by the rising tension in international relations. Over the last year in particular, we have, unfortunately, been witnessing a continuous deepening of international insecurity. A series of political and economic crises, and more particularly the pattern of dealing with them through dangerous confrontation rather than conciliation and negotiation, is increasingly seriously shaking the sincere hopes of the international community of ensuring peace and security through scrupulous respect for the principles of the Charter. Declarations on friendly relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes remain unimplemented. The definition of aggression seems to be little more than an intellectual exercise. Something seems seriously defective and we should not seek to apportion blame here but try to find ways and means of rededicating ourselves to the common good, to renew our collective political will, to live by the Charter principles and to recapture that spirit of its founding fathers.

In the first instance, we should never resign ourselves to the actual state of affairs. It is precisely for such a purpose that my delegation today recalls

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

Egypt's proposal, first enunciated by us during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, calling for a sober appraisal of the international political system and the role of the United Nations and its effectiveness in the maintenance of international peace and security. We still share the accurate analysis of the Secretary-General as reflected in his report to the thirty-eighth session on the international situation and the pivotal role of the United Nations in ensuring that all States abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter. In fact, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State of Non-Aligned Countries urged the adoption of methods of preventive diplomacy, by calling for the strengthening of the United Nations effectiveness in the settlement of international disputes and crises by peaceful means. Egypt strongly supports all steps aimed at contributing to the implementation of the Declaration of International Security. In this regard, we note with deep concern that the provisions of that Declaration have not yet been fully implemented. The Security Council is called upon to fulfil its crucial responsibility for the preservation of international peace and security. Hence Egypt urges the Security Council to discharge its responsibility through an effective implementation of the collective security provisions provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

Egypt, situated in the heart of the Arab world, in the north-east of Africa, providing a link with Asia and lying on the southern coast of the Mediterranean, which links to it to Europe, duly recognizes the importance of the issues of international peace and security. It of course attaches great importance to the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. We welcome the thorough report of the Secretary-General on the subject, which is being dealt with in the First Committee for the first time under a separate item. The security of the Mediterranean area involves its adjacent regions and the world in general. All are interdependent. The Madrid Final Document alluded to the link between security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean area as a whole. It emphasized the importance of taking positive steps towards finding just, viable and lasting solutions to the problems which bedevil this region.

The region of the Middle East suffers from insecurity - this is a well-known fact. Expansionist practices, the use of unrestrained force, foreign occupation and the denial of the peoples' inalienable national rights have all been dealt a crushing blow, which has hence been dealt to the very notion of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region itself.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

The occupation of Lebanon, the lack of a just and lasting solution of the Palestinian question, which is the core of the Middle East conflict, the unresolved problem of Cyprus - all such problems constitute a serious impediment to any progress towards transforming the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace and co-operation. Areas of tension are numerous and exist not only in the Middle East, but in Asia, Africa, Europe and Central America. We do agree with the general view expressed by many States in their replies to the Secretary-General that the transformation of the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation would have a beneficial impact on world peace and security for the benefit of all countries.

It is with this framework in mind that Egypt took the initiative of calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We also believe that mechanisms for economic and technical co-operation among Mediterranean States would strengthen the urge for peace in that area.

There are numerous focal points of tension and sources of threat to global international security and stability. Détente is fading, thus spurring us to work more seriously for an effective system of international security in its entirety. It is our firm belief that the lasting settlement of disputes in the area of crisis is a fundamental prerequisite for the lessening of tension. The policies of apartheid, as well as the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, should end. In the Middle East, a just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian question would lead to the removal of other major obstacles to international security and to justice, peace and stability in the area. An equitable solution of the problem of Cyprus would ensure further stability by guaranteeing Cyprus national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and its non-aligned status. As regards the Indian Ocean, Egypt reaffirms its original position and will maintain unchanged its support for the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. We equally reiterate the non-aligned Delhi Declaration regarding the termination of the work for the convening and success of the Conference on the Indian Ocean.

In spite of the disappointment which was echoed in this room by many delegations last week, we urge the Ad Hoc Committee to complete the work on the preparation for the convening of that Conference.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

Egypt also hopes that the implementation of the Madrid Final Act and the success of the forthcoming Stockholm meeting on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe will have a favourable impact on the strengthening of international security.

We believe that in order to consolidate international peace and security we must address ourselves to the problem of the serious limitations imposed on those efforts by the growing tension between the super-Powers. Again, détente is fading. In this context, we sincerely hope that obstacles which may now seem to be perceived as insurmountable will none the less be overcome so that negotiations on the intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe can be resumed and work for general and complete disarmament under effective international control be given a fresh impetus. We believe that only by exploring all avenues to international security can international peace itself be consolidated.

Equally, we remain of the view that we cannot over-emphasize the interrelationship between areas of regional tension and global security as such. The resort to the use of force regionally cannot but jeopardize international security world-wide. Hence the international community, in seeking its global objective of ensuring its security, is called upon to remove obstacles to that security at the regional level. Only through concerted effort by the international community as a whole to secure the inviolable rights of States to live in peace and security will the ultimate goal of strengthening international security be achieved.

Mr. GARCIA ITURBE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): At this stage in the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, our Committee takes up consideration of the items on international security.

When in mid-October we began the work of this session of the Assembly, the general assessment which practically everyone who spoke in this Committee made at that time was that international security was truly going through a stage of crisis and that appropriate measures had to be taken in order to improve the situation so that all of us could live in a world of peace, free from the danger of war.

If we strike a comparison between the situation which existed at that date and the situation which exists today, less than one and a half months after starting our work, we must reach the conclusion that security and peace are much more endangered today than when we began our work. What we termed at that time a climate not too conducive to international peace and security has deteriorated

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

further. If we analyse the deterioration in the international situation in less than two months, we shall see that in an alarming manner warmongering, hysteria, doctrines of hegemony and imperialist arrogance are increasingly threatening human survival.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in a praiseworthy effort to bring about international peace and security, honoured us by coming to this Committee on 24 October to inaugurate Disarmament Week. In referring to the dangers to world peace, he said that:

"the world is at a dramatic crossroads, because whatever path is chosen can have a direct impact on the destiny of the world and on the well-being of all its inhabitants. This is particularly so in the field of disarmament."

(A/C.1/38/PV.11, p. 11)

In his statement, referring to the series of situations affecting world security, he appropriately mentioned Article 26 of the Charter of the United Nations and further stated that that Article:

"rather than defining the prerequisites for the maintenance of peace, attaches paramount importance to the need to avoid the use of force in the settlement of disputes and, on the other hand, establishes the principle of collective responsibility, entrusting its application to the Security Council ...".

(ibid.)

He ended his statement for world peace with an appeal for:

"a patient and constructive dialogue, in strict compliance with the principles and purposes of the Charter." (ibid., p. 13-15)

That was a magnificent appeal to all Members of the United Nations by the Secretary-General who, on 24 October, reflected in his words the sentiments of the international community for peace, mutual respect, self-determination and the sovereignty of peoples.

However, 24 hours had not elapsed after the Secretary-General's words in this same room when the Yankee Marines, violating the principles of the United Nations Charter, were landing in Grenada, massacring its people, bombing hospitals, engaging in a shameful and unequal struggle against a poorly equipped and numerically inferior army, singing alleged anthems of victory which, more than pathetic chants about the sovereignty of the Grenadian people, were actually the roars of a hungry beast pursuing another prey in the Latin American area.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

When on 20 October we addressed this Committee, we spoke of those who wished to revive the policy of the "big stick" and of "manifest destiny", those who dreamed of adding to their long list of military acts of intervention. When we said that from 1848 to date there had been more than 60 of those acts in Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean, the military intervention in Grenada had already been decided upon: one more to add to the list which we mentioned that day.

We should recall that on 17 June 1982, during the second special session on disarmament, here in this United Nations building, a speaker said:

"We who have signed the United Nations Charter have pledged to refrain from threat or use of force against the territory or independence of any State. In these times when more and more lawless acts are going unpunished - as some Members of this very body show a growing disregard for the United Nations Charter - the peace-loving nations of the world must condemn aggression and pledge again to act in a way that is worthy of the ideals that we have endorsed. Let us finally make the Charter live." (A/S-12/PV.16, p. 12) That same speaker went on to say the following:

"What a better world it would be if the guns were silent, if neighbour no longer encroached on neighbour and all peoples were free to reap the rewards of their toil and determine their own destiny and system of government - whatever their choice." (Ibid., p. 13)

That speaker, although many here will find it difficult to believe, was none other than the President of the United States, Mr. Ronald Reagan.

He said that upon signing the Charter of the United Nations, they had pledged to refrain from threat or use of force against the territory or independence of any State. Yet, again violating the principles of the Charter, they trampled upon the independence of Grenada and used force to invade its territory.

He said that the world would be a better one if its peoples were free to determine their own destiny and system of government. Yet it was precisely to prevent the people of Grenada from doing just this that the United States launched its piratical action on 25 October 1983.

We must reiterate that the cynical lies with which they attempted to justify the invasion of a small country are reminiscent of Adolf Hitler's methods during the years prior to the Second World War.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

The unjustified brutal invasion of Grenada is not an isolated instance in the policy pursued by the United States Government to endanger peace and security in Latin America and in the world in general; there are also the daily acts of aggression against the people of Nicaragua.

Everything seems to indicate that in the list of punitive actions against the peoples of Latin America, it is now Nicaragua's turn, and nothing more clearly illustrates this shameful truth than the fact that on 17 November, less than a month ago, the American Congress approved a total of \$24 million to subsidize the dirty, undeclared war which the United States and its Central Intelligence Agency is waging against the legitimately constituted Government of Nicaragua, despite the Nicaraguan people's support of that Government.

Is this how the United States contributes to international peace and security? Are the military manoeuvres being executed in the Caribbean with the participation of dozens of ships, aircraft-carriers, helicopter-carriers, amphibious units and thousands of marines, an effort to guarantee peace in the region? Can it be said that Nicaragua is a danger to the national security of the United States? Will Nicaragua invade the United States? The answers to these questions are perfectly clear to all, including the United States. We have before us yet another example of the hegemonistic, piratical policy which disregards the right of peoples to self-determination and independence - a policy that has been adopted by the current Government of the United States for the purpose of satisfying spurious interests.

Another action detrimental to the sovereignty of peoples of the Americas and aimed at activating hotbeds of tension in the area is the emplacement on the Malvinas Islands of a military base which, because of its power and dimensions, represents a serious danger to Argentina and to other countries of South America. In this connection, we cannot but mention the policy of continuous harassment and aggression which the United States has been pursuing against Cuba for 25 years.

Suffice it to mention among other actions, the illegal occupation of part of our Territory in Guantanamo and the maintenance of a criminal economic blockade against our people. All of this is coupled with periodic intimidating and threatening military manoeuvres close to our coasts, which increase the threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

The irresponsible and interventionist policy of the American Government illustrates its total disregard not only of the right of peoples to self-determination but of all principles of the United Nations Charter, to which the Secretary-General so wisely referred in his statement of 24 October.

How applicable to the present are the words of The Liberator Simon Bolivar:

"The United States seems destined by fate to plague Latin America with misery in the name of freedom."

Unfortunately, these are not the only acts which today affect international peace and security. The decision to begin the emplacement of nuclear missiles in Europe is an act of enormous negative implications, from the political, military and security standpoints. This new act of aggression by the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies offers 572 more opportunities for destruction of the world, as if there were not already sufficient. They seem to find it necessary to add new links to the nuclear chain, with a view to continuing a policy having the sole ultimate purpose of justifying an excessive level of exploitation of resources that could be used for the benefit of mankind, instead of for its destruction. All of this, of course, considerably hinders the efforts of the United Nations to deter the danger of nuclear war and guarantee international peace and security.

The increase in military budgets and their future implications are truly impressive and enable us to perceive that the aggressive and war-mongering policy is being planned and projected at increasing levels for the coming years, a picture that is not encouraging for those of us who wish to reduce the possibilities of nuclear catastrophe.

In a study made by the Center for Defense Information, it is stated that expenditures in the military budget of the United States increased from \$106 million per day in the 1950s to \$156 million per day in the 1960s, to reach \$257 million per day in the 1970s.

But even more alarming is the fact that if established projects continue, the Reagan Administration would be spending \$786 million per day this year: that is, \$32 million per hour and \$533,000 per minute. If we carry this into the year 1986, the figures would be \$1 billion per day: that is, \$41 million per hour and \$700,000 per minute. A lucrative business, that of disseminating the instruments of war throughout the various continents of our globe.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

How ironical it is to hear references made to freedom of expression, to the defence of public opinion, and to international security, when we see how, together with these millions of dollars devoted to arms, there are also millions of sick, hungry, illiterates, who do not even receive a scrap of bread, and cannot even grasp the reality in which they live. The same ones who impose the arms race on us are those who imposed distorted structures on our economies, those who brought about under-development and who force us to an unequal exchange. They are the same ones who keep 2 million Americans homeless and have cut the budget for economic assistance to the elderly and to children. It is noteworthy that without development resources there will be no peace. It would be better if they were to devote their millions to the economic and social development of our peoples and not to the constant search for military superiority.

Tragic as this may seem, it is the real world. The architects of the American foreign policy have defined their line of action and logically are acting along those lines.

An obvious example of this is found in the book Dictatorships and Double Standards by Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, the Permanent Representative of the United States to United Nations. On page 58, criticizing the recommendations of the Linowitz Commission, a Commission made up of Americans and not persons from other countries, we find the following stated:

"The most striking characteristic of the Linowitz recommendations was their disinterested internationalist spirit. U.S. policy, it was assumed, should be based on understanding of 'changed realities' and guided by an enlightened confidence that what was good for the world was good for the United States. Power was to be used to advance moral goals, not strategic or economic ones."

Further, on page 59, the following is mentioned:

"Adopting the Linowitz Commission's recommendations thus required abandoning the strategic perspective which had shaped U.S. policy from the Monroe Doctrine down to the eve of the Carter Administration, at the centre of which was a conception of the national interest and a belief in the moral legitimacy of its defence. In the Brzezinski-Linowitz approach, morality was decoupled from the national interest, much as the future was divorced from the past. The goals recommended for U.S. policy were all abstract and supranational: 'human rights', 'development', 'fairness'."

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

In other words, according to that philosophy, what is good for the world is not necessarily good for the United States, that to act on the basis of moral objectives is not as convenient as acting on the basis of strategic and economic objectives; there is no room for new relations or for self-determination and the development of peoples; development, justice and human rights are mere abstractions.

That political view can lead only to an international situation that will grow more dangerous every day, one in which international peace and security will enter an ever-more critical, more threatened stage. One does not require much insight to realize that the United States acts at the international level in keeping with that philosophy, which is contrary to the interests of the international community. Suffice it to glance at the results of the votes we have just held on the disarmament items and we can see that. There is no regard for peace or international security or human survival when the vital interests of the United States are at stake.

This aggressive policy, which ignores our peoples, is present in all regions. In the Middle East we find a situation which at any moment can unleash a confrontation of enormous proportions. The military occupation of Lebanon and the presence in that country of the so-called multinational peace forces have brought to that country, instead of peace, the death of countless citizens, and Yankee interference in its internal affairs.

The Israeli presence in Lebanon, under the pretext of guaranteeing its borders, and with the support of the United States, is nothing more than constant provocation, an element of deterioration in the situation in the area. The new United States/Israeli strategy of aggression against Arab countries was recently seen in the Beirut bombings by American aircraft only three days ago, despite United States declarations that its troops are there to maintain peace. The expansionist and aggressive policy of Israel in the region and its acts against the Palestinian people, favoured by United States dealings in the Middle East, encourages us to reaffirm our solidarity with the peoples of the area and their struggle to recover their territories and dignity.

The United States is strengthening its aggressive plans for the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. In a few months, the Rapid Deployment Forces of the American Government will begin to create appropriate conditions for operations in the area in order to defend the interests of the United States in the Middle East, in the

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

Horn of Africa and in the Gulf area. Those forces, with their operations, will cover approximately 20 countries of the region.

For all of this, the Pentagon has prepared a five-year plan as a consequence of which, in accordance with the projections of the Reagan Administration, the army will attach five divisions to that Force; the Marines will attach two divisions, with their respective wings; the Air Force will assign 10 tactical wings, and the Navy will assign three aircraft-carriers with their escorts, five anti-submarine aircraft squadrons, and three vessels carrying supplies and weapons, which will be based on Diego Garcia.

All of this indicates that the scenario in the Middle East, a region posing an extreme danger to international peace and security, will, in accordance with the purposes of the American Government, become even more dangerous and more alien to the United Nations precepts of peace.

The African continent too is a victim of the aggressive, imperialist policy which finds its main ally in the area in the racist South African Government. An important element of the situation in Africa is precisely that of the steps taken by South Africa towards its nuclear capability, which is a danger to neighbouring countries, the entire continent and all of mankind.

South Africa's aggressive policy continues to show itself in the illegal occupation of Namibia and against the people of Angola, which has been the victim of many attacks, is suffering the occupation of part of its territory and whose sons have been felled by South African guns on various occasions.

Mozambique also has been the victim of South African attacks, such as that of 17 October against the capital of Maputo, to which we might add previous incidents such as those in April when the South African Air Force attacked the Matola suburb.

To the long list of acts of aggression by South Africa in southern Africa we could mention constant acts of aggression against the Republic of Zimbabwe, the financing and training of subversive groups to infiltrate that country to destabilize it and sabotage its economy, and acts against other front-line countries and the Kingdom of Lesotho.

This situation was clearly reflected in the Final Document of the Seventh Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in New Delhi, which stated:

"Developments in the southern part of Africa show that apartheid, racial discrimination and colonial tyranny continue to resist the forces of change.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

The struggle of the peoples of southern Africa for self-determination is an integral part of the wider struggle of the peoples of the world against all forms of oppression, exploitation, domination, inequality and discrimination." (A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, p. 16)

In dealing with the item on international security we can say that on a good number of occasions this forum has almost unanimously adopted measures for strengthening international peace and security, eliminating the danger of war and basically the danger of nuclear war. It should escape no one that to achieve those purposes, a joint effort must be made to ease tensions and bring about a climate much more favourable to talks, analysis, understanding and co-operation.

The United Nations has been and will continue to be an appropriate and important forum in which to debate these situations where all conditions exist for beginning this deliberative exercise which should result in the strengthening of international peace and security. But in order to achieve this we must all come here with the necessary frame of mind and political will to guarantee that statements made here are not simply rhetorical exercises but that they follow faithfully the policy and promises which every country makes before the international community with regard to its behaviour in international relations.

The United Nations Charter provides for a system of collective security which has been abused very often. Violations of Security Council decisions and General Assembly resolutions on South Africa, the Middle East and Latin America, as well as the continuous support by certain Western Powers to racist and fascist régimes, are acts that run counter to the system of security provided for in the United Nations Charter.

There must be no further impeding of the decisions of those bodies. The United Nations must be allowed to play its role in the maintenance of international peace and security - a role which it has been unable to perform with the required effectiveness because of the actions of a small number of Governments which do not implement or permit the implementation of the provisions of the Charter.

Mr. DIACONU (Romania) (interpretation from French): The examination of the items which are the object of the present debate in this Committee once again offers an opportunity to concentrate attention on the situation of international security.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

The record of implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security over the last 13 years since its adoption is in no way positive. As a result of the aberrant acceleration of the arms race, policies of confrontation, the continuous increase in nuclear arsenals, and the accumulation of chronic problems yet unsolved, international peace and security are seriously threatened and the world today teeters on the brink of the nuclear abyss. At stake are fundamental interests and peoples' right to a free and independent existence; they must be urgently safeguarded.

Ideological differences are being artificially transplanted into the area of inter-State relations; certain local conflicts have become part of disputes between opposing blocs; there is a growing struggle for spheres of influence and zones of domination; there is also a grave trend towards undermining the policy of peaceful coexistence unanimously accepted by all peoples of the world as the only alternative to the outbreak of a world conflagration.

The increasing threat or use of force, brutal intervention in the internal affairs of States, unscrupulous violation of fundamental principles of international law, the lightness with which unilateral acts are undertaken which may even further complicate the international situation and aggravate tension in inter-State relations are relentlessly occurring commonplace events which daily endanger the peace and security of peoples.

As our debates in the Assembly and in this Committee have shown, the fundamental cause of this situation is, above all and without any doubt, the continued intensification of the arms race - primarily the nuclear arms race - and the total indifference towards the profoundly negative consequences of this phenomenon for the life of peoples and the future of humanity.

Any responsible approach to the problems of international security should take as its point of departure the truth that the fundamental issue of our era is the prevention of war and the achievement of disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament. That is why the guideline for the strengthening of international peace and security necessarily involves energetic measures to slow down and end the race for armaments, particularly nuclear, and to reduce arms stocks. The military

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

balance necessary for the stability and security of all States can be assured not by the accumulation of new weapons but by the reduction of existing stockpiles.

In this respect, the situation created in Europe, which my delegation has had occasion to bring to this Committee's attention, is very edifying. Plans for the deployment of new medium-range missiles and the development of already-existing models and the general prospect of intensification of the arms race on that continent make Europe the biggest trouble spot in the international situation, with the potential for tragic consequences for the entire world.

In total disregard for public opinion and the clearly expressed will of the peoples of Europe and of the entire world, measures for the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and, as a counter-measure, preparations for the deployment of new Soviet missiles are already under way. Thus we find ourselves in an unprecedentedly grave situation.

As President Nicolae Ceausescu recently stressed:

"Statements to the effect that the deployment of new missiles will serve the cause of peace and hasten nuclear disarmament are designed, in fact, to conceal reality, to pacify peoples and distract their attention from the great peril connected with the new missiles.

"The peoples must be told the truth openly and honestly. The new missiles do not and cannot serve peace. On the contrary, they will considerably increase the danger of war, of nuclear war, of nuclear catastrophe." (A/C.1/38/12, p. 2)

The messages addressed by the President of Romania to the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the appeal issued by the Grand National Assembly to European Parliaments and parliamentarians and to the United States of America and Canada, as well as the recent statement issued by the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party and of the State Council and Government, which have been issued as United Nations documents, all have as their basic theme the lack of justification for accepting as a fait accompli the deployment of new nuclear missiles, and they call for energetic measures to do everything possible, before it is too late, to avoid this highly dangerous step. It must be made clear that no one has the right to play games with the lives of nations, with the fundamental right of peoples and nations to life and survival.

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

In that sense, the adoption by this Committee of the draft resolution introduced by the Romanian delegation on the bilateral Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on medium-range missiles responds to a widely felt need that the United Nations, the organ chiefly responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, should intervene in this crucial problem and demand its immediate settlement in conformity with the security interests of all countries. At present that need is more urgent than ever before because all available actions must be taken and every opportunity at our disposal must be grasped to prevent the implementation of measures or projected measures whose effect could be irreparable.

The concrete proposals that have just been submitted by my country, proposals that take account of the newly created situation, are based on the overriding necessity to avoid, even at the last moment, an irreversible course of events and to find a solution, even a provisional one, in order that the United States and the Soviet Union will resume their Geneva negotiations on a comprehensive agreement that would lead to the cessation of the deployment of new medium-range missiles and to the dismantling and destruction of those already in place.

I should like to reaffirm once again my country's unshakeable determination, and that of the Romanian people as a whole, to spare no effort to intensify and consolidate our co-operation with other peoples and other European States and to participate in any actions for the defence and consolidation of peace and security on that continent and throughout the world aimed at ending the arms escalation and moving towards disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, at preventing the installation of new medium-range missiles and at the withdrawal and destruction of existing ones - actions without which the maintenance and strengthening of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world are at present unthinkable.

The serious situation prevailing in Europe is all the more alarming in that it has come about within the broader context of an increase in distrust, an exacerbation of conflicts and states of tension and a worsening of the world economic crisis.

Along with efforts to end the arms race and to bring about disarmament, the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security entail more than ever before the need to ensure that relations among States rest on the rigorous and

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

lasting respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, equality of rights, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage, the non-recourse to the use or threat of force and the peaceful settlement of all disputes among States. In our view we can never say that we have done too much when it is a matter of reaffirming the universal validity of such principles or of developing and giving form to their content, of finding ways and means whereby the United Nations can contribute to their strengthening and to their systematic application in practice in relations among States.

We consider that the fact of affirming and reaffirming the primacy of legal norms, of consolidating those norms and, in general, of consolidating principles underlying the relations among States means that we are contributing to a reduction in the policy of force and a decrease in the areas in which arbitrary behaviour still exists in international relations, all of which will assist us in abandoning the harmful concept according to which international life boils down to a simple confrontation among forces and strategic positions with sovereign contempt for all the interest in peace and security expressed by the vast majority of the world's States, in particular small and medium-sized States.

It is this conviction that underlies my country's initiative embodied in the United Nations Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes that was adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in 1982. That same conviction also inspired Romania's initiative with respect to the development and strengthening of good-neighbourly relations among States, a question which, after having been subjected to political debate in our Committee for two years in a row, is now being considered by the Sixth Committee. I should also like to mention that this year the Romanian delegation, along with other delegations, has submitted a detailed proposal on the creation within the United Nations of a special organ for good offices, mediation and conciliation whose activity would be aimed at helping to prevent new armed confrontations and at bringing about the peaceful settlement, through negotiations, of conflicts and all other problems among States.

Indeed, the relationship between the peaceful settlement of disputes and the strengthening of international security is so obvious that there is no need to dwell upon it. There can be no international security if the thorny problems that exist among States are not settled by peaceful means. Summing up Romania's clear position in this matter, President Nicolae Ceausescu stated:

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

"Everything must be done to avoid taking the military course, that of force, in the settlement of various conflicts among States, to act to halt existing conflicts and to achieve their solution through negotiations. No matter how long and difficult such negotiations may be, it is better for the countries concerned and for the cause of peace and détente to take the peaceful route, that of negotiations, to resolve conflicts."

In this spirit Romania and President Nicolae Ceausescu are acting with all necessary firmness to achieve the settlement of all problems among States through solely political means and to strengthen international security.

The continuation of the tense situation in the Middle East owing to the lack of progress in settling the question of the Palestinian people and to our lack of success in creating a broad and viable process of negotiations that can lead to an over-all solution of the conflict in that region and to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the area, which has been subjected to so much destruction, has been a major contribution to the deterioration in the international political climate. At the same time, the serious situation in Lebanon, which is primarily the result of military intervention and the maintenance of Israeli troops on that country's territory and of the increased confrontations there, has also had a very negative influence. The negative development of the situation in the Middle East demonstrates even more vividly the truth that the problem of the Palestinian people is at the core of the conflict, and that if it is not settled no comprehensive, just and lasting peace can be achieved. Such a comprehensive, just and lasting peace calls for Israel's withdrawal from the the Arab territories occupied since the 1967 war, solution of the problem of the Palestinian people by assuring its right to self-determination and to the creation of its own independent State and guaranteeing the independence and sovereignty of all States of the region.

We should like to stress our conviction that the complete solution of the problem of the Palestinian people, including recognition of and respect for its inalienable rights, must lead to the achievement of its national aspirations, namely, the creation of its own independent State where it can concentrate its efforts for development, progress and well-being. In the Middle East there is space both for an independent Palestinian State and for the State of Israel. It is necessary that they finally achieve relations of peaceful coexistence corresponding

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

to the interests of the other peoples of the region and of peace and security in the whole world.

In order to achieve this fundamental aim Romania favours the intensification of political and diplomatic efforts, including those in the United Nations, towards convening an international conference under the auspices and with the active participation of the United Nations in which all interested parties would participate, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the Soviet Union, the United States of America and other nations that can make a positive contribution to settling the Middle East conflict.

As my delegation has had occasion to stress during the recent debate on Namibia, Romania manifests its solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization for accession to national independence; it consistently calls for the liquidation of the apartheid policy and of racial discrimination in South Africa. The urgent solution of these problems, which maintain a dangerous hotbed of tension in South Africa, would without doubt constitute a major contribution to the strengthening of international security.

We also share the desire of the Korean people for a unified Korea and thus we support the initiative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which will form a constructive basis for a unified, free and independent Korea. A notable contribution to strengthening the security of the Asian States and of the entire world, eliminating tension and conflicts on that continent, would be the preparation for and convocation as soon as possible of a conference on the Indian Ocean, which should be viewed as a true zone of peace free of foreign military presence. In general we feel that the creation of zones of peace and co-operation free of nuclear weapons in different regions of the world could effectively contribute to strengthening the security of the States of those zones and guarantee world stability and security.

In this context I should also like to reaffirm my country's determination to act consistently to transform the Balkans into a zone of peace and co-operation free of nuclear weapons and to affirm our support for the proposals to create similar zones in other parts of the European continent. We are most concerned over

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

the military evolution taking place in the Mediterranean and we give our support to efforts to guarantee security and to develop fruitful co-operation in that region which would strengthen security in Europe and in the entire world.

Romania has always endorsed proposals to increase confidence among States and favoured the adoption of concrete measures to meet the real causes of mistrust and suspicion among States.

In this connection we welcome the completion of the efforts that took place in the capital of Finland for the preparation of a conference on confidence- and security-building measures on disarmament in Europe which should commence in Stockholm in 1984. We express the hope that that conference, together with other meetings convened in Madrid, will assure continuity in the process initiated at Helsinki for the strengthening of security and development of co-operation in Europe.

The maintenance and strengthening of international security also requires the democratization of relations among States in conformity with the profound changes taking place at the world level. It is obvious that the major problems today confronting mankind can no longer be resolved within a narrow, restricted group of States, however large and powerful they may be.

The very complex task of maintaining international peace and security calls for the active participation of all States without distinction as to their size, economic potential or social system. It is particularly important to ensure participation on the basis of equality in the settlement of all problems by small and medium-size States, by States in the process of development and by non-aligned States which constitute the great majority of States in the world and are directly interested in a policy of peace, independence and international co-operation.

We have always favoured an increased role for the United Nations in international life since this is a unique forum with a universal vocation based on recognition of the equal rights and sovereignty of all States Members and we have decided to make a contribution to transform this Organization into an effective instrument at the service of all States for the maintenance of international peace and security.

In this connection we should like to stress the necessity of increasing the role of the General Assembly as the supreme body which can ensure the settlement of the major issues of concern to the peoples, with the participation, on a basis of

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

equality, of all States Members. One particularly important step along these lines would be respect for resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, which is automatically in the interest of all nations.

Romania supports proposals to improve the United Nations machinery for maintaining international peace and security. In a time of serious deterioration of the world's political climate, it seems entirely opportune to us to examine all activities of the Security Council so as to identify practical measures to be taken to enable this body to carry out the task incumbent upon it in conformity with the provisions of the Charter.

However, we feel that an essential condition of this desideratum would be for the permanent members of the Security Council to abandon their policies of confrontation and undertake constructive negotiations in a spirit of good faith to resolve the problems before the Council respecting the independence and security interests of all States Members of the United Nations.

We also support strengthening the Organization's role in general efforts to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and the policy of apartheid, to eradicate under-development and to build a new international economic order.

The persistence of under-development and the widening gap between rich and poor States are no basis for international political and economic stability and for the maintenance of international peace and security.

At the beginning of my statement I said that the record in the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is far from being a favourable one. This fact in no way diminishes the validity and importance of that document. On the contrary, the provisions of the Declaration are more urgent than ever, while their practical implementation would be a remarkable contribution to the forging of new relations of full equality and co-operation among States.

My delegation feels that the General Assembly should once again call the attention of all States Members to the fundamental provisions of the Declaration and hopes that our debate will stimulate full respect for them as realistic steps towards the strengthening of international security. In this sense, our deliberations could contribute to reducing international tension, improving the world's political climate and to returning to a policy of *détente* and respect for the independence of peoples.

Mr. SHEDOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Among the problems on the agenda of the present session of the United Nations General Assembly, the complex issues under discussion at the present time relating to the strengthening of international security are without any doubt central because they relate to the principal issue, the ensuring of peace on Earth.

Being based on the fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter and its determination to save future generations from the scourge of war the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted in 1970 by the General Assembly at the proposal of the Soviet Union, was a genuine programme for initiatives and actions by States aimed at consolidating détente and achieving concrete measures in respect of disarmament and peace-keeping, at preventing the threat of nuclear war and at eliminating from international practice the policies of diktat and use of force, neo-colonialism, racism, apartheid, exploitation and crude pressure in international economic relations.

Our consideration at General Assembly sessions every year of the results of the implementation of the provisions of this Declaration would and, without any doubt, do serve to focus the attention of States on this process and the difficulties it is encountering. It would also focus efforts on active, effective measures aimed at implementing the principal task of the United Nations under its Charter, namely, ensuring international peace and security.

All this stands out in relief if we note certain provisions of the last resolution on this question, resolution 37/118, "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", adopted by the General Assembly last year and which, in particular, contains an urgent appeal to all States to abide strictly, in their international relations, by their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations, to contribute effectively to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and to take all necessary measures to prevent the further deterioration of the international situation. These were the will and the demands of the overwhelming majority of the world community.

The realities of the present stage in international life demonstrate that the world situation remains tense and continues to deteriorate. The reasons for this are well known.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

A sharp about-turn from the policy of détente to one of international tension, the unrestrained arms race, and the striving at any cost to overturn the approximate balance in military and strategic forces which has emerged between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty countries - these are the characteristics of the foreign policy of the United States and of a number of NATO countries - one which leads to a sharp increase in international tension.

By heating up the international situation the ruling circles of the United States and a number of its partners in the NATO bloc are seeking a way out of the blind alley of their present policy. Those circles have openly followed a path of confrontation with the socialist countries, increasingly turning back from the spirit of agreement of the recent past which was based upon a desire for stability and co-operation on the basis of peaceful coexistence. This reveals the adventurism in the policy of the leading imperialist country and the increasing threat of a nuclear conflict. A notorious example of this is the incipient deployment in Western Europe of American medium-range missiles, weapons designed for a first strike. As was stressed in the declaration on 24 November this year by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov:

"The deployment of nuclear missiles near the borders of the Soviet Union and its allies is designed in no way for the defence of Western Europe, since no one threatens Western Europe. With the deployment of American missiles on European soil, there is an increase not of European security but rather of the genuine danger that the United States will impose a catastrophe on the peoples of Europe."

Brandishing the nuclear club of more than 12,000 strategic warheads, the monstrous sums allocated by the United States to the arms race - almost \$2 trillion in the next five years - and the strivings of the Pentagon to carry this race to outer space in order to have the whole of the planet in its sights, the plans for modernizing and extending the sphere of influence of the NATO bloc, attempts at knocking together new and aggressive blocs, sabotage and open military intervention - these are all exceedingly dangerous efforts of the militaristic policy of the United States.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

In the Near East, in carrying out strategic co-operation with Israel, Washington not only is encouraging that country's aggressive course, but is itself getting involved in actions against the Arab peoples. One recent instance of this was the massive bombardment by American aircraft of a number of regions in the mountainous part of Lebanon, including positions of the Lebanese national patriotic forces and the Syrian troops which are part of the inter-Arab peace-keeping force in that country.

The same pattern can be seen in Central America, where the United States is using various techniques in an effort to overthrow the legal Government of Nicaragua and smother the liberation movement of the Salvadorian patriots. In the Caribbean basin, the United States has in nasty fashion - which caused indignation in the whole world - undertaken an armed intervention against Grenada and continues to occupy the territory of that country. In its attack on Grenada we see the essence of the imperialist interventionism of Washington, which is trying, through the use of its military muscle, to bring back the long gone period of exploitation and enslavement of other countries, and this aggressive policy has a global character.

The motives of those who are embarked upon this conflict course is obvious: they do not want to desist from the long-outmoded dogmas, concepts and military-political ideas which guided imperialism in the recent past, enabling it to unleash armed conflicts. The concepts of limited nuclear war, first strike and so on, which are, in essence, modifications of previous aggressive doctrines of imperialism, are designed merely to justify the arms race in nuclear and conventional arms and to legitimize the material preparation for a world war under present circumstances.

Compare this with the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, with the resolutions which have been adopted on this issue by the United Nations General Assembly, and to the naked eye it is obvious that the policy of imperialism is heating up the international atmosphere and pushing humanity towards the abyss of a nuclear catastrophe.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States is aimed at maintaining peace and at developing co-operation on the basis of equality among all interested countries. No contradictions between States, no differences in social structure, ideology or way of life can stand in the way of the necessity for all peoples to safeguard peace and prevent a nuclear war.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Stop those who would incite a new war: there is no more important task than that. That is demanded by the vital interests of all peoples, as comrade Yuri Andropov has stressed.

Now as never before it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the imperatives and truth of the nuclear era. They are as follows: in the nuclear age it is not possible to take a narrow, egoistic view of peace. There is only one choice, that is, to do all to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. That is why it is necessary that States in their actions in the international arena base themselves on the principle of not harming the interests or the security of other States. In solving issues associated with disarmament and limiting the arms race, the principle of equality and equal security has primary significance. There is one other fundamental truth of the nuclear age, which is that the smaller the nuclear arsenals of both sides, the more reliable is the maintenance of peace.

In the Prague political declaration of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and also in the joint statement adopted in Moscow in June of this year at the meeting of the leading Party and Governmental figures of the countries of the socialist commonwealth, it is proposed to adopt an extended series of urgent and effective measures to ensure stability of the military-strategic situation, to limit the arms race - both nuclear and conventional - and to maintain and deepen détente, all of these being positive achievements in international relations of the 1970s.

A new confirmation of this series of proposals was seen in the communiqué of the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty which took place in October of this year in Sofia. Of particular importance is the initiative adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of States parties to the Warsaw treaty in Prague in January of this year, calling for conclusion of an agreement on the mutual non-use of military force and maintaining relations of peace between States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The heart of this would be the obligation of all States not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against one another and, consequently, not to use military force against one another in general.

The Soviet Union's unilateral adoption in 1982 of the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons was one more exceptionally important and responsible manifestation of good will on the part of the members of the socialist

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

commonwealth. The NATO countries, however, have up to now refused to give a positive reaction to this proposal, thus demonstrating their lack of desire to achieve equal and stable relations of peace, unbecclouded by military tensions. There exists, however, an impressive list of proposals submitted by States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, to which up to now the NATO countries have failed to give a positive reaction. We have in mind: the proposals, starting in January 1984, not to increase military expenditure and thereafter to undertake mutual practical reductions for which it is necessary immediately to undertake direct negotiations; the proposal for a simultaneous freeze by all nuclear States - above all, the Soviet Union and the United States - of existing nuclear weapons, both qualitative and quantitative; the proposal for a full and complete prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons; the prohibition of the militarization of outer space and prohibition of the use of force in space or from space against the earth; the proposal for freeing Europe of chemical weapons as a step towards the full prohibition and elimination of such weapons on a world scale; and proposals on steps for resolving issues relating to the reduction of armed forces and weapons in Central Europe.

The position of the NATO countries on some aspects of these issues, which has once again been manifested even at the present session of the General Assembly, can hardly fail to provoke concern. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has, at the present session of the General Assembly and including the First Committee, expressed its views on a number of issues related to disarmament and notes with a feeling of satisfaction the adoption by this Committee of a whole series of important resolutions which are aimed essentially at serving the cause of strengthening international security. This cause is served in the first place by the Declaration which decisively, unreservedly and forever condemns nuclear war as contrary to human conscience and reason, as the most monstrous crime against the peoples of the world and as a flouting of the primary right of the individual, the right to life.

Our delegation expresses sincere hope that the most important provisions of these resolutions will become the basis for the elaboration of practical measures for their implementation and thereby for the implementation of one of the cornerstones of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which contains an appeal to all States to undertake urgent measures:

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

"for the cessation and reversal of the nuclear and conventional arms race at an early date, the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control". (General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 20)

The States of the socialist commonwealth have fully manifested their political will to carry out this purpose. It is now up to the Western side to respond.

The Byelorussian SSR, which was subjected to Fascist aggression and which lost in the struggle against Nazism during the years of the Second World War more than 2,230,000 persons, that is, one quarter of its population, and more than half of its national wealth, is vitally interested in ensuring peace and security on the European continent. In this connection, we are very satisfied by the successful completion of the Madrid meeting of representatives of States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. This success, achieved in a difficult and tense atmosphere, was the result of a manifestation of political will and a very carefully considered and constructive approach. The spirit of co-operation demonstrated the general vitality of the European process which started in Helsinki and thus creates the possibility that it will continue on the firm basis of the Helsinki Final Act. The participants in the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of States members of the Warsaw Treaty, which took place in October in Sofia, stressed in its communiqué the resolve of those States "to implement, in the interests of developing détente and co-operation, the agreements reached at the Madrid Conference, as expressed in its Final Document. Implementation of those agreements requires, it is understood, the efforts of all States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, in strict accordance with the principles and provisions of the Final Act as a unified whole".

Of particular significance is the agreement reached in Madrid on the convening in January 1984 in Stockholm of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. That Conference should become an important factor in reducing tension on the European continent and in reducing the danger of an armed confrontation and achieving disarmament in Europe. Of course, this will be true only if its participants make maximum efforts to achieve positive results.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

As already stressed more than once, in order to strengthen international peace and security, it is necessary to step up the struggle to settle existing conflicts peacefully, to put an end to knotty issues in world politics at the negotiating table, and not through arms build-ups. How to do this is obvious. For the Near East, which has suffered so much, this means withdrawal of Israeli troops, from all Arab countries occupied since 1967; ensuring the security of all States and people of this region; satisfying the legitimate rights of the Palestinians to statehood; convening an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all interested parties, including the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO); restoring Lebanon's independence and territorial integrity; and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Lebanon of the Israeli occupying forces, as well as the troops of the United States and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

For the Mediterranean, this means the creation of a zone of lasting peace and co-operation; the specific proposals of the States of the Socialist Commonwealth to this end are well-known.

For Asia, this means ending all forms of interference and subversion against the people of Afghanistan and Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea. It also means the elimination of the obstacles to the reunification of Korea on a peaceful and democratic basis without any external interference. On the whole, in this context, the proposal of the Mongolian People's Republic calling for the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific becomes increasingly urgent and has obtained the support of many countries.

The United Nations should step up its efforts to achieve the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism - notably in Micronesia. It must ensure the complete independence of Namibia, maintaining the unity and territorial integrity of that country and granting full power to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

Racism and apartheid must be eliminated; the urgent problems connected with the reconstruction of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis must be solved; peace must be achieved and an end put to the arms race. Those are the principal tasks of our era. They can and must be tackled.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

There is a great potential for peace today. Evidence of this is the active support from millions and millions of people of varying political views and convictions participating in the anti-missile, anti-war movement and standing up for the fundamental human right to life. We are convinced that the desire of peoples for peace will triumph.

Soviet international policy is aimed at peace, at opposing the aggressive efforts of the enemies of peace, at solidarity with all fighters for freedom, independence and social progress. That principled Leninist position will continue to guide Soviet policy.

Mr. RACZ (Hungary): Thirteen years ago, at the twenty-fifth session, the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic sincerely and wholeheartedly welcomed the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, because it was convinced that consistent implementation of the principles enshrined in the Declaration would greatly contribute to a positive development of international relations, to the strengthening of international security and to the maintenance of world peace for the present and future generations of mankind. My delegation did so on the further basis that the purposes and objectives set forth in the Declaration were in conformity with my country's foreign policy priorities.

We noted with satisfaction that the international situation at that time, which was the direct source of the said Declaration, had produced a series of positive phenomena, as well as a great number of practical achievements. Mutual understanding among nations developed; international co-operation widened and deepened; positive tendencies were prevalent, and the process of détente gained ground. However, that process, serving as it did the interests of all nations and favourable as it was for the whole of mankind, slowed down after some time and came to a virtual standstill.

At present, the international situation is extremely alarming and gives us cause for serious concern. The circles which would like to undermine peaceful coexistence, the only possible foundation for relations between States with different social systems, are becoming ever more vehement in their actions. The tangible progress in the improvement of international relations, which in the 1970s began to influence the overall development of world events, is in jeopardy and the

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

trend towards détente, which brought positive results to the peoples of the world has suffered a considerable setback. Co-operation is being replaced by confrontation; attempts are being made to undermine the peaceful foundations of international relations. Further steps are being undertaken to whip up the arms race, thereby increasing the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. The United States and some of its allies do not even attempt to conceal their pursuit of military superiority.

The imperialist policy of resorting to force and diktat, consolidating and redividing spheres of influence and making direct use of military power against States and peoples is intensifying, as illustrated by the recent United States aggression against Grenada, a full-fledged Member State of the United Nations and a member of the Non-Aligned Movement. Such actions are inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the United Nations and with international norms; they are a serious threat to peace and international security and are therefore strongly condemned by my country.

Old military conflicts are being rekindled and new hotbeds of tension are being created. Actions are being carried out to escalate political confrontation; increased attempts are being made at external interference in the internal affairs of States; the positions of the military-industrial complex of the most reactionary militarist forces are being strengthened, and a military psychosis is being fomented. More obstacles are being raised to the attainment of accords on pressing international issues and to the development of equitable economic relations, free from discriminatory restrictions.

Reversal of these negative tendencies, continuation of the policy of peaceful coexistence, preservation and, to the extent possible, development of the results achieved in the period of détente are in the common fundamental interests of all countries and peoples of the world. This community of interests of countries having different social systems may be a source of hope, optimism and encouragement even in the present crucial situation. In addition to the consistent peace policy of the socialist and other peace-loving countries and their pursuit of peaceful solutions to controversial issues, a positive tendency is perceivable in the growth and spread of the mass movements that have sprung up all over the world, speaking out for peace and against the arms race.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

Nevertheless, in order to remove the danger of a nuclear war, to create a balanced pattern of international conditions and to normalize the international atmosphere in general, it is indispensable that joint efforts and firm action by all peace-loving forces with a sense of responsibility for the destiny of the world be coupled with a responsible and sensible approach and a fuller awareness of realities on the part of the leaders of States. Relations between all States should be based on respect for independence and sovereignty, the non-use of force or threat of force, the inviolability of borders, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in internal affairs of other States, equality, and other fundamental principles of inter-State relations.

The Hungarian People's Republic, together with the other socialist countries, is making consistent efforts to curb the arms race, promote the cause of disarmament, reduce tension, strengthen international peace and security, and develop co-operation among countries and peoples in conformity with the principles set forth in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This fact is evidenced by the constructive proposals put forward this year by the Warsaw Treaty member States. Among those far-reaching proposals, I should like to emphasize but one, which is of special relevance to the issue under discussion, namely the proposal for concluding a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the Warsaw Treaty member States and the member States of the North Atlantic Alliance, a treaty which would be open to all other States as well. My delegation wishes to express its conviction that in the current complicated international situation it would be especially important to make progress towards a positive solution of the issue of concluding such a treaty.

Hungary as a European country attaches particular importance to the cause of security and co-operation in Europe. We are firmly convinced that continuation of the process of European security and co-operation in the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act acquires still greater significance in the present tense international situation. We persist in our strong belief that the said historic document is as valid as ever, that it still forms the basis for inter-State relations in Europe, and that its consistent implementation is therefore in the common interest of all signatory States and is bound to exercise a positive influence on the quest for peaceful solutions to the existing hotbeds of crisis in other parts of the world.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

It is against this background that my country welcomed the successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting of representatives of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which is another proof of the fact that even in a complex, aggravated international situation it is possible to find negotiated solutions for all problems in relations between States, if the necessary political will exists, if a well-balanced and constructive approach and a spirit of co-operation are displayed, if the vital interests of peoples, the interests of peace and security, are taken into consideration.

We attach special significance to the agreement reached in Madrid to convene a conference on confidence and security-building measures and on disarmament in Europe, which is scheduled to open in Stockholm on 17 January, 1984. That conference is intended and expected to become an important factor in lessening tension in the European continent, reducing the threat of military confrontation, and achieving disarmament in Europe.

For its part, the Hungarian People's Republic will continue to work, as it did in the past, for the full implementation of the principles and recommendations embodied in the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid concluding document and will make every effort for the success of the Stockholm conference.

My delegation is of the view that the strengthening of international security is conditional on concrete positive steps to be made towards the elimination of long-existing or newly created hotbeds of crisis in different parts of the world, towards a peaceful, negotiated solution of outstanding issues.

We call for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis, a settlement based on the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. on the exercise by the Palestinian Arab people of its right to self-determination, including the right to establish an independent State of its own, and on the assurance of the peace and security of all States of the region within internationally guaranteed boundaries. The outside armed intervention that took place the other day has further aggravated the situation in the region and has made the solution of the problem still harder to achieve. We are convinced that the situation in the region can only be settled by an international conference to be held with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

The Government and people of the Hungarian People's Republic are in solidarity with the peoples of Latin America in their struggle for national independence, self-determination and social progress, as well as against oppression and neo-colonialist designs. We lend support to the common actions by the countries of that continent to achieve a negotiated settlement, to find just and peaceful solutions for the conflicts that generate tension in the region.

Similarly, the Hungarian People's Republic highly appreciates the efforts by the countries of Indo-China to reduce tension in South-East Asia, and it supports the proposals formulated at the April and July conferences of their Foreign Ministers.

We attach great importance to a peaceful solution of the question of Cyprus. As is well known, my country advocates the territorial integrity, independence, sovereignty and non-aligned status of Cyprus and the withdrawal of all foreign military forces from its territory. The so-called independent State declared by the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community is contrary to the interests of the island country and of the peoples of the region as well as to the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

Hungary shares the indignation of international public opinion about the racist régime of South Africa continuing its policy of apartheid in defiance of broad international condemnation. We also condemn the attempt by some Powers to impose arbitrary conditions not sanctioned by any United Nations resolution and to have the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, pushed into the background.

My country continues to stand by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its just struggle, and invariably supports the cause of a peaceful and democratic reunification of the two parts of the country without outside interference.

International security cannot be reduced to the elimination of force from international relations, but, with a positive approach, should comprise observance of the principles governing inter-State relations, constant expansion and deepening of manifold relations between countries and peoples, and creation of an economic basis for such relations.

The United Nations, too, has an important role to fulfil in shaping those relations, and during its existence it has given ample proof of its ability to live up to the expectations placed on it. We hold the view that the most important prerequisite, and at the same time the principal source of the United Nations

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

efficient activity in pursuit of a prosperous future for mankind, lie in an identical interpretation of, and respect for, its Charter and in a consistent and full implementation, without any interference in the internal affairs of Member States, of its resolutions aimed at maintaining world peace and security, as well as of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): In addressing the subject of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, it is important to underline that the Charter of the United Nations provides as its basic purpose, inter alia, the maintenance of international peace and security through such means as the development of friendly relations among States, non-use or threat of use of force in international relations, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. Current experience in inter-State relations, however, points to a growing manifestation and disposition to the use or threat of use of force. Yet the Security Council, the main organ of the United Nations charged under the Charter with the responsibility to maintain international peace and security, has not only proved ineffective but in fact has also demonstrated its inability to exercise fully the authority vested in it to keep the peace.

In the experience of small and weak States and indeed of developing countries, the Charter concept of collective security from which they should legitimately hope for some measure of support from the world body in their effort to safeguard their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and grapple with the problems of development has been undermined. Furthermore, their earlier expectation and/or conviction that the collective security provisions of the Charter would be a source of refuge when their very survival as sovereign States is threatened has gradually become either misplaced or largely unfulfilled.

Today the world finds itself in the throes of a major crisis. That crisis is not only of confidence but also of expectation, and finds unmistakable reflection in the worsening state of the world economy, international security and world peace.

The development of co-operation among States accepts the merit of interdependence. To that extent the necessity to restructure the relations between the North and the South in the political and economic sense on the basis of mutuality of interest becomes the starting-point in the effort to establish a new order in which all countries can pursue their development goals consistent with

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

their possibilities, national priorities and aspirations. But in doing this there has to be a reorientation in the attitude of States, particularly in relation to the objective reality that no country or people, no matter its level of development, can allow itself to be subjected to perpetual domination.

In these days when the powerful States arrogate to themselves the duty and obligation to police the entire world, to create and extend their spheres of influence and to dictate the pattern of socio-economic development and values to other peoples, it is clear that the basis for a peaceful world has been undermined. And, what is more, in pursuit of their geo-political, geo-strategic and economic objectives, the more powerful countries have become more belligerent through a ready recourse to the threat or use of force, intervention or interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, a disposition to crisis management the seeds and embers of which they had in the first instance both helped to create and fan, a denial to other people of their right to self-determination, particularly those under colonial or foreign domination.

We retain a vested interest in the capacity of the United Nations to respond to the legitimate wishes of the peoples of the world for peaceful coexistence, détente and international security. In the circumstance, the United Nations should rethink its options, revamp its working methods and seek to re-establish its competence and moral authority as the collective conscience of the international community.

Peace is indivisible and security which makes it thrive and sustainable must be seen as such and pursued collectively. Besides, national security can retain its form, consistency and viability only if it is conceived and pursued as an integral part of international security. In other words, as no country can be an island unto itself, its security can be assured only within the framework of an established and assured climate of international security.

Security in the developing countries, just as it should also be in the developed countries, is a function of their ability to realize in peace their full development potential. It cannot therefore be denied that poverty, economic weakness, political instability and inability to meet development objectives are incompatible with security. It is for this reason that the call for a new international economic order based on equity and justice becomes more compelling and more sustained. The lack of solutions to the world economic crisis in which

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

there are underlying problems of a structural nature compounded by cyclical factors has led to the aggravation and further inequalities in international economic relations. These make the import of the call more telling on the survivability of national economies and, by extension, of nations themselves.

The most visible index of the security perception of States lies in the recourse to armaments as an instrument of national defence. Unfortunately, the current arms race, both in its nuclear and conventional aspects, has far exceeded the legitimate requirements of defence. This has given rise to insecurity and the exacerbation of international tension. While admitting the legitimacy of the concept of undiminished security of States at a lower level of armaments, it is now clear that the question of the arms race cannot be solved in a vacuum but must of necessity and in parallel subsume the existence of a collective security system made possible by universal respect for the provisions of the United Nations Charter, relevant principles of international law and, in particular, the effectiveness of the Security Council in enforcing its decisions. That is why we believe that the establishment of a special committee on the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter as a supplement to the efforts of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security merits serious consideration.

Proceeding from the general to the particular, let me now make a few comments on the situation in Africa which has been dubbed variously as a crisis area, a target of opportunities and a melting-point of super-Power rivalry.

From a historical perspective, the Berlin Conference of 1884 in which Africa was made the subject of external appropriation and exploitation by a few colonial Powers must remain one of the most blatant acts of interference in the internal affairs of an entire continent in which the future seeds of conflict, instability and insecurity were conveniently sown. At that Conference, in pursuit of their economic and strategic interests, as well as in the promotion of their spheres of influence, Africa was carved up and delimited by the colonialists irrespective of existing natural boundaries, contiguity, political associations or social systems of the various populations.

More recently Africa has become a fertile ground for foreign intervention and rivalry between the super-Powers in the projection of their political and social ideologies and in defence of their main resource lines, both strategic and non-renewable. It would certainly be a contribution to international peace and

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

security if African security was assured and Africa left free to forge its own destiny and contrive its own form of political, economic or social associations consistent with its development objectives and aspirations.

The security of African States forms an integral part of international security. As a member of the least-developed continent and one of the major victims of the current crisis of the world economic system we must draw attention to the fact that international security cannot be based on the existing glaring disequilibrium in the expectation patterns between it and the developed world. That gap, in the interest of equity, justice and orderly development, must be securely bridged.

One of the primary sources of threat to the security of African States comes from South Africa. Its racist policy of apartheid, its aggressive policies towards its neighbours, its frenzied build-up of its military machine, including its development of a nuclear-weapon capability, its objection to the independence of Namibia, the last vestige of colonialism in Africa - all these cannot but have serious implications of concern to the security perceptions of Africa States and, by extension, to international peace and security. South Africa must neither be enabled nor encouraged to remain defiant of international opinion, nor must it be assisted to jeopardize African security.

By the same token, the encroachment on basic freedoms and fundamental human rights at the level of States in any part of the world cannot but have deleterious consequences on the inalienable right of all peoples to be part of the process which seeks to establish a secure and stable international society in which they can live and grow and realize their full potential.

In conclusion, a determined effort on the part of every State Member of the world body to be part of the peace process provides the only sensible option for the establishment of international peace and security. Let us therefore undertake this effort in a common endeavour to keep the peace and put to rest the vicious interrelationship between the arms race, insecurity and under-development.

Mr. QING Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The question of international security is deliberated every year in the First Committee. In the past few days representatives from many countries have expressed in their statements grave concern over the present international situation, and the Chinese delegation shares their feelings. In the past year, contrary to the wishes of the peoples of the world, the international situation - instead of witnessing a

(Mr. Qing Jiadong, China)

relaxation of tension - has become more tense and turbulent. The independence and security of many countries, particularly the small and medium-sized countries, have not been ensured but have encountered more serious threats. The purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter have not been carried out. Instead, they have repeatedly been undermined and trampled upon.

In Afghanistan and Kampuchea foreign troops continue to entrench themselves, while the people of those two countries continue to suffer oppression and massacre. In the Middle East the flames of war blaze on unabated while the crisis becomes more acute. During the very period when our General Assembly is in session such an event as the armed invasion of a tiny Caribbean island has occurred. Negotiations on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe have also come to a halt in spite of the universal demand by the people of the world that they should continue. A new round in the arms race is unfolding rapidly.

As far as our Committee is concerned, the number of draft resolutions on disarmament adopted this year surpassed that of any previous year, though this by no means implies any progress in disarmament. Quite the contrary: there may be many and varied reasons leading to such a disquieting situation in the current world, but there is no need to hide the fact that the root cause lies in the two super-Powers' policy of rivalry for world hegemony.

In recent years the peoples of the world, particularly the people of third world countries who were the most victimized by hegemony, have exerted important efforts to safeguard independence, sovereignty and peace and security, both inside the United Nations and outside it. They oppose wars of aggression and demand the withdrawal of all foreign troops from occupied territories. They oppose intervention in the internal affairs of States and demand that the peoples of the world should be allowed to solve their own problems. They oppose the arms race and military build-ups and demand that the regions in which they live be established as zones of peace. Their legitimate and reasonable wishes were once again strongly reflected in the general debate of the General Assembly and in the deliberations over the questions of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, the Middle East and Grenada.

It is our belief that when the people of the world strengthen their unity and persist in struggle international justice will eventually prevail. In the past year, thanks to the efforts made by Member States, particularly the many non-aligned and neutral countries, the United Nations has done a great deal in the safeguarding of international peace and security and has played a definite role,

(Mr. Qing Jiadong, China)

but due to reasons of which everyone is aware many correct resolutions adopted by the United Nations are not implemented. The United Nations appears weak and ineffectual in finding solutions to important issues. We share the opinion of the Secretary-General and that of many delegations and advocate strengthening the role of the United Nations. In this respect we hold that the Permanent Members of the Security Council, primarily the two super-Powers, bear special responsibility. They should demonstrate by their own actions that they strictly adhere to the purposes and principles of the Charter and fulfil the obligations to which they are committed under it.

The Chinese Government has consistently adhered to a policy of safeguarding world peace and opposing hegemony. We have always stood for the equality of all States, large or small. We hold that the relationship between States should be based on the five principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence. Together with all peace-loving countries and peoples we are ready to make concerted efforts and to work tirelessly for the defence of international peace and the security of States.

Mr. SILOVIC (Yugoslavia): I shall direct my comments to agenda item 66. The issue of the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region is for the first time being considered as a separate item in the General Assembly. In our view the engagement of the United Nations in the consideration of numerous questions related to that region can only contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the problems and to their solution in the interest of all.

In many of its aspects the Mediterranean is a specific region.

The Mediterranean Sea is encircled by three continents: Europe, Asia and Africa, comprising 18 countries with a population of about 300 million.

Numerous civilizations emerged in this region, their different social and cultural values permeating and supplementing one another through the centuries. At the same time the special geographical position and economic potential of the Mediterranean have always been of particular interest to Powers outside the region. The consequences of previous periods are still apparent in the relations between the countries of the region and in its vicinity. They cause differences, disputes and even conflicts, open or potential.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

The hotbeds of crisis in the region, however, are also the product of contemporary adverse and complex developments in the world, which are particularly and alarmingly reflected in the Mediterranean region.

The arms race, wars and military interventions, various crises and the rivalry of the super-Powers for predominance in the region have made peaceful solutions of the problems more difficult. The Mediterranean at this moment is one of the regions of tension and for many reasons it is the centre of their geo-strategic rivalry.

The complex and dangerous situation in the Mediterranean is accompanied by an increasing concentration of all kinds of military forces and armaments. As in other parts of the world, the presence and build-up of naval and air forces in the Mediterranean is causing additional negative consequences for the security of the region and for relations among the countries therein. The unjustified concentration of foreign military presence in the Mediterranean gives rise to anxiety and threatens the security of all, in particular of the non-aligned countries in the region.

On the eastern shores of the Mediterranean there persists one of the longest and most dangerous crises - that of the Middle East, caused by the aggressive and expansionist policies of Israel. The latest development in the Middle East is particularly dangerous. Foreign occupation, intervention and interference pose a direct threat to the integrity of non-aligned Lebanon and to the security of other non-aligned countries in the region, as well as to the struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, its sole, legitimate representative. A comprehensive and just solution to the question of Palestine is thus being rendered even more difficult.

Furthermore, in the eastern Mediterranean region the crisis of Cyprus has acquired a new negative dimension caused by the unilateral declaration of independence of the part of the Republic of Cyprus under foreign occupation.

In the regions adjacent to the Mediterranean whose security affects the Mediterranean but which are also and to the same extent influenced by its development in that region there are other tensions and potential dangers. Directly linked to the security of the Mediterranean is the security of Europe, a continent burdened with the largest concentration of military forces and armaments and a continent where the two blocs directly face each other.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

This calls for resolute and urgent action aimed at a gradual relaxation of tension, the strengthening of co-operation among the countries of the region and the creation of conditions for achieving genuine security in the Mediterranean.

The majority of States in the Mediterranean region are non-aligned. The non-aligned countries are the protagonists of the proposal for the relaxation of tension and strengthening of co-operation in the region.

At their seventh summit, the non-aligned countries devoted much of their attention to the situation in the Mediterranean and launched an initiative aimed at promoting co-operation in that region. They called in particular for the United Nations to play a role in the process of transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation, free from confrontations and conflicts. They also supported United Nations resolutions directed towards the reduction of tension and the solution of problems in the Mediterranean region.

There are numerous possibilities and projects which, coupled with political will and genuine efforts, could lead to the promotion of co-operation in the region, thus contributing to the reduction of tension in the Mediterranean.

We should persist in creating opportunities for strengthening existing opportunities and finding new ones for political, economic, scientific, cultural and other spheres of co-operation in the Mediterranean. We should also jointly endeavour to create and implement projects for the protection of its environment. We must be determined in the search for channels of co-operation, regardless of existing differences, there being no alternative.

As we are living in an interdependent world the future of the Mediterranean should be built on ever-closer and more diverse co-operation, not on confrontation and the build-up of arms. Only by all-embracing, equitable and fruitful co-operation as the foundation of peace and dialogue as the means for solving disputes can relations among Mediterranean countries and between them and other countries be promoted. This is not an unrealistic vision, but a necessity if security for all is to be achieved.

We call for the promotion of existing, and for the search for new, forms of co-operation in the Mediterranean based on active and peaceful coexistence, the political settlement of disputes, equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States - namely, on all the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and on the policy of non-alignment.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

The problems of the Mediterranean should be dealt with resolutely, but also realistically, gradually opening up channels for co-operation and creating opportunities for settling existing disputes.

We should not be passive and helpless onlookers, but should act creatively and channel our efforts for the benefit of all.

While I have the floor, may I avail myself of the opportunity to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.87 on agenda item 66, "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". I do so on behalf of Algeria, the Bahamas, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay, Zambia and my own country, Yugoslavia.

The draft is the result of consultations held by the group of non-aligned countries and, with some preliminary exchange of views, with other countries as well. It is based on the assessments and proposals of the seventh summit of non-aligned countries held at New Delhi earlier this year and on last year's resolution on the same issue.

The contents of the draft resolution necessarily reflect the latest adverse developments in international relations.

The sponsors were guided by the need to analyse and assess concisely the present international situation, which is characterized by an alarming rise in tension in international relations, the lack of solutions to acute political and economic issues, the stalemate in multilateral and bilateral negotiations and an intensified policy of rivalry between the two leading Powers. The fact that no concrete steps have been taken in implementing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted 13 years ago by the General Assembly on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, causes deep concern and demands the undertaking of urgent steps by all Member States. For that reason the draft resolution points to short-term and long-term actions to be taken by the international community, aimed at solving the problems we are faced with.

In the elaboration of the draft resolution the sponsors proceeded from the belief that an end must be put to the further escalation of tension in the world. They were guided by the interests of all countries and they therefore express the hope that the draft resolution will meet with ever-wider support. To that end, the

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

sponsors are continuing consultations with other countries in order to accommodate their points of view as much as possible.

I would take the opportunity of pointing out two small errors in the draft resolution as issued today. In the second line of the fifth preambular paragraph, after the words "great-Power confrontations" instead of the comma the word "and" should be inserted; and in the fourth line, after the word "world" the word "and" should be deleted.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.